

Giving without expectation, receiving without debt.

The satellite-eye view of the world is a very interesting one. Satellite imagery from way above Earth all around the globe allows us to see the “big picture” of what’s going on simultaneously in the world like never before. From this perspective climate change is realized not to be an individual’s issue but is seen as simply as the interchange of heat and cold. These breathtaking images reveal how so many things interact and connect, it is clear that Dr. James Lovelock’s Gaia theory is utterly non-theoretical and is in fact Oneness, clarified from up above. The global perspective is of the earth being a single organism without border or boundaries, fluxing and changing as it moves from heat to cold and the energy fluxes and balances over its surface as the Earth flies through Space. Here we see two things, total intimacy of connection and total impersonal-ness. There are no individuals at this level, no-one pulling the strings no matter how much they may think they are. The God’s-eye view, so to speak, offers us the realization that there is no separation between any of us, no avoidance of this truth. Even if there is a move to fragment on the Earth’s surface in the human perspective world, this energy flux of “me” is soon to be balanced by that which counters its “hot-air”, restoring equilibrium until the next wave of energy. The human is but dust, although as intimately vital as any other kind of dust in the universe.

Back on terra-ferma however the following conversations go on:

“Well love, I don't really think I can afford a coffee today, what a shame I left all my change behind!”

“Don't worry Doreen, here's fifty pence, have one on me.”

“Oooo I couldn't do that,I wouldn't want to put you out of pocket.”

“Go on, it's only 50p!!”

“Well ok, just this once, but I'll pay you back next week... Ah that's better, I owe you a debt of gratitude!”

This kind of madness happens all over the UK, I actually had a conversation like this and the person in question actually paid me back the 50 pence the week after in order that we were “quits”. And no, my real name isn’t Doreen.

Anyway the point is that people on the ground level view seem to take things very personally and without any intimacy at all. This is a very British issue in the way it is presented here but the idea of debt and being owed and being paid and making sure people don't have “one over on you” is constantly an issue for a great many people. But why? What’s at the bottom of this? Fundamentally there is a fear associated with wanting to make sure “I am self-sufficient” and not reliant on anyone else. The reason for this is that if “I am a separate person” then everyone else, and I mean *everyone*, from one’s partner to the next-door neighbour to the stranger in the street is a potential threat. The sense of separation is such that there’s an immediate contraction away from anything that looks like a gift, because a gift essentially could turn out to be a Trojan horse, a situation where the gift is used as leverage for someone to “get what they want” and that would be dangerous to “me” so it’s deemed “best” to maintain the status quo.

We see this all the time. The fear of anything entering, the withdrawal into the isolation of “me” and yet the total craving, the unimaginably awful sensation of wanting to be connected but only on “my terms”. To be with the tribe it must be actually be on the “terms” of natural order and as such one has to be what one *is* not what one thinks one should, ought, or might be, but actually what one is. As one isn’t a “me”, so there is no-choice to be had in this. The “no-choice” idea can in fact be used as a disguise for all manner of ridiculous illusions of grandeur/dictatorial roles, but this is not no-choice this is “all about me” syndrome. So without a “me” this immediately takes out the base layer of our ideology, the actual “self” that is protected so well and which attempts to prevent gifts coming in or the receiving of things, it is something that is essentially a preventing and a mistrusting of a world that is full of seeming individuals, but beneath this façade this is clearly a total illusion.

This also affects the output or outgoing energy of giving. There are those who are utterly unable to receive gifts and have formed an iron-clad protection, and then conversely there are those who utterly unable to give. Often the non-giver expresses that “what’s mine is mine, what’s yours is yours” again another form of non-sharing but this time internally rather than externally. So the non-receiver tends to be the pathology of the yang energy, the non-giver tends to be the pathology of the yin energy. This can be male and female respectively but also there is yin within the male and yin within the female.

The essential misconception here is that there is any choice in the process of giving and receiving. Giving and receiving or sharing is utterly about sexuality. Christopher Ryan’s and Cacilda Jethá’s brilliant book “Sex at Dawn” gives many clear descriptions about how the natural tribal peoples of the world are fundamentally sharing-based societies in every sense. There is nothing that is not shared, from food and water, to each other’s body’s, everything is shared including sex, with non-monogamy as a fundamental basis, but with total fidelity to nature, as it is. This key factor is not specifically based in survival, for there is no recognition of that notion, there is always an assumption of the abundance of nature in so-called “primitive” society, without fear of its demise tomorrow. Therefore there is always a sense that sharing is instinctual, it’s just what we do, it’s what most naturally expresses from the human when they don’t act from a “me” and they simply respond as fingers of the same hand, there is no responsibility, no requirement, as it is, is the only perspective. There is therefore no expectation in giving, for “me” to be liked or for “me” to be the creditor, nor is there in reception the feeling of being the debtor. How can a thumb be in debt to the fingers?

The sensory processes of the body each need connection to others, just as a baby needs skin-to-skin contact for its heart to beat and for there to be breathing and functioning of its body when newly born, so the human needs this contact all through life, we are formed to connect in this way constantly, not a random shot in the dark every so often. Sexuality and sharing are fundamentally one, and sexuality without sharing is a form of violence. Of course if it is violence then this is what it is, a totally reactionary process of the isolation of the “self”. There can’t be an altruistic person who goes in there to “fix the problem” because when “self” comes in as the one who “knows” and wants to make

people more “aware” of themselves, this is all judgemental and immediately forms a hierarchy of “I know better than you”. This kind of issue is how gurus are constantly formed. So the point is that until “self” drops out of the picture the constant sense of separation prevents sharing on any level. It forms the very barriers we are within daily and it also sparks off the aggression and “self”-defensiveness of internalizing, hoarding and selective giving, or in the case of expressive giving in order to gain or to have “you” like “me”, but the preventative receiving in case “you” get too close to “me” and “you” get “in” or “take over”. Givers and receivers are of course partially natural, the more yang there is the more there is a giving, the more yin there is the more there is a receiving, but there is never a pathology about this natural expression it is simply the way it is. However, the pathology is added on to this, in which the giver/receiver becomes “me the giver” or “me the receiver” and as such it all falls into a madness of individualism.

Anarchy is actually the situation of that which has no leader or “head”, so to speak. (please see the work of Douglas Harding: www.headless.org) In nature, however, this anarchy means natural order, it is when everything is ordered or forms total harmonic resonance and that which is without dissonance of “self”. The human condition of feeling separate is like a dissonance within the fundamental resonance of nature. The dissonance is made of the same stuff from which the resonance of nature is born, so it isn’t apart but the “thinks” it is, therefore until it falls back into the place it comes from, there is a fundamental sense of separation. No-one knows the way back and can show you this way, even if they say they can, because they are no more aware than you. However as there is a ripening of the disposition of “self”, which happens as nature intends it, there is a slow or sometimes fast decay of what we thought was “in control” - “me”. It is then realised that in fact this was never the case, and that there was always a song of Oneness underneath the slight, partially-apparent or superficial surface-tension of dissonant-self, which at the moment that wanting and waiting ends, total intimate impersonal life is revealed.

It is in a sense “wonderful” that there is nothing to “do” about this. If there was, “I” would be a reality and so hierarchy, good and bad, right and wrong and the whole hell of existence and suffering would be indeed “true”. The only possibility however is that this simply isn’t real, as we can see in every aspect of nature apart from human life, and all this means is that human life has a dis-ease which nothing else seems to have. This state of “self” also fluxes, in deep sleep and from moment to moment it is not always there. There is no hope for “self”, for “me”, but this is wonderful, because no hope for “me” means that freedom is everything that “me” isn’t, an impersonal gift within an intimate reception.

David Nassim
5/2/2012