



Attention and the Relational Nature of Being Human

2P's in a Pod-Cast — No. 3: Patrick & Peter in conversation

This is the third in a series of dialogues between Peter Mitchell and Patrick Bryson, recorded over Zoom. Our conversations are open-ended explorations, following whatever emerges between us rather than beginning with a fixed agenda.



In this conversation, we explore attention, relationship, language and what it might mean to be fully human — not in search of final answers, but for the sheer joy of looking together.

The original conversation has been lightly edited for readability while preserving its spontaneous and exploratory character.

Precision, Uncertainty and the Limits of Spiritual Language

Patrick: A lot of my thinking at the moment — we've touched on a few things that we may or may not follow on — is that I'm actually writing quite a lot when I can. It's not a full-time activity, but I feel it's important to put into words the biggest possible understanding I have from the life I've led.

Why it's important, I'm not sure. But there are so many things in life that are open-ended. And if you live a spiritual life, of course everything's open-ended, and you find ways of navigating the unknown nature of everything.

But I've found myself getting less interested in that and more interested in the specifics of what I am, what we are, what we're up to, and what we could be up to. I've sort of turned around 180 degrees and become very interested in detail and precision and the specifics of the unknown, if you want to call it that.

Because we're human. We're not an abstraction. We are actually quite specific. Most of us have two arms, ten fingers, a head and eyes. We're actually very similar in many ways, formally.

So, I wanted to go: okay, there must be a place where you get enough things set up that make enough sense. And I think liberation is very key to this. Then we can look at: what actually is the form that we have?

Peter: Hmm.



Patrick: Of course, it could be for a lot of things, and that's why we have so much diversity. But I've become very interested in putting together, or understanding, a more coherent picture of what it means to be a human being together with other human beings.

I'm not the first to want to do that, of course, but I feel we're missing something. I don't quite know what it is. We're missing a big-picture understanding. And that's why we're in a metacrisis, I suppose. We're in a crisis of meaning. There are a lot of people speaking about this.

That's where I've started: this meaning crisis. It's historical. We've got rid of a lot of things that were full of flaws and hidden biases. We don't have religion so much anymore — although there's plenty of it if you want it. It's optional.

But we do seem to be missing something.

I don't know why I said all that, but that just came.

Peter: I can totally relate. Some of the interesting conversations I'm having on Substack are making me discover the importance of being able to articulate your experience clearly.

I've had a few back-and-forths where I've said something that I believed was my understanding — like, "I am Awareness" — and then had that immediately challenged. To the point where I have to really dive back into my own experience and unpick all these hidden assumptions that feel like foundational spiritual perspectives you're operating from and then realise you've already built a structure out of something that's unstructured.

Which doesn't mean you can't articulate your experience. But it does mean you have to be so precise — like you were saying, the precision, the detail — and not say anything you cannot back up by looking into your own experience.

I find that very liberating, because you're unravelling all these unconscious biases and structures that you've reconstructed. You have these experiences of impermanence, of vastness, of the unstructured nature of everything, and then you build a relationship with it again. You unravel everything, and then all the bits come back and form another structure, and you think you've kind of got it.

So, it's this ongoing process of unravelling and re-ravelling, which I'm thoroughly enjoying — particularly in dialogue with others.

What's starting to become very clear for me is that it's not about finding a final answer. It's about keeping the curiosity alive and being willing to keep digging, looking and looking again, trying to be more precise and seeing where that goes.

Wherever you end up, behind it is essentially this mystery — the mystery of life itself. You can never pin anything down. But the process of trying to see further seems to be really important. The willingness not to assume anything, and to keep looking and investigating.

That's one of the things driving me at the moment.

Patrick: It's a great driver, I have to say.



Peter: Yeah. And like you, I'm writing. I wrote to Anne today because we're exchanging stuff about the website she's working on and I'm inputting into. And it was only while I was typing that I had another insight into what was needed.

My thinking is through writing now, very much. As I write something, something comes through and I get it in the writing in a way I wouldn't necessarily get just sitting contemplating my own thoughts.

So, there's something about putting things into words — while realising that words don't fully encapsulate. But at the same time, they're important. They're connectors.

Anyway, I don't know what I'm trying to say now!

Patrick: I love what you're saying because it resonates a lot with how I'm living these days.

One of the things I saw quite clearly is that a lot of what we call spiritual language is cliché. It's adopted and lazily used and parroted. People use certain words and we nod and go, "Yes."

I find that unbearable at a certain point, because I realised that was what was suffocating me.

Of course, that's true of anything conceptual, anything in life that we relate to through memory, concepts or language. That's a necessary function, but it's not necessarily what is springing from us in that moment.

So, I thought, if one of the truths is that I'm not my body and I'm not my mind, well then, what exactly am I?

It must be possible to operate knowing the place the body and mind have in one's life as tools or functions. But then what is it to operate without identifying with that — or with an understanding of that — and not use it to project a performance of knowing something about something?

If that doesn't sound too convoluted!

I think that's what we need to understand. And not as some esoteric thing that only monks in monasteries at the top of a cliff in some faraway land write about, and then you read about it 2,000 years later and go, "Oh, that sounds lovely."

But for that potential, which is in all of us, to be fully functioning and operating.

That's why I agree with you about precision. If you don't have precision, you're not really paying attention. And if you're not paying attention, then there is a certain habitual, evolutionary sense of identity constantly being reinforced.

If you read enough of this stuff, they say you're supposed to be free of that. So, when you're free of it, what does that look like?

I think it's got something to do with what you're saying. Yes, operating in the unknown — but that doesn't mean everything's unknown. It means you can really see and respond in ways that are very precise, very clear, and even very original.

Peter: I've started to use the term uncertainty rather than unknown. The unknown seems to dissolve everything into nothingness.



But you do know things. You're not completely not-knowing anything.

Fundamentally, though, there is uncertainty. There's an openness and a sense of infinite possibility on the threshold of being that encompasses everything you know, but contextualises it in something vaster.

So there are all these open threads.

Patrick: Yeah. And it really is all to do with how attention works.

When we look out from a place that isn't coming from looking into memory or narratives or stories, it's not unknown. It's very specific.

You have a particular shape and form. I have a memory of you, but you're also completely original in this moment, as I am. That's very specific. We find that we are actually human beings. We have a human form.

So you can look into the unknown, but you can also look into the very, very known present.

I find that much more interesting than dwelling on abstract vagueness. Consciousness is a word that everybody uses, and I hate the word now, because what does it even mean?

Peter: Yeah. We're pointing to something that's the ineffable underpinning of everything — that you are, but which isn't your identity.

And we're also trying to explain something we're right in the middle of. We're not standing outside it looking in. That's the logical, conceptual way of approaching things.

We are right in the middle of it. We're participating in it and trying to understand it at the same time.

We almost are the thing itself trying to understand itself. There's this recursive, loopy quality to it.

But when you accept that and try not to fix anything, there's this wonderful sense of living on a threshold — an emerging threshold — not quite knowing what might come next but being excited by the thrill of it all.

Starting Again Without the Story

Patrick: This is beautiful. In a way, this is what your work is all based on, right? It's an invitation.

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: I do it in a slightly different way. I invite people through meditation, because when we meditate it's possible to stop everything.

And when you get that stop point, then you can start from a different place.

Of course, that takes as long as it takes, and there are different stages, but basically, when it stops, it stops.

Peter: It stops.

Patrick: Your story, your memory, and your need to build additional chapters to that story — when that stops, something very exciting can happen.



Because then it's possible to meet someone else who's also doing that. And then you have something very, very interesting.

It's the potential to really see: what are we made of? What are the characteristics and qualities that we have that are very specific as human beings?

Until we're liberated, we're generally looking at a story that we're trying to add to, work out or fix. It occupies all of our attention.

Peter: And everything that's arising — the world arising — is all in relationship to that.

Patrick: All in relationship to that, yeah.

So, I don't think this is particularly esoteric or spiritual. This is just human nature. By looking and paying attention, I think everyone is doing the same thing underneath it all.

And I see it as an evolutionary kind of design.

When you question that, and through whatever doorway you get into this — through your work, or your approach, or anyone's, there are so many options — something can occur that sets a different stage.

But what we see then is not the unknown. It's: Oh, it's this life the way it is.

That's what excites me — not my own discovery of that, but the discovery of that with other people.

And I think there's a story to be written about that which isn't fixed.

Where Does Intelligence Arise?

Peter: Yes, I totally agree.

I had this really interesting experience just before coming on the call. I saw my little icon in the window waiting for yours to open. All I could see was this face, but on this side of it — nothing. There was no one here that was that.

And yet, the minute we started, something comes through.

What's that actually all about? Because I don't have to claim it.

Most people, as they're speaking, claim it: I'm speaking. They're my words. They're my thoughts. That's all part of the story-building.

But to realise, in a weird way, that you're almost an empty conduit for something...

What I'm starting to think through the relational work we're doing with the groups is that intelligence isn't something in here. It's weird — everything's intelligent. Intelligence is arising in the moment.

If we don't claim it, it's available.

I don't know exactly where I'm going with this because I haven't clearly formulated my understanding of it. But I'm sensing it's not something that sits in the brain working.



As you wake up, you start to realise there's no inner and outer, in a sense. It's an artificial boundary we've erected to navigate in the world. Really, there's just experiencing that has no inner and outer.

So, if that's the case, where is intelligence thinking? Where are thoughts arising?

They're just arising.

You don't need to grab it because it's happening anyway. It's happening through you, but not necessarily as you.

It's fascinating to start to unpick it.

Patrick: I think this is touching on territory I'm looking at very closely.

Language is imprecise and limited. So, when you state something a certain way, I'm bound to look at it and go: What is that? Is that true? Is there something missing?

Because there's always something missing when we say something.

You were saying that intelligence seems not to be mine.

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: And yet it's not only "out there." There's this uncontainable way it works that's both what we say it is, but also almost its opposite.

Relationship Without Separation

Patrick: There is our collectivity. And we need to shift more of our attention to that because of over-individuation and narcissism, which is a real issue.

We need to feel and notice that we are actually in relationship.

And relationship, to me, doesn't mean myself and somebody else. It means the totality of relationship.

I find myself to be someone who is not even in relationship, because "in" would mean —

Peter: Separation.

Patrick: An unnecessary division. There is relationship as a totality.

And yet there is this specific individuation within that.

I think that should allow us an incredible degree of liberation and, in a certain way, boldness — to be independent. Wildly independent. Rather than conforming in order to be "in relationship," if you know what I mean.

Peter: Yes, I do.

I think that's one of the key discoveries we're finding with the Between-Us Groups.



You've got the uniqueness of the individual on the one hand and the sense of belonging to the collective on the other. Most people would see that as: either you're individual and you can't fit in, or you belong to a group and therefore have to fit in and can't be individual.

But what we're finding in the Between-Us Groups is that sense of belonging, that sense of connectedness — and, like you said, not being in relationship, but discovering our relational nature as deeply foundational.

There's nothing to do about it. It's a discovery, an uncovering, not something you do.

And actually, that allows your own individuation to be completely unique — completely an expression of everything my whole life has brought me to in this moment, which is completely different from what your whole life has brought you to.

Uniqueness, Belonging and the Whole

Peter: I'm discovering who I am in this moment, with my own history emerging. You're discovering who you are. But we're not starting from separation as a point of coming together.

I think our uniqueness is an expression of the wholeness that we already are. That's what we're finding in our groups.

The groups thrive on diversity and difference, on people bringing something completely authentic that might even be against the flow of where the meeting was going.

And that actually deepens the intimacy. It's extraordinary.

We're discovering that we have so much more in common than divides us. Put those two together and it's very rich.

Patrick: I find it fascinating how different everybody is. Not even close!

When I look at you and I look at myself, we're wildly different. And yet we have the same universal form.

It makes me wonder: what is this for?

I think it forces us to be creative. Part of being a human being is that we interpret our experience all the time.

Generally, most of us are interpreting our experience according to very preordained assumptions. And that's fine, I suppose.

But if you're someone who isn't satisfied with that and you start abandoning the preordained, you end up with nothing preordained.

You get to have a very exciting life. It's very unpredictable. But at the same time, it's not chaos.

Peter: Sometimes it feels like it! Although when you look deeply, there is an underlying... something else is carrying that as well.

Patrick: If we're here and we don't have history — it's a big "if", but just say — because we're being authentic...



When I look at myself internally, there's just nothing there.

Peter: Yeah.

Patrick: But when I look out, there's all this life and all this pattern. And the patterns are in time. Things have a time-honoured reality. Everything isn't just appearing and disappearing. Material has a temporal form.

So therefore, that means we are also that, right?

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: Then it makes sense to me that there's some form of change or alchemy going on in relationship to that.

And I think it gets very interesting when our point of reference is liberation, not historical repetition.

Then we can be involved in an alchemy that's actually more about the way life operates, and we're in harmony with that.

That would bring everything together — the way everything works, our human form. If we understand science and all of history, our human form has taken millions of years.

There's a kind of thing going on that we could get more with.

Peter: And I think it comes down to what you said earlier about attention.

That seems to be the key.

There's a very big picture unfolding of which we are a small part. That's my sense anyway. There's something big and vast that has its own... agenda is the wrong word, but its own telos, its own direction, and we're all part of that.

It's about getting out of the way of that, while being consciously aware that one is a creative point in the whole picture.

Our attention — keeping our attention on that edge, that threshold, that emergent point — is where we're fully engaged but not trying to control.

We're aware of the bigger picture and what's happening, making connections and sensing almost attractors in the future, directional things coming towards us.

Because time isn't just this fleeting one-after-another. My own experience of time is actually one of duration — this open-ended continuity, this flow that has no beginning and no end.

For example, my move to Canterbury. I don't know what's going to happen, but Canterbury is sitting out there as an attractor in my future. Very real but not defined.

And things in my past are sitting there as impulses for how I'm operating now, yet my relationship to those is also changing the past and changing the future.

As I move forward in time, my perspective on those future points and those past points is also changing.



Attention and the Human Event

Peter: There are these different layers to time that you can experience simultaneously. There's the pressure of clock time — I was out and thought, "Oh God, I'd better get moving because I've got a call with Patrick."

Patrick: Get your skates on!

Peter: Exactly. That's going on while simultaneously there's this whole different relationship to time, and underneath that there's the stillness and silence that's timeless.

It's like experiencing a slice of the ocean — from the storms on the surface to the stillness at the bottom — all at the same time, without one blending into the other.

Patrick: No, they're distinct.

I find attention the most fascinating component of all this.

If anything, I would say, I am attention. Because it's a complete mystery what it is.

There is an agency to attention, and I think that whatever a human being is, is attention in a body and a mind.

Then there's this perception of the way things are, our human form, this factor of time.

So to me it's become kind of obvious that we are actually an event.

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: We are an event. If we're anything, we're an event.

And within that, attention can be directed.

When attention is liberated, we can perceive the whole. But you can't contain the whole, because that's not possible.

So what exactly is attention? Where's it coming from?

Peter: That's fascinating. I'm finding myself tingling.

Patrick: I think about it all the time. We think we have attention.

We don't.

Attention has us.

Peter: Yeah.

Patrick: It's a much more dynamic and interesting way to look at it than consciousness.

When you say the word consciousness, what happens?

Peter: You just blur it out.

Patrick: You're sort of floating in some silver mist and you relax!



But when you look at attention, you're awake.

Our humanity and our relationality seem to me to be two of the most primary aspects of what I would call myself and my fellow human beings: our relationality and our attention.

If our attention is on our relationality, then I think everything can fall into place.

Attention Between Us

Peter: This is really sparking something for me, Patrick.

I've always thought, in a way, that I'm in control of my attention and where I place it. But I'm not.

Patrick: Well, there does appear to be a degree of that.

Peter: Yes. But it's a little like what I was saying about intelligence being "out there" rather than "in here."

Attention is relating to what is arising in the moment.

Right now, my attention is fully on you and what you're saying. But in a way, I'm not directing it. You're pulling it.

It's you out there pulling the attention and I'm going with it, rather than me deciding, "I'm going to listen to Patrick now."

It's a Between-Us sort of thing, isn't it?

And with the world as well. Attention is between you and the world. It's arising with what's there.

That's fascinating. I don't know where this is going, but this is really...

Patrick: Why this is important to me is because things get very coherent. Things make sense.

Rather than something generally sounding true, or there maybe being a direction in general, I feel like I'm at the heart of whatever I am — and I don't know what I am — and at the heart of life.

And I feel that this attention, which isn't specific but is very dynamic, wants to meet other human beings as much as is possible.

And at the same time, if that doesn't happen, it's also fine.

Peter: It's like attention wants to meet attention.

Like when you make real eye contact with someone. Something happens in that eye contact that is so mysterious and you can't define it, but it's very real and experiential.

It's a little bit like that with attention.

And I like the way attention can be so vast and wide and take everything in, and yet at the same time laser down and be completely specific to an event, a moment, a person or a thing.

Both can be present at the same time.



Patrick: They're not exclusive or in opposition, even though they're very distinct.

And that, to me, is what a human being is.

I think we need to really honour this. In a way, it's sort of obvious.

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: Isn't it sort of obvious?

And yet it's not what we overtly lead with. We lead with what I'm doing today, the ache I've got, the task I have to do — all very interesting, and all things that make us different.

But our story is generally what we lead with.

Peter: Which is what we did at the start of this call, before I recorded it!

Patrick: Exactly!

And we need to do that. I'm not saying otherwise, because that is also what we are.

I love the details of people's lives and what they're doing. I didn't used to.

Peter: People are endlessly fascinating now. Because everybody is this.

Patrick: Yes. That's the recognition.

Peter: The recognition that everybody has this potential. And maybe in a moment in a conversation they might just get it.

I wrote a poem a couple of years back — I can't remember what it was called — but it was something like: treat everybody as if they are who you are, and give them the space and opportunity to be that back, even if they don't.

Patrick: You can contemplate that, understand that and practise that.

But when it's actually what you understand, then it's also how you act.

Peter: How you live.

Patrick: How you live and how you act.

In a certain way, we are a performance. We're also a story.

But when we're only that, there's always a sense of something not quite fitting together.

When all of that falls into the understanding of this bigger picture — and I don't mean an abstract vision, I mean actually seeing the big picture and feeling it as oneself — all the pieces fit.

That used to drive me crazy. I'd spent so long on this stuff. I knew so much. It was almost as though I had all the pieces, and somebody would say something and I'd go, "Yeah, that fits over here."

But none of it seemed to fit together.



There was something missing. Something specific.

I think when we discover that specific thing that's missing, everything falls into place.

Peter: You can't assemble the bigger picture by putting the parts together.

Patrick: It's not additive.

Peter: But when you see the bigger picture, all the parts naturally sit where they are, and you go: everything's in its right place.

You can't start from the bits and assemble the big picture. It doesn't work.

Patrick: Because we should be able to understand our human purpose and form, shouldn't we?

But obviously we live in a world where that's not really the common currency.

So, what we're talking about has to be the solution.

And I trust in that in a way I never used to.

Each one of us is very small. But we don't know how this can work. Like you were saying earlier, you don't know what intelligence really is.

Peter: Yes. Each of us is small, but we're also an expression of the whole.

In our uniqueness, we may have a role to play that we have absolutely no idea about. But by being completely, utterly and authentically who we are in every moment, we're fulfilling that role without ever knowing how it fits into the bigger picture.

Are we planting seeds at the moment that may germinate in — well, how many generations?

We don't know. We have no access to that picture.

At the same time, I think our role is to be as completely authentic as we possibly can be in every moment.

And that's it. Then we're doing what we have to do.

True Absence, Strong Presence

Patrick: To me, finding this... I call it true absence, because I find that a nice, precise term.

If I am anything, it's truly absent.

That may mean something or nothing to you, but to me it's the most precise articulation of what I've discovered. And yet it's totally paradoxical.

It doesn't make any rational, coherent sense, because there's everything else going on as well.

But I don't feel any contradiction or paradox in myself anymore, which is quite refreshing!

It makes every day interesting because I don't know what's going to happen.



And then, as we know, there's a whole story of people who discover something they call "the truth". They set themselves up and feel genuinely passionate about sharing it and doing whatever work. And then 40 or 50 years later you realise things went off the rails.

There are deeper things to pay attention to — the way identification works, ownership and individuation.

Because we are individuated. But along with individuation comes: "I'm a separate individual. I'm a special one. Look what I found."

On one hand you'll have pure motives and on the other impure motives, all going on at the same time.

This is also what a human being is.

What are we going to do?

Peter: I'm having a really interesting experience as you talk about true absence, because I'm feeling you as a very strong presence.

You're experiencing yourself as true absence, and I'm experiencing myself as true absence — but I'm probably coming across as a strong presence.

Isn't that fascinating?

Patrick: Totally coherent. That's coherence.

It's space meeting space.

Peter: In something very dynamic and real and expressive.

Patrick: Yes. Exactly. Well said.

That's the best articulation of what makes sense to me. And it's so obvious and so commonplace that I'm like: Why are we in such a mess?

This is actually what we are.

So that would mean that in this time-bound event, this evolutionary unfolding, we're at a very specific juncture.

It's taken many thousands and millions of years to get here, and it's a potential. The design — whoever created this design that we are, this form we are... It's hard not to think of a person, but obviously there isn't one. It's a process.

But the design may not be good enough to pull this off.

Peter: Yeah. It's a huge experiment.

And God knows how many of these different experiments are happening throughout the universe — how many are successful and how many come to naught.

But it's up to us to give it our best shot, isn't it?



Patrick: Yeah.

And in your mind's eye and my mind's eye there's this incredibly beautiful, ephemeral... what is it? It's not even a substance.

But we know this because it's happening between us.

Therefore, this is possible.

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: And you could say: we have succeeded.

Peter: Yes — in this moment.

Because there's nothing else, is there? There is only this, right now, here.

Patrick: So therefore, the realisation and the potential are symbiotic.

The potential indicates there could be more.

And yet the realisation tells you it's complete.

Peter: It's here.

Patrick: That makes sense to me about being a human being.

I'm not a green-headed, ten-armed Zygogue from some other planet!

Peter: You look like that to me, Patrick. Sorry.

Patrick: But this makes sense to me because it's very specific. It's less unknown.

There's an attraction in that.

When we make the unknown the goal, attention can go anywhere and get fixated.

Why I feel true absence is so important is that it's the only aspect of this that keeps everything moving.

I don't know whether pure is a good word, but — moving. Fluid.

The fluidity of this human form that I am, seems to be the most interesting thing.

Being alive — fully alive — seems to be the best bit.

And true absence seems to provide the understanding of how it works.

Peter: It's the space for everything to arise uninterrupted and unimpeded, as it wants to, through and as us in human form.

Language as Creative, Not Just Descriptive

Patrick: What's interesting as we're talking is that I'm very aware of how my attention is operating.



I don't know who's aware of that — that starts to get...!

But I'm aware that my attention moves around. Depending on how we talk and the language we use, it moves into different present experiences of what's going on, rather than into history or stories.

Sometimes those come up, but they usually fall away.

Which means the way we use language is actually creative — less to do with being a description of something that has happened or could happen.

Language is a creative part of how we are operating.

Peter: It's a conduit, isn't it? A way between...

I don't want to fix it. I'm going to leave it at that. I don't want to define it too clearly.

But it's allowing you and me to experience...

I mean, we could probably just sit here in silence for 45 minutes and have just as deeply rewarding an experience.

Patrick: True!

Peter: But there's something — coming back to where we started — about the enjoyment of being precise.

There is something exquisite in being precise about the nature of your own experience and having someone respond to that.

There's something very beautiful about that.

Patrick: Yes, it is beautiful.

Rather than language being only limited — trying to grasp something with it — it's actually creative.

God, I can't...

Peter: I get the sense of where you're going.

Patrick: Our capacity for language is part of what defines us as human beings.

And the precision of that seems to be of the utmost importance, because whatever this event is, the way we use language and the way we articulate is how this event we are part of operates and unfolds.

Language is creative, not just descriptive.

Peter: Yes.

Patrick: And you mentioned silence.

What we do in our group is — I actually prefer to sit with people in silence. Because what goes on in silence, when everyone is also doing the same thing, is very powerful.



It's not words or language, but there is a language going on. There's an energetic aspect. And it's only when you stop everything else that you even notice that.

There's an exploration of that.

Whenever we meditate, we always do some form of sharing or talking afterwards, because I think the potential of whatever has or hasn't occurred could be lost if you don't use language.

It raises the importance of language to a very significant degree.

Peter: Yes.

There's something about the experiencing, and then almost the acknowledgement of the experiencing.

And yet it's not pinning it down. It's not, "Oh, I have to get this down and publish it."

Although there's also that aspect! I'm recording this and I'm going to stick it on my website because there's something very generative about this that others can benefit from as well.

There are all these different layers.

Love, Generosity and Sharing

Patrick: Yeah. It's to do with how much we want to share.

I think in attention and relationship there is a natural undercurrent of love and generosity.

And I think that's an important sign of any kind of human progress:

Is there love? Is there generosity? Is there sharing going on?

If there is, then whatever else is going on is okay.

Peter: Yeah.

Wow.

That feels like a really good point to sit in silence, maybe, for a few minutes.

Patrick: Yeah, why not?

It feels like we've opened all the doors...

Peter: Yeah.

Patrick: ...doors and windows.