

The real ideal: How the nature of “self” forms ideals no matter what.

“Dear Optimist, Pessimist, and Realist. While you guys were arguing about the cup of water. I drank it. ” — The Opportunist.

It is so easy for us all to form ideals, even if we don't realize this is what we are doing. Many people suggest that there is no “idealism” involved in their projects and processes and that they are “realistic”. This unfortunately is a misconception. Everything driven by the “me”, that aspect of the human which believes itself to be a separate individual, will always form the notion of a world that is “better” than the current one and aim to go after it. There is no use trying to stop this, as in itself it is the “me” getting involved in the idealism of “being without ideals”.

The conundrum that faces us every moment of every day is how are we going to “fix” the sense of separation we feel. This may not be a directly obvious issue to many people, so “optimists” may like to believe that “life is wonderful and actually I'm doing pretty wonderfully today”. However all the while there will be some addictive process going on that is believed to be about “enjoyment” but is actually a displacement mechanism for the underlying tension or “drive” that pushes a person from one thing to the next to the next, until it quickly becomes a blur of energy and sped-up thought processes. Conversely there can be the pessimist who often calls him or herself a “realist”, who points out that 99% of life is actually awful, that that is the “way of the world”, it's time to “get real” they tell us. The problem here is that there is no reality in this expression, it is simply an expression that sees just as narrowly as the optimist the view of despair. In a way the pessimist is considerably more prepared to look into the depths of their experience and there is no more or less of a cover-up operation going on, however this doesn't make it any more “real”. A real realist is very hard to find, for a real realist is in fact only to be found in the natural state of the human being, the situation where there is no “me” getting in the way. The joke above in fact points out the “opportunist” as being closer to nature, the one who doesn't have an ideal but simply is within life.

Many projects are born of an optimistic or pessimistic-realist mentality and these two deeply criticize each other. The optimist will form an ideal of “love and light”, spreading “joy” to people everywhere, the aim is expansion and expression, it is about the expanded altruistic “me”, a total fantasy that occurs within the mind - a utopian world-view. This is often seen as being “the right thing to do” or “the best help for humanity” or even “the new world order” but all of this is a clear idealism, an expression of what is very often a fantastical situation that uses massive resources and huge amounts of belief, in fact essentially it is held together by belief. U.G Krishnamurti points out the nature of belief and idealism:

“Whether you are seeking God, or bliss, peace of mind, or more tangibly, happiness, you end up relying on hope, belief and faith. These dependencies are the tokens of your failure to get the results you desire.” - From “Mind is a Myth”

The above might be seen as deeply pessimistic by some, but this is actually where there is a great requirement for differentiation of terms. The pessimist might believe that the optimistic view is unreal and so suggest the opposite, that “the world doesn't work like that” and “we have to be practical about this” and “we need to think of

things in a tangible way”. All of this attempts to solidify something, to make it have borders and be separate because this is what the experience is. The pessimist can see that it really isn't like the façade of what the optimist says, but distorts reality into a materialism that is about absolute objects separated from each other. The optimist yearns and strives for something different so is based in a kind of anxiety state, pushing forward for victory and the pessimist-realist is stuck in a depression, a held-in internal process. Neither is better, both are the same dis-ease expressed differently due to different constitutions. I described these two sides of psychology in two earlier articles that may be of interest called: “Life in a box” (yin dis-ease/ pessimist-realist) and “Life on the edge” (yang dis-ease/ optimist), illustrating the different psychologies of the pessimist and optimist respectively. The true-realist or *natural expression* is not in between these two poles but is actually the background, the poles are within a much larger expression than either is able to see, both views are as narrow as each other.

The pessimistic-realist will tend to be more masculine and colder, it will move to a situation of “getting on with the pain of it” and “not getting involved with dreamers”. There is in fact an understanding in the new-age communal living scene of there being two types of people “diggers” and “dreamers”...very often they merge into one another with the old adage: “ I used to be a dreamer but then I had to get real as it was all about ego. Until you really “do” it then it’s all hard work”. Conversely you get the situation where the realist hits a brick wall with his project and says “we finished building the housing project like we said, but now all that’s happened is people live in it just like any other housing project. If we had had a communal atmosphere that was different to the norm perhaps we could have done something different.”. Usually in this day and age there is more dreaming and less digging but overall it’s actually all the same. Both the dreamer and the digger have ideologies, they are two sides of the same coin, but the coin is within a wide world that neither side can see, this is the problem.

The only “outside” view of what is going on can be seen in nature. Nature doesn't dream nor does it dig. It doesn't strive ahead and nor does it remain stuck and contracted. The difficulty for the human is the yo-yo-ing back and forth between these states. People can't keep up being positive so eventually they fall into negativity before someone “helps them” and then they go back to being “positive”. The converse can be true also. The point is that the so-called “middle way” is not in the middle, it is in the background, it is the context, it is neither of the poles or both the poles at the same time.

As Tony Parsons (<http://www.theopensecret.com>) points out the nature of “self” is always seeking, everything that is “self” or that has a “me” content which is a large percentage of what most people do while awake, is about the “self” and so is always about seeking. There is nothing to “do” about this. The above is simply a description of the situation of there being a belief for some people in a non-ideological “path” and how ridiculous this is. You can't “do non-doing” or any such rubbish, all of this is ideological statements wrapped up in spiritual language. The long and short of it is that the human “me” can't do anything about its predicament of feeling separate, this has to burn off and die away, no matter how hard one tries to grasp it and say “it's all okay”, or if one looks at it and hopes, yet pessimistically believes that we are “all doomed to a life of suffering”.

Fundamentally all this article is simply pointing out the judgment in any context, judgment of the person who believes he is a realist without ideology or the altruist with ideology, in either context there is an impossibility to “judge”, for one will inevitably be biased by being within one camp or another. When ideologies which in fact **are** the “self”, give way to simply-being and instinctually-living this turns the human back into its true animal-nature. This simply occurs, there is nothing we can “do” about this, we are born of nature not the other way around. Health Instinct has the ideal of expressing what there is naturally rather than what we want there to be, but this doesn’t stop the writer being deeply biased in attempting to find an “escape route”, while knowing that this will lead nowhere. All I can do is to express that when someone suggests they don't have any ideals it’s a bit like someone forming a style of clothes made of hand-me-downs and calling themselves “unfashionable”...in fact this too is a fashion... so they keep telling me.

David Nassim
2/1/2013