

TOTAL LOVE / SAME BODY OF LOVE

All the same- and not. (And all the same).

Conflict arises from different perceptions of what is real. It is not always as simple as 'good' or 'bad,' although we might like to think it is, and to make it so. Because it's easier for us- requires less capacity- than opening ourselves to a wider understanding that recognises that *our own way* is not necessarily *the way; the only way, or the right way*. Even if all our life experience up to this point tells us that *it is*. It may be *for us...* but not necessarily for other people. We know that.

The point is, on the level of relative worldly experience, people have different life experiences. Often, it's less a case of definitive 'right' and 'wrong,' and more just different points of view based on different understandings of reality and what's happening. Based, usually, on previous experience, or a pre-configured perception. Now, this may not always be the case, and there are some things that we can generally, mostly all agree upon. Like the right to freedom of choice. The 'choice' to have a particular perspective on reality, for example. (Or is that a construct too?!).

It's as though we're all attempting to define 'what's real.' On a relative world level. But... aside from the things we can mostly all agree on, the whole point of the relative level of experience ('the world') is that it's relative. There are no ultimate standards- no particular privileged way, universally valued above all others. Could it be that the 'things we mostly all agree upon' are actually universal standards of life? Perhaps, just perhaps, there are universal principles to aspire to... to realise... to integrate into our own individual understandings. And this is our opportunity. Because it could lead us to a fuller way of life, of living, of being. For ourselves. Possibly for everyone. (The key here of course, is that we don't fall into justifying relative truths, cloaked as universal ones).

So on one level or another, it's as though we're all attempting to define 'what's real' (Ultimately, *The 'Centre Point' of all Creation...* but often we occupy ourselves with other, worldly concerns...) from our different positions encircled around 'the edges.' Contributing our separate understandings of the whole. From our own standpoints. Like we all have a view of a garden, a scene. And we're all 'working it out,' alone and together. We're all looking from different places. Inevitably, seeing differently.

These are the different situational perspectives of our own individual lives- *within* (and yet as relative aspects of...) the *One Life of Pure Consciousness, Total Awareness*. And perhaps there are tried and tested (and even new) ways of aligning our own individual awareness to the Greater Awareness. This is what spiritual practice is about. Atonement. The state of being 'at one.' With the Real.

Though it's much simpler for our (taken-to-be) limited minds to define things in simplistic and reductionist terms. Or to construct our own lesser truths. Than to go beyond such comfortable-uncomfortable recognition of our limitation, and look into

all the complex factors. To see that there is more than what we see. And so we resort to 'one thing is 'good,' another is 'bad.'" And that's that. Not realising that different people come from different perspectives. Not wanting to stretch the imagination that far. Because 'my way is *the way*'- or some such narrow notion.

We each have our own contextual places, histories, social, cultural, economic conditions and conditionings. And of course, these differences are to be respected. An example. Somebody brought up in a particular culture may carry that cultural outlook with them throughout their life- kind of like a running background computer program- 'software for life'- as part of who they are. Or, alternatively, they may define themselves in relation to other cultures they may encounter later on, or even in opposition to what they feel has been enforced upon them as a cultural norm. That is, they find (other) indicators of who they are.

Again, this is on the relative, worldly level. Can we find out who we are as something more? Not as culture, or even counter-culture. But as beings born of Wholeness, and becoming- *being*- reflections of the Totality that we moved away from in the process of individuation- or individual manifestation into human form. Can we come back to the *Source of Love and Life* we 'left behind.' Can we *be* the *being* that we are? Because according to spiritual traditions throughout the ages, not only *can we*- but *we must*- because our liberation is there. Is here- where we are- beyond distraction. Beyond the veil of separation, manifestation. We find it nowhere else but in ourselves, in the world- and yet it is beyond the worldly level entirely- and paradoxically then, within it.

What's the solution? To the problem of limited definitions? Or rather, being stuck in unhelpful limited definitions? Is it to erase our living differences? The differing conditions of life? To erase our differences in perception? Certainly not! Because then the variation of life in which we learn- in which we have our varied journeys- will be denied. And so then, will we. Instead, we can realise limitation is limited.

So any 'solution' to the supposed problem is not to erase our differences in perception. For these differences are the wonderful and necessary variation of the expression of Pure Life Itself. (If you go back far enough- follow the chain of Creation back to its Source). It's just not to get stuck in them. Perhaps the 'solution' is to see the process for what it is. To see that we come to different conclusions and have differing points of view because we are different people. And that's just how it is, and how it will always be. (Unless we are made drones- and surely we don't want to ask for that! We don't want to go down that dead-end road... do we?).

We can come to seeing the simple worldly truth that we are just different people, and therefore of course- inevitably, think differently. And this understanding then, really grasped- may result in less inflamed opposition, less polarisation, and less of the unhealthy type of argumentation. More de-escalation. And might give us permission to enjoy our differences, rather than feel threatened by everyone who might hold a different point of view to our own (and acting out of that often

unconsciously-self-imposed place of insecurity). Perhaps we can celebrate difference, rather than attempting to universalise human experience. To set a fixed prescript of how it should be- of how each person everywhere must think, feel, act.

Rather than expect ultimate truth to be found in the relative, we can allow relative differences to be (where they are not harmful or restrictive to others... and I suppose herein lies some room for debate...). What's the best way? We're *all different* (relatively)... and ultimately we're *all the same*- in the fact that we are all emanations of the One Spirit of Life Itself. Expressions of the One Consciousness. And even in relative existence, where we have been granted difference and uniqueness- we all generally need the same things- the things that *Life* needs when it's in human form: food, clothing, shelter, love, etc...

It's natural that we have similarities- and it's natural that we have differences. It doesn't have to be one or the other. Not when you see by the understanding of the universe that says: we are all- and each- particular expressions of Pure and Total Love- expressing and giving that Love with each breath. Receiving that Love with each breath. We are journeying in difference ways. Going up and down the escalators. But how can we maintain Wholeness in this separation? Perhaps our urge for *sameness* is a misguided expression of the urge towards Wholeness. Which is the urge to return to our Deepest Nature.

How can we hold separation (physical, mental, emotional, even 'spiritual') and Wholeness (of *Consciousness / True Spirit*) together? We may give example to this 'Wholeness that allows for separation and separative experience- yet within its own cohesion' in the analogy of the wholeness of the body. Not the 'Body of Pure Love,' but the physical human body. There are different parts to the body. But they can work in conjunction, and not in opposition. Indeed they do. Why should a leg argue with an arm? A foot be in conflict with a hand? Difference does not have to mean conflict. 'Different' does not have to mean 'in conflict.' The body is a whole.

If we were all the same, the world would be a sad and limited place. Perhaps there would be no conflict- but there'd probably be nothing much to live for either. And it's not that we live for conflict- but we live in the world *through differentiation*. Life lives through its own differentiation. If life on Earth were all the same, the world would be boring. If we were all the same, the variation would be non-existent. The possibility of different experience null and void. Consciousness would be massively limited!

If we were all the same, there would be no expression in time-space (of anything... of Truth). If we were all the same, there would be no complex realm of experience in which to live our particular evolutionary journey. No movement of learning, growth, development, consciousness' understanding. For ourselves, everyone else, and *the Ultimate Consciousness that animates us*- that is manifest as souls in bodies in the world. Our world. The world born of Consciousness. That We Are.

~Nathan Godolphin,
25/03/22.