

## Aligning Ourselves with the Will of God?

By Robert Cergol

... Or a rationalization of our suffering (let's invent some meaning to fill the hole instead of entering that "hole" to face emptiness)?

*From Bob Cergol, in response to a statement about the need to surrender our life to God's will and our failure to do so due to fear, uncertainty and doubt.*

\* \* \*

*Regarding Andrew Cohen's response to an inquirer -- contrary to the popular belief in God's love as unconditional, in Cohen's experience God's love was totally conditional upon giving up everything and holding nothing back:*

There is nothing more conditional than total surrender of self as the condition to become aware of God's unconditional love -- or become united with God in that Love. I have difficulty with [this] worded expression of genuine realization [because] it suggests that the individual will was involved. As I see it, to use the same metaphor, it was the presence of God's unconditional love which made surrender possible. I have an appreciation of the phrase, "God is Love" that I never before conceived was possible. It is love without an object. Just as "God" simply is, so too, Love just is -- because nothing else is. So I think it is valid to use the term unconditional love. Of course an individual's need for unconditional love suggests the "sinner." But the "sinner" only needs unconditional love from "outside" because he has no love for himself, for he is cut off from his source which is Love itself.

*Regarding fear, uncertainty and doubt as the culprits in our failure to do so:*

There is only one fear -- the root of all fear -- annihilation of the self, which is the result of our uncertainty about who and what we are. Uncertainty is a saving grace, arising from the non-verbalizable "communications" from the inner man that contradict the way in which we live our lives. Doubt arises because even at the level of the ego we can sense that we are bullshitting ourselves -- about death and about our identity.

The stated perspective strikes me as expressing the belief that the "I" will somehow be exalted by this "alignment with God's will." Or that suffering is a bond that can be redeemed for God's presence in our lives. The truth is that if the person were to arrive at this state, he would be dissolved into God.

All creation ... is already in alignment with the will of God. Individuals don't see it because they are totally identified with the dreamer of the dream -- the personal consciousness, which is an effect of "the light in the body."

A sincere, heartfelt desire to be aligned with the will of god is but a faint echo, of "god within you" -- calling you home. But you can only go if you are willing to accept personal annihilation. But as Pulyan said, "You cannot decide to not decide" and as [Richard] Rose indignantly told a group of people he overheard discussing dropping egos, "What are you talking about?! You can't drop an ego! They're taken from you!"

The notion of personal surrender to a higher power is an intuition that comes through to those who strive to listen. But the ears that hear it belong to something else. And that something else cannot surrender in a willful act for that would be the opposite of surrender. The robot cannot turn the switch off. The switch that the robot can reach has two positions: On and On.

I see it this way:

- An individual's number 1 priority in life is self-preservation.
- The individual's number 2 priority is to magnify that self.

Every thought, every emotion, every action, every experience is processed by the individual mind and judged as either self-magnifying or self-diminishing. Unfortunately, 99% of our mental experience is concocted after the fact by the mind. There is a disconnect from the events which occur in our lives -- again, all because of the two priorities named above.

That individuality doesn't even know what it is striving to preserve. And it knows that it doesn't know! Therefore it struggles to define itself and confirm its existence. Every action it takes to define itself outwardly fails, leaving it feeling empty and therefore diminished. ("All things betray thee, who betrayest Me," the poet writes. Naturally, since all of that is unreal -- not the self at all! -- doomed to fail!). The feeling generates an ever stronger need to define. This process pretty much sums up individual existence. It's like a dust funnel in a desert storm. Much ado about nothing. Some lives express that need in an ever-descending spiral of self-destruction -- no less an expression of the will of god, than the bud that never blooms expresses the hidden life which is its source.

The individual mind, therefore weaves a dream within the dream that reinforces these two priorities. This dream embodies all of the pathos and conflict of which you write.

*Regarding. "The view is not the viewer:"*

Well, the dreamer of the dream is also the dreamer in the dream, which is to say that he, likewise, is part of the dream. This dreamer splits himself as the protective device that forms a nearly invulnerable bulwark against annihilation. The attention is always focused outward on this "other self" which has all these problems and which uses suffering to invent meaning and purpose for that shadow -- to alleviate its suffering and fill the hole in its aching heart with this meaning -- but it doesn't.

When this self thinks he is looking inward, he is in fact looking outward. That self can never really see himself. The instant that such seeing occurred would be the same instant that that self would cease to exist.

How can such a self align itself with the will of God? You cannot take positive action to align yourself with the will of god for the simple reasons that: a) you do not know god, b) you do not know yourself and c) all such actions are "positive" i.e., they postulate a direction whose root purpose is to protect and magnify the individual.

That is why it seems so true to me when both Rose and Nisargadatta talk about a negative approach. A ceaseless looking for the source of motivations, emotions, actions, etc. is an oblique approach that I think results in what Rose referred to as becoming a "will-full, will-less vector." I prefer Kierkegaard's phrase, "Purity of heart is to will one thing." There is one and only one "will of God." Aligning ourselves with the will of God is turning our attention away from all desire -- the purpose and result of which is to magnify the personal self.

I think the question "What does my life express?" and "What is my life an expression of?" are good questions with a lot of dimensions. When you experience a strong emotion, what does your behavior express? During that behavior, what do your thoughts express? Extend the timeframe beyond that moment of strong emotion. What do you express in a day, a week, a month, a year, a lifetime? Extend the question beyond the scope of the personal individual. What does a rock express? A plant, an insect, a bird, the seasons, the cosmos?