

**Real Love:
the true nature of it**

The Strokes indicate our problem of sense-of-separation profoundly in their song "Heart in a Cage": -

"Heart In A Cage" by the Strokes

*Well I don't feel better
When I'm f**king around
And I don't write better
When I'm stuck in the ground
So don't teach me a lesson
Cause I've already learned
Yeah the sun will be shining
And my children will burn*

Oh the heart beats in its cage

*I don't want what you want
I don't feel what you feel
See I'm stuck in a city
But I belong in a field*

Yeah we got left, left, left, left, left, left, left

Now it's three in the morning and you're eating alone

Oh the heart beats in its cage

*All our friends, they're laughing at us
All of those you loved you mistrust
Help me I'm just not quite myself
Look around there's no one else left
I went to the concert and I fought through the crowd
Guess I got too excited when I thought you were around*

Oh he gets left, left, left, left, left, left, left

*I'm sorry you were thinking; I would steal your fire.
The heart beats in its cage
Yes the heart beats in its cage
Alright*

And the heart beats in its cage

In relationship with others and in the environment of modern “civilized” culture, there is a powerful focus on finding “real” love. This love has many faces but all of them are personal. They are always to do with a transactional process of buying and selling. She loves me, so I can love her; I gave her a lot of love, she didn't get any love from him. Where is the love? What has love got to do with it? etc. All of these statements have nothing to do with the essences of the meaning of love. We need to replace the word love with something like Unity, Oneness; it is always unconditional in nature. In James Cameron’s film *Avatar*, this problem was dealt with perfectly by using “I see you”. The Sufis say it more accurately “I am you”. All of these phrases are expressions of what is underlying the common delusion of separate “selves”, living in a world from which they are separate and within which they are lonely. To find love therefore means to find Oneness. It is therefore impossible to say that you “love” someone. Why? Because to love someone would mean that love is a separate entity that one is applying to another separate entity. Love can’t be applied. In a similar way to the words “god”, “nature” or “oneness”, love is a term that has universality in it. One wouldn't say “I god you” or “I nature you”, but in many ways this is what is being said. Love is a noun and expression of the name of something universal and unattainable, it isn't a word that can be used for transaction.

Yes, I realize that the word is seldom used to say what it intrinsically means, but as a phrase which is about wanting to connect, wanting to be close. It is a call to be closer together, a call to realize the unity that is already there. However, it is almost never used in such a way, if it was, then the whole notion we have, of being “in” or “out” of a relationship, would be impossible. Being “in-love” or “out-of-love” would be an impossibility. If all that love was meant to be was a signpost back to our senses, then it wouldn't have so much commercialization or transactional basis to it. It has turned into a loaded word that men fear to use because it's like signing a contract, and women often feel it is a word that means so much and is an unreachable goal that their men rarely attain. Unfortunately this is the way society has become. Women are taught that they need to hear the words “I love you” before they go “deeper” into a relationship. Men are taught that in order to keep their freedom, saying “I love you” means something you only say when you are ready for marriage. Yes, these are stereotypes but very often there is a general accuracy in these perspectives. And what does “marriage” mean, in connection with love? The human, as an animal of nature, feels nothing for legal documents; this is a use of the mind, not of the innate sense of being.

The overall picture here is something that is totally devoid of the actual root meaning of love. Love is not a contract, nor is it a bargaining tool. It isn't personal and yet it is deeply intimate because it is all of everything. Hence love is unconditionally everything or Oneness is everything. To use the word ‘love’ as something that can be delivered, like a package, that might or might not arrive, is absolutely ridiculous. Love is also background to suffering and tyranny, as it is within all relationships of whatever kind. So in our quest to find real love we need to consider its deeper meaning and implication.

As we have different relationships we come to understand the nature of relationship as something that is about connection. The male body is representative of the universality of the male expression. The female body is the same, it is a universal expression of the feminine quality. When people connect sexually they do not do so with an “idea in the mind”, unless they are detached from the experience; usually there is less or no thought, there just is the experience of what is being felt. There is no person present to engage in the conundrum of who is who, it’s not about that any more, there is no “I” and “you”. When mother and baby look into each others’ eyes for the first time, or there is a touching of the skin of the two, there is no thought process as to who is who and what it’s all about, the two are united and universally inseparable; there is no “two-ness” in fact. Friends can be together and connect together, sometimes without words; here too there is no thought, like twins knowing each others’ minds intimately. There is no separation in fact, it only seems like it from the 2nd or 3rd person perspective. From the 1st person perspective, “two-ness” doesn't exist.

Animals do not say, “I love you” in a cognitive way, in fact every act is an in-love-with-everything act. This includes those processes of life that, from the human mind, look violent: the lion killing the antelope, the fox killing the rabbit, these are acts of love. Real love therefore is larger in its way of response that it is in the words used. It encompasses everything. In relationship to all the people around us, it is impossible to say “we love them”. It is, however, true that we are them; we are aspects of each other, fingers of the same hand. The thumb doesn’t think “I’ll love the 2nd finger this year”! - it’s in love with the whole hand and the whole body and all of nature. A way of expressing such a thing is beyond words. There are no words to describe the sense of unity. If we use the word love to proclaim something, we are proclaiming beyond the word. Any word can be used, any profanity or “unsacred” word could hold the same message. The word ‘love’ lives in obscurity, to be used both as a weapon and as a tool for a separatist mind, but it can have no effect if one sees that the person using it very often has no sense of the true meaning of it, otherwise they would not use it.

A loving relationship is something totally natural, something incorruptible by the politics of the world economic systems, so there is no word to describe such a thing. Words used by society are part of the mind and the mind is something which, by its nature, separates and breaks one thing from another. There is no problem with this, except when the words ‘love’ or Oneness are used. They are words that end words, nothing beyond them can be understood, for they are only labels of meaning, not something we need to understand with our minds.

Hence saying “love” or “Oneness” can be clearly understood in the context of going beyond the idea of the madness of society, but saying “I love you” is an idea of love being something that is transactional between an ‘I’ and a ‘you’. Unless the idea of ‘I and you’ is lost, it will always be something that one is trying to keep hold of, then breaking apart from, re-forming, then finding oneself broken-hearted etc., a constant struggle to find unity externally, rather than through the being.

Many people have commented on this same point. In Christopher Ryan and Cacilda Jethá's brilliant book "Sex at Dawn", the pre-history of modern sexual relationship is uncovered. Here we get a clear picture of the reality of human sexual behavior being about tribal unity, understanding sharing and non-possessiveness in sexual contact with others, as well as in all other facets of life. We have the clear realization that human beings were never meant to live separate from one another in nuclear families and that this is the root of all our problems. The message is the same here, that the notion of separation has rooted itself in the minds of many people on the planet and this is the greatest distortion of all. This distortion affects us at the level of sexuality also: men suppressing their sexual expression and being told that their needs have to be "controlled" and sanitized, and that that which is not is deemed dirty by society which is incapable of accepting something that isn't hermetically sealed. So this causes repression of the sexual energy and the man becomes the pervert, the defiler or violent aggressor. The female, for so long abused for her own sexual longing and need to connect, is turned into a repressed and controlled being. She is therefore unable to naturally be sexual, holding internal tension and stress, leading to cancers and hypertension, reaching a peak which renders the body immobile, so strong is the control and fear. Women and men are categorized into "players and whores" vs. "ladies and gentlemen". Those who don't "play the social game" and instead do something which is actually more sensual and more natural, which is considered a total travesty of judgment and idealism, are often turned upon by society's laws and prohibitions. Hypocritically, society believes in the bonding and ownership of bodies, and considers the swan as its emblem of monogamy (which, as Ryan and Jethá point out, is actually untrue) while their primate cousins, with whom they share almost all their energetic make-up, are considered as backward, broken, living in a way which is unsuitable for humans. However, the truth is that we are not further evolved, but rather, far more mutated. It is an illusion to think that we could be any more evolved, when we are at the same evolutionary moment as the primates closest to us. The chimpanzees and bonobos share everything, are non-monogamous and live in total peace; peace does not mean without pain and aggression, but without suffering. Our greatest mutation is that we want to see something that isn't possible, humans being at the top of the tree, so we can say "we're safe now". There is no safety in hierarchy, it always comes crashing down eventually. Everything built up by humans will always come down, it's the nature of nature. This isn't to do with quality over quantity or any such commercialism; this is simply to do with the nature of shared and unified understanding over separatist thinking. Instead of despising those who live in a different way, who seem primitive to a western society, who eat different things, have different ways of being, instead of berating this, let's look at how we are, and unless we really have got it right, which truly means living without suffering, then it might be an idea to look towards those who truly know, through very simple but highly-developed interaction with nature, with health itself, and who understand the nature of love, as an impersonal and intimate expression.

How have love and sex separated? Why do people believe this to be the case? This is mainly because there is separation in the idea of what love is and what sex is. If there was only love, then sex would be another expression of this, which is what it is. But "love" is so deeply tied to possessiveness and control that it has all but lost its primal understanding.

Yes, “love” might be associated with a specific feeling now, in modern society. Love is associated with the feelings of warmth and intimacy, the excitement at seeing a lover or family member, or friend. What happens the rest of the time? Does it go away? Of course this would be impossible. So instead of calling this love or not love, this is “being together with”, being One. Such a thing is unbreakable and beyond life and death, beyond distance. This brings about such feelings that we call love. But love is not something we can do or be, or try or grasp, we cannot make a recipe for it or turn it into anything. It is just the basic foundation we are living in. It has manifold forms to it, me the writer, you the reader, but the reverse is true - am I writing the words you are reading, or are you reading the words I am writing - in fact it’s one, there is no separation, the illusion is that there is such a thing as separation.

The word “Love” is far more complex than that of God, Oneness, Unity, health, etc. All these words are hard to pin down, they are broad and mean something larger than can be told, but none is more hidden than the word love. God is closest to it as it represents the idealism of the human mind, but when used in the context of belief, it is always about something separate from the person and as a result it is clear what it is - separation. Love is something that seems to be within, yet is turned on and off like a tap. It is used to manipulate, to control, to make into, and rarest of all, it is used to signify an unconditional nature of everything. It is profoundly personal, believed in like a god, and yet deeply misunderstood.

We say “for our world to be at peace, we need to love one another”. This gives us a wonderful warm feeling, an idea of Oneness. The problem is that this already exists, has always existed, therefore is not something that can be achieved, for it has already happened. The seeking is over. How is it possible to love? Who is it that loves? Who tries to love? Who fails at loving? When these questions are deeply connected to, then the answer reveals itself, there is no-seeker who is doing any of this, there is no personal choice involved, no-one making the decisions. People cannot help but be attracted towards and repelled away from each other/everything, like magnets in the energetic ocean made of love. Love is everything, it is unknowable as a finite commodity. Behind their fear of containment and making a contract, the man/woman who can’t say “I love you” may be intuiting that this doesn’t make any sense. The woman/man who says “I love you” all the time, but doesn’t “get back” what they “give out”, might realize, behind their resentment, that love is not what they think it is, or it should be, could be or might be, but is just what it is.

The mis-use of the word love is such that it can be used, like no other word, to cover up a myriad of delusions and illusions, encompassing all things within it. In essence, it is not that we don't know what we are wanting or saying, we all do. There is a feeling that all this superficial language merely connects to the unreachable, but for these words to be directed to a few people, rather than all people and everything, is an ignorance that can no longer be overlooked. My feeling is that the word love should be reserved for expressing something within the way of the mind-made-world, a commodity, a feeling that has judgment attached to it. For something with more meaning perhaps we could consider

Oneness, which is a word that moves beyond superficiality, towards something with deeper truth.

The band “Badly Drawn Boy” have a song, “Year of the Rat”, which was animated and is about the nature of love as Oneness. It can be found here:-

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PScUdYTO0UM>

Please note how the main character simply remains still. He’s not trying to do anything, he is simply being what he is. The madness of the world, or separation, goes on around him. The words in the song talk of Oneness, not of love. This is love beyond judgment, it has no condition that is apart from it. As such, the message is clear.

“Love is not breathless, it is not excitement, it is not the promulgation of promises of eternal passion. That is just being “in love” which any of us can convince ourselves we are. Love itself is what is left over when being in love has burned away...” - Louis de Bernières, Correlli’s Mandolin

David Nassim
22 Dec 2010