

Posing the child's question: how the simplest questions have never been answered, just dressed up in complexity.

When young children are at the stage at which they are still drifting in-between the state of separate "me" and the true wide-eyed-wonder of the natural reality of Oneness where there is no "me"...they ask the most clear and profound questions.

All of the koans of Zen and the self-enquiry of Advaita Vedanta (the non-dual aspect of Hinduism) are the "first questions" that young children, perhaps at the age of 3 might pose, such as:.... "what does "I" mean?", "What is a "you"?" ... "why do we have to go to play-group?" "why does Daddy have a moustache?", "why do you put paint on your face Mummy?" "why aren't I "good"?", "why did granny die?" "where did she go?"

These primary questions are considered "sweet" by the arrogance of the adult, but actually these questions are very often also asked later on in life at the mid-life crisis or even in big business by consultants. They are the "left field" questions that make people stop and stare and re-think "why?" they are doing whatever they are doing, albeit in a very limited parameter. However at the core the original questions of childhood are the ones that remain totally unresolved by all forms of philosophy and religion timelessly and have been left completely unresolved as expressions of the perplexed human-animal as they turn into the human-adult.

The fundamental question "why?" as pointed out by Tony Parsons (<http://www.theopensecret.com>) "...is the original question and it is answered by the silence within which the question is asked." The question "why" is something that comes from nowhere and therefore is impossible to answer, however the attempt to solve the puzzle of "why?" is the attempt to feel secure. "Why?" emanates from a feeling and this feeling is one of beginning to see the world as subject and object, it is formed from the attempt to put back together what seems broken. The fundamental probe "why?" is formed as a spontaneous gesture of beginning to seek for something that was in fact never lost. But it feels like "life" is getting further and further away, the small child increasingly feels that he/she is separated from everything and so "why?" comes up more and more until it becomes a constant living wheel or "rat-race" of question-and-answer, a desperate seeking for the ultimate answer in some form that makes sense, but it never will for there is never an answer that is satisfying.

"Why" comes about with "me", they are one and the same thing. So put them together "why me?" ...and you don't just have to be reading this article to ask that question. Ultimately the confusion of moving from the free state to the matrix of duality is something that immediately forms the reflex action of question and seeking-for, as Tony Parsons has said "*everything that is not the liberated state is seeking*". There is no way to go between world views, so to speak, but the "why" is an attempt to do so. The original questions are the key ones that are at the edge of the bubble of "self", such as simply "what is "self"?" These unanswerable questions are formed immediately in the child's mind and only come back to us much later on in life, usually after a long process of seeking to the point of realizing the whole damn thing is futile, so we return back to asking the original questions of our youth.

This is not an essay on trying to tell you what to do about it, merely a description of what is going on. In humans it seems there is this natural process of contraction into the dis-ease state of “self” and then as time goes on there is a letting go of this, which ripens in accord with nature. The contracted “self” state is not shed by any ideologies or intentions of the “self”. Nothing the “self” attempts to do in its direction or “path” or “journey” or whatever exercises it may or may not do, or any intentional framework, all of which only re-enhance the sense of “me”. This is why the expression of so much of what we call “spiritual teachings” and the peddlers of such information, “teachers and gurus”, have no more or less value than anything else, it’s all still essentially within the dualism of dis-ease. Physical death finally releases the contraction if it doesn’t let go before this point, so fundamentally there is always a natural opening, as the state of dis-ease cannot be held forever.

However the child’s questions are still deeply interesting as they hold total anarchy of nature within them. “You can’t ask why that man is bald - that’s rude!” the parent scolds. Parent: “That woman that Daddy was kissing is a bad woman and Daddy is a bad Daddy for kissing her”. Child: “but don’t you like daddy kissing you, Mummy?” Parent: “Yes, but he should only be kissing me.”. Child: “who’s “me”. Mummy?” So these and other childhood questions hit the root of the difficulties of society, they mess up the code by which society functions. Why is it that people “shouldn’t work with animals or children?” because these expressions don’t “work” they “un-work”. An infant will still happily urinate in the corner of a Church during the service, or be in hysterics at a funeral, or be asking why the guru is sitting so still instead of eating popcorn. And these are really the fundamental questions...I mean, why aren’t they eating popcorn?

The child’s innocent questions have total clarity and total natural-power behind them, they are a breath of fresh air in an environment of misunderstanding. As we become accustomed to being the adult and seeing it all through adults’ eyes then the child is hidden beneath this superstructure of “self”. But as more humour comes into it and there is more of a natural interest in what’s literally happening in the sensory-immediacy, then nothing Daddy did was “right” or “wrong” even if he thought he was at the time. Neither is there anything for Mummy to be angry about, what’s more important is whether the toast tastes good and if there is a want for a drink or not. The child’s world is deeply simple...the adult always looks with envy at the child and says “just wait until you grow up and then you’ll understand what the “real-world” is like”. However this “real world” is no more than a passed-on pattern of contraction that is all based on unresolved basic child’s questions, though in a more complex version, none of which ever get answers either. The adult is no more than a deeply confused child. The child is already confused as to why mummy is smashing plates and shouting at Daddy after having asked “who was that woman that was kissing Daddy”. Then what happens is that the child believes that this set of words causes total panic-stations and so there is deep confusion and a natural movement to run from the noise and aggressive vibes of it all.

The world of the adult is deeply mad. The world of the child is sensory, it is in fact sense-able. This is something that the arrogance of the adult cannot see, who believes the “innocence” of the child is something to be held in contempt and to be belittled as “primitive” rather than deeply acknowledged.

Posing the child's question is what is at the root of all our questions, every last one. The simpler the question, the closer we come to a point of realizing that we are still all children, that we know absolutely nothing and never have done. There was never a choice, or ever a need to search. Everything is at-hand and always was, but somehow for a moment that seemed like an eternity, there was an idea that "I" "knew", when in fact there was never a separate "I" and so no-one to "know" anything.

In this way Christ's message is clearer, in alternative interpretation:-

Mark 10:15

Truly, the adult "I" cannot be open to the Natural-world like a child, so it seems to remain hidden."

Matthew 18:3

And he said: "I tell you the truth, unless there is a liberation, and so a becoming like little children again, there will always be seeking for 'the kingdom of heaven.'"

David Nassim

18/10/2012