

## Relationships

In order to define what a relationship is and isn't, we first need to reiterate why you are here in a body on the earth plane. At some level of your existence you chose to occupy a body and have a series of experiences - life, that, when added the experiences the rest of your incarnations are having, will lead you to the knowingness of All is One – Unity. As such, each and every encounter must bring you information, via actual experience, that will help you grow to that knowingness. The common areas of growth on the earth plane are associated with fear, separation, control – controlling and being controlled, physical survival and various levels of empowerment as seen through the interactions one has. The earth plane is a place of artificial separation. Bodies occupying separate spaces are an anomaly that helps our personality see the differences between Unity and separation as we process all of our contributing incarnational experiences at the Soul level.

Relationships are no different than hobbies, mountain climbing, school or working: every single thing you do must serve to illuminate something for you in the effort to further your growth, and relationships are a marvelous tool to assist in that endless process. Hopefully your work, your hobbies, your travel, are going to help your incarnation grow, thereby helping your Soul Matrix evolve. This is not always the case, especially in relationships, as we often get sidetracked by beliefs, fear, confusion and get stuck in various scenarios, which can ultimately stagnate our personality's growth or even stop it altogether. Efficient growth is best – notice I did not say “painless” growth is best, as one man's pain is another man's pleasure. By definition, growth to Unity requires a breakdown of resonances that conflict with the truth that All is One. Breaking down resonances (belief systems and other energies that conflict with Unity) can be especially painful the more we hold to them and the more ingrained. In the end, breaking them down is the only reason you exist – to return to Unity, and relationships help facilitate that process.

A relationship, whether it be a family one, work related one, or deep personal one, is about inter-relating via interactions that help overcome resonances that interfere with your ability to understand that All is One - Unity. A relationship therefore is a tool, nothing more than a tool – a fun tool, a deep tool, an exciting tool, a stressful tool, a challenging tool; but a tool. A relationship is not a place to hide, a place to be taken care of, a place to avoid the world or a place of convenience – relationships are not a pancea. A relationship is a place that must challenge each individual participant to grow. The purpose of all relationships is to facilitate one's personal inner evolutionary process. By this definition, a relationship is going to be challenging work and the idea that a good relationship shouldn't be, is untrue.

People are often driven into relationships by the fear of being alone. This is the single worst reason to be in a relationship. This is driven by infant aspects of us still resonating confusion and fear and is in no way a balanced approach to a relationship. Infant-self still exists, in its entirety, within all of us. Infant-self is not a phase of life left behind by a bodily growth spurt, but an aspect of ourselves that still exists as a whole; it is your focus of attention that has moved on. Infant-self, while in the womb, experiences a cushy life. Gestation is a place of living the high life, nothing to do but be. In a moment, without warning, mom cuts off all the life-support systems and infant panic ensues. Imagine a body on life-support at the hospital, without warning the nurse pulls the plug – the body convulses and struggles to survive. The unplug happens in the womb in the same manner, potential suffocation, potential starvation, potential death are all felt as mom pulls the plug and the infant waits to see if it will live another moment – the experience is even more horrifying if mom prolongs the event, resists releasing the baby out of fear of pain or fear

of the future responsibility of infant care. Shortly thereafter, another life trauma occurs, the earth plane arrival via delivery. Like that, life goes from “nothing better,” to a world of “how will I survive?” The reason this is relevant to relationships is that the infant-self spends the rest of physical life looking to get back in the womb, back to the place where the umbilical cord and mom took care of everything.

After birth, mom or someone else, takes care of infant-self but in a different way. Infant-self has to work to attract attention to get needs met, but mom meets them – even if it is at the most basic level. No matter who you are, if you are alive, someone took care of infant you, as no infant ever got a job. True, many did a terrible job, but regardless, the imprint was set – someone takes care of me (feeds me, bathes me, carries me). This is your first relationship, your introduction to relationships on the earth plane and it is an anomaly. This fact doesn't stop infant-self from trying to recreate that relationship.

The infant-self's efforts to get back to the safe zone is not logical, it is the infant acting out of fear derived from that unplug moment and imprinting this fear into the larger matrix defined as the personality – you. Men don't want to sleep with their mothers as Sigmund Freud proposed, but they do want to get back inside the safe zone, not consciously of course, and the female infant-self wants the same. It isn't a sexual thing, a rational thing, or even a good thing, but a confused effort to return to what once was. That infant-self can and does show up in relationships. The infant-self often sizes up potential dates based on their ability to recreate the responsibility free zone of pre and post-birth. We fight against this of course, but it is present.

Younger aspects of us can surface at anytime in a relationship – any relationship at all. We can regress at any moment; a good bout of crying and pouting in the presence of another is a clear sign that a younger-self has shown up, maybe even infant-self, and this does not make for a pretty exchange for obvious reasons. Younger aspects of ourselves can be present in interactions with anyone, in most cases this is not desirable – what age are you in each relationship you have? Do you access younger aspects of yourself to get things you want – especially with mommy and daddy? Are you the most mature-self you can be in every single relationship you engage in; if not, why not?

The age at which you had your first date, the first real “relationship” is the age at which you will show up as at every first date thereafter, and by definition the age and which the primary foundation of any relationship is laid. If you were 16 when you had your first date, that aspect of you will show up each and every time it sees the resonance known as “date energy.” If the person you are with is doing the same thing, we can easily see a 65 year old man and a 60 year old woman “acting like teenagers” on their first date and even longer into the relationship. I ask you, how this reasonable? Two people with 125 years of life experience between them regressing to ages at which they had nothing but distorted life views and little experience, and expecting this “relationship” to be significant. Yet this is common and modern society applauds it – they're just staying young. It is not about “acting one's age” but accessing ones totality of experience and seeing if the relationship will facilitate more growth or less. I'm not saying people should act their age, this is a social constraint that has little meaning, but they should access their most mature-selves in relationships, *especially at the beginning*. Eventually the teenage-self moves out of the way to be replaced by the adult mature-self and this can be shocking to the relationship. This ends up being the “I don't know who I'm with” moment, or the “this isn't the person I married” moment.

That very first real life date sets the tone with the associated fear and excitement, but as a teenage-self. When we first date we don't know what we are doing, everything is new, everything brings up fear, excitement, danger, massive insecurity and associates it with the opposite sex and dating – or the same sex if you are inclined. From that point on, the young-self, with all its ignorance, all its know-it-all-ness and all of few years of life experience, locks in what dating is for the entire personality matrix (you). Date at 35, or 55, or 85 and that young-self will show up on queue. The additional problem is that from the get go we add the idea that relationships are full of excitement, fear and potential danger to the personality matrix – wasn't dating in high school largely based on a sense of social and personal danger? This is a recipe for disaster as all relationships fall into a space of routine; the fear based excitement cannot be sustained for very long – courting for life is hardly practical and once a more rational relationship settles in the younger-self gets bored. Often there are two energies that introduce discontent in a relationship: younger-selves' experiencing boredom, and stagnation caused by the growth limits being reached.

Younger-selves can be brought to the front in a number of ways. Anything can trigger it, it is most obviously seen when interacting with the immediate family – no one, and I mean no one, will ever be their most mature-self in the presence of the immediate family. A weekend with mommy, who sees you still at 10, and daddy, who still sees you at 15 can have you obliging them by bringing those aspects forward. This can of course wreak havoc on a relationship if time spent with mommy and daddy turns a mate into a 10-year-old. People who have children (or spend a lot of time around children) are also guilty of falling into younger-selves. When interacting with the children they often access a younger aspect (talking baby talk or teen age slang) and they forget to return to adulthood after the interaction - leaving them interacting with others, including their mate, in an inappropriate age and creating unnecessary conflict. Spending time in places like Disney -Land and other children oriented places can trigger the shift. Recently, through a friend, I had occasion to hear about a girl I liked in elementary school. At the speed of light I was 11 again, ready to see her as if not a day had gone by - many years had gone by and for the life of me I really couldn't actually remember much about her – my 11-year-old saw opportunity, I saw a regression to the past with the 11-year-old me leading the way.

We learn all about what a relationship *should be* from movies, books, TV and plays. The problem with this system of “learning” about the world is that system it is a contrivance. The noted film director Sydney Pollock once said that he couldn't have his characters be on screen and “in love” for more than two minutes because love on screen is boring. What does this tell us? What we think is “love” is the presence of conflict – keeping people apart. A story about actual inter-relating would be boring beyond belief. But a story where the two people must be in conflict to “be together” is a great story – a love story! When the couple finally does get together, the movie, play or book is over! Our education stops where the story just begins. So by definition, entertainment love purposely avoids actual acts of inter-relating in favor of acts of conflict, forced separation and creative contrivance designed to keep people apart as long as possible. This is course is not love, but a distorted kind of courtship which has now become known as romance and through clever marketing and promotion is sold as “...a love story.”

What about romance? Love is about romance? I can hear the cries over this one. Where did anyone get his or her idea about romance? Books, TV and so on is our culprit here – at least if you are less than 75 years old. Social conventions contribute, cultural and religious concepts and just outright fantasy do as well. Valentines day is a contrivance designed by various industries to sell us stuff; it isn't romance, yet we think it is. Women can't call men

– why not? Wait three days to call back, more than seven days and he/she isn't interested, buy flowers, open the door – where is this written, as I didn't get the memo that stated this as an absolute of life? Any and all of these romance traditions serve to do nothing but create conflict within us, as they are conglomerate conventions and not based on individual processes. These silly efforts do accomplish one thing; the courting conflict appeases the personality aspects imprinted upon by the teenage-self, continuing the problem. The tension created by awaiting a follow-up date, fully engages the high-school-self to no end, as it fully mimics the original imprint – danger, fear, tension.

The pursuit of relationships tends to be goal oriented – marriage. Why date if it won't lead to marriage? He or she is not “marriage material” is often said. When are you going to get married is the second question in the standard relationships questions. First being, “so do you *love* him/her?” Third being, “when are you having kids?” People just mindlessly toss out these questions as the requisite moments in a relationship's timeline and they rarely take into account personal growth. Sadly those in the relationships use these questions as defining markers for the relationship. To make one's pursuit of a relationship to be about anything but personal growth is to be both foolish and invite disaster. Marriage is not a viable goal, but a social, contractual convention.

Marriage is a custom that is poorly understood. The act of getting married invites the government into the relationship and in most cases a church of some kind, and officially removes someone from the at-large potential procreation pool. Yes, that is the real point of marriage. One seeks approval of the government/church to get married, and while it is rare, the government can turn people down. Once approval is met, legal recourses are in place. In order to get a divorce, the couple needs permission from the government to do so as well. If the government sees fit to keep folks together, they may force the couple to stay together – the government can and will dictate terms of the relationship as it pleases and in many countries the church does as well - if they are not one in the same. Why anyone wishes to subject themselves to this impersonal oversight is totally beyond me. I don't have any interest in the corporation of the government telling me how to do anything in my life, especially how my relationship is supposed to be executed.

Marriage does temporarily solve an inner dilemma many have – the issue of ownership and security. Many people are so incredibly insecure that nothing but a government document binding them to another will *temporarily* stave off the insecurity. But like any other imbalance, if one brings to them an insecure person to fix their insecurity, eventually the two forces will combine to create havoc and the binding document becomes a curse rather than a blessing. The reliance on the binding nature of the document and the ownership symbol of the ring, also serve to appease some folks that wish to actually control or own another, as those physical elements actually reinforce the ownership method of relating rather than the growth method of inter-relating. The possibility of potential future marriage often has people ignoring unforgivable present time behavior – the marriage prize is greater than the beating it might take to get it.

This irrational drive to be married has spawned an unfathomably profitable industry. There are actually magazines devoted to being a bride! People move from the irrational pursuit of marriage to the surreal process of going into debt to have a wedding. DeBeers pays diamond miners a pittance a day to dig up diamonds. Then, through a rather obscenely sophisticated system of market control and price fixing, drives up the value of the item to nonsensical levels. Then, the same company takes out adds across the world strongly suggesting that people go into *debt* a total of three months salary to say “I love you.” What

is more nuts than their effort is that people buy into this, to say nothing of dresses, receptions, gifts and honeymoons. Relationships are not about material events, material demonstrations of “love,” but about growth. The distorted part of this effort for many is the idea that the ceremonial spectacle *means* commitment and “love forever.”

All relationships end. All. There is no such thing as soul mates, “meant to be’s,” past life fixes or anything else. All relationships happen by choice, by execution of freewill, and all will end at some point. The reason for this is simple. The relationship is there to help you grow, challenge you, and if growth stops – then it must end. Relationships are there to help individual evolution, as the “relationship” itself does not exist in and of itself. It cannot live without each person participating; as such it is a result of the two people interacting and should not be seen as a “thing.” When growth happens on both sides, the relationship is in order, when growth stops – the relationship must stop. Oddly enough this means that relationships can accomplish their task in one hour, one day or one hundred years, it all depends on the people involved. Sadly, folks often explode as a relationship meets with what they feel is an untimely end, never bothering to look at all that the relationship made available to them while it was in order. The end comes as our vibrational resonance changes and our growth needs change – this is not a bad thing.

We look to connect with people that are in a similar vibrational realm as ourselves, always with an eye on growth. I hear this often, “we have a lot in common.” This can be good, if and only if, you see the imbalanced commonalities as needing balance within both individuals, *and* look to use the relationship to address them. Two people with dysfunctional families can do wonders to help each other balance the trauma, they can also access all the dysfunction and stay mired in it for the length of the relationship – inviting the stagnation I referred to earlier and possibility worse.

The idea is that each relationship one engages in brings about a 50/50 rate of return for both participants. Most people can tell me what the other person is getting out of any given relationship they are engaged in, but many cannot tell me what *they* are getting out of it. People sometimes feel their half of the equation will come at some unknown point in the future – this can be known as self sacrifice. One must be get an equal amount of energy back relative to what they are putting out, and that energy must be accessible, tangible and in the present moment – not the future. If things aren’t 50/50 then something needs to be done as soon as possible. Make sure the 50/50 is defined by growth needs and not nonsense from fantasy beliefs, defective programming or child-aspects.

We interact, connect, and inter-relate to people we have a resonance for. Hopefully the aspects of us accessing the other individual are the more refined vibrating aspects, but often this is not the case. A crack den has a very low vibe and the folks who are in it resonate with that vibrational level of reality. My day-to-day life doesn’t come near the resonance of a crack den. It would take a lot of serious effort to lower my vibration to connect with the folks hanging out there. If by chance some younger part of me, some confused part or some misguided part, got into a relationship with someone vibrating at that level, I’d be in trouble. The lowest common denominator drives any group or relationship, as it is easier to go down, then it is to go up. Relationships that function best have people vibrating at a similar level, at least within striking distance of each other. Are your relationships meeting at vibrational levels that match your growth needs? If you have moved out of the resonance of a relationship, seek to move on to one within a more growth oriented level.

When I was young I dated someone who said to me, “you have everything I need and nothing I want.” It was one of the most brilliant things anyone has ever said to me. She was self aware enough to see the difference. Most often there is a galactic sized chasm of difference between the needs associated with growth and the wants associated with social programming, bad imprinting, younger-selves and confused beliefs. When you do everything for your growth, you can’t go wrong – ask yourself “how does this assist me in my growth?” “How does this relationship help my evolution?”

A good relationship allows the individuals to remain as themselves, using their personal growth process to guide them. We have our own unique process that is guiding us back to the creator, All is One - Unity. Each process is unique. One should get into a relationship to further that process, not to abandon it for the institution of relationship or the establishment of marriage. The impersonal relationship systems actually encourage losing one’s self. We merge bank accounts, change names (ownership!), and enmesh. This betrays the concept of personal growth. Again, where is it written that a good relationship has only one bank account? If you have issues with managing money, then a system of banking should be selected that facilitates growth in that area, be it merged, independent or something in between. Folks see marriage as a thing, a thing defined by recognizable components like merged accounts and rings. Folks often say, “we are trying to save the marriage” as if it is an item like a car or a stove. The wording is key here. They don’t look to save themselves from total meltdown, or continue their growth, they look to save the institution they have invested in. They struggle with the conflict as they give the relationship, a thing, greater weight than their own self. People will often see it as some kind of investment that provides them with some kind of material rate of return: “I’ve invested a lot on this relationship and I’m going to get...” Folks fail to recognize what the relationship has done for their growth, but over identify with some institutional tenant their partner has failed to live up to. Rarely do I hear “the relationship has taught me so much and it has come to an end and gracefully we will end it?” Look back on all the relationships that have pissed you off, disappointed you, or failed in some way and simply identify what the relationship actually gave you, - take one minute per person.

A balanced relationship facilitates growth that both parties can see and feel. There is nothing more wonderful than overcoming a personal fear or limitation; the next best thing is seeing another close to you overcoming a fear or limitation. There is nothing more wonderful than coming to a new understanding; the next best thing is seeing someone close to you achieve a transformative experience – even better when you can see your contribution. To help facilitate the growth in another is a magical thing, yet I never hear this mentioned in “how to have a relationship” support systems. Working with your partner to keep those weaknesses, imbalances and personal inner projects in check and then balance them, is the only reason to have a relationship. One can travel with anyone, including folks they never met. One can have sex with anyone, including with some one they do not like. Folks can only share those inner growth experiences with those who have supported them through the processes and done what they can to facilitate the achievements – this is about connection, not about systems and conventions.

A relationship is about balance, knowing when to do something and when to hold back. We are taught through those same horrifying imprinting mechanisms that you just do everything for your partner without regard to their process. A balanced relationship has at its core the tenant that personal growth is key and sometimes letting a partner figure things out on their own is an act of perfection. This speaks to the process of individual growth and respecting that process above all others, especially above the classic conventions of

relationship. An example: Social doctrine says if your partner is sick you rush them to the hospital as to do anything other is criminal – it shows you care. But what if the sickness was nothing more than the physical effects of a shift in consciousness and you understand, through your experience and connection, that it will pass and the person will be stronger for riding it out – so you leave them alone to process the experience? Friends would berate you, family would crucify you and society might have you arrested – yet some amazing beauty will unfold if you honor growth here.

The conventions of relationships have us interfering, well meaning as it may be, with personal growth all the time. Stepping in where we should be stepping out. I hear people often say “how do you know when to do what?” This is a fear-based question that only arises out of the dysfunctional system set up by social relationship conventions. When one steps out of those and maintains a connection to their own personal growth, they can more clearly see the needed growth in others as they have a resonance for the imbalance; the reason the personal connection is there is a similar resonance present – like attracts like: i.e. I had insecurity taking exams in school. My mate is taking a test and is freaking out. If I step out the convention, see my mate as a flawed evolving being; I can notice that tests equaled insecurity in me so it might mean the same in my mate. Then I can apply what is necessary to help balance the issue, or I can just demand they shape up.

“I just want to be loved” is another often-repeated phrase concerning intimate relationships. This phrase is cringe inducing to say the least. This is often an infant aspect that has grabbed on to the word and doesn’t understand what it is commonly intended to mean. What the infant-self really means is that it wants someone to take care of it just like mom (or our caretaker) did. Regardless of the origin, the sentiment is absurd. Those who say this are usually folks who dislike themselves – they do not self-love and think that others “loving” them will make everything all right. The object of a relationship is to teach you to love yourself. I’ll say it again, the reason you are in a relationship is not to learn to love others, that is relatively easy, but to learn to love yourself which is not so easy – *especially* for those addicted to self-judgment. Consciousness works on resonance, like attracts like, if you love yourself, you will attract others who do the same. If you hate yourself, you will attract others who do the same. If you: respect, don’t judge, understand, are compassionate towards yourself then you are on the right path. If you don’t, based on the law of resonance, how can you expect to bring in someone who reflects this back to you?

Love. The use of this word in the English language is an abomination. We use it to talk about the way we “feel” about our car, our house, even our favorite brand of yogurt. The word is used to sell everything from toilet paper to war. We see that what passes for love in the movies is conflict and the effort to overcome it. I’m stuck here, the word has no meaning, yet what we *think* it means is a problem because many of our issues are tied to beliefs associated with the word itself. The short answer for what “love” is, is simple: All is One - Unity. The long answer might be more helpful. Love, in the form of earth based relationships should be this: Non-judgment, compassion, respect, caring, understanding, sharing, teaching, expansion, individuality, freewill, absence of expectations, growth without reservation, grace. If your definition of love isn’t at least those sentiments, particularly non-judgment, then stop using the word. People actually say “I don’t love him/her anymore.” Does this make sense in the context of Unity? To say this is to imply you are judging when to “love” and when not to. There is no such thing as unconditional (nonjudgmental) love, to say there is, is to say there is conditional love (judgmental) and

this just makes no sense at all – if you are judging you are not loving but in the act of judging, and *judging isn't love - it's judgment!*

The word love has become even more distorted by the entertainment process in movies, books and music too. The soundtracks to our lives are not what they seem. Rock and Roll is a euphemism for the act of sex. The use of the word love in music is often a euphemism for a good old fashion shag. Well you get the idea, if you can't say &#\$%, you can say love! "Love love me do" "Can't buy me love" take on a whole new meaning don't they? So what people often equate with love in love songs is sex in love songs. Songs about conflict are great; songs about the mundane world of a balanced relationships are kind of boring. This doesn't mean music, movies, books and plays can't be great fun, enjoyable and even enlightening in some way, but it does mean that everything needs to be taken with a pound of salt and viewed in a different way – what are these representations facilitating in each other?

The DNA in us is another major, unseen, driving force in relationships. The DNA is programmed in the most impersonal way possible to procreate at any cost - have kids and as many as possible. The DNA system, rather than working with your growth process and turning on when all things are in order, goes off on its own once a month. Monthly, the female fertility system in women goes off and demands impregnation – men have a corresponding element as well. DNA demands children regardless of any prevailing issues at hand. The mechanism is so strong that a large percentage of the population are procreating with people whom they have no connection with at all. One can have children without having met a person (sperm bank) or via sex with someone they don't like, or with another individuals mate. This is not driven by rational thinking, but by DNA - with a dose of social and religious encouragement. Much of the mate selection process is generated by procreation DNA compatibility – who's DNA will make the best children at this point in time? This happens in the background and has little connection to rational thought as the genetic effort has greater social tenants to adhere to then personal preference. Men will genetically select based on "birthing hips." The subtle DNA configurations help explain why some men are hunted down by women and other men, often very suitable men for relationship and children, are ignored and the same for men. The pressure this puts on relationships is just insane, people having children not for any growth reasons but just because they have this biological issue and they must execute a program, a program that shows up every month no matter what and is in no way personal, as everyone has it. Add to this the social considerations, men leave a legacy, women want to have children to have something to take care of, to love (external love!) and we see the pressure comes from everywhere but personal growth. I'm not even going to go into the nefarious reasons people have children in connection with relationships.

I hear women often say they want kids because they love kids. I never hear them say, "I love pre-teens, young adults, older children who are living at home and won't get out." They've relegated their interest in children to cute kids under 3 without regard to the effort, money, energy and compromises needed to raise a child. They never say "I want a relationship with a child because it will help me grow in this area or that." Further, each human body is animated by an animating energy. Something creates the extra 21grams of weight each body carries, 21 grams of animating energy that gives the body what we call life. There is zero thought given to the idea of the origins of that energy. Should this not be a key question to be asked before the effort to have kids is started? Shouldn't people in a relationship explore the idea of the animating energies they are going to invite into their world? I mention this because this too creates conflict within relationships that is totally

unnecessary. People get into relationships to fulfill this genetic desire and feel somehow unfulfilled if they don't execute the code – *even if executing it is totally against their growth process!* These inner conflicts, with no discernable origin in most, cause many to just shutdown, as they can't reconcile all of this inner conflict. By the way, children are the only thing you do not need to demonstrate to the government that you are qualified to do: license to cut hair, drive a car, buy a dog from a pound; not to have a child and no parenting education is given during government sponsored education - once they're born is another story.

Those who experience same-sex relationships are confronted with this problem as well. They define their relationship by the standard social conventions and when the issue of children comes up – they are stuck between the classic rock and hard place as the DNA hits them too. The idea that ones entire sense of themselves is measured by how well one fits into the impersonal social systems of marriage and children is just plain inexcusable and contributes to endless amounts of unnecessary pain and suffering.

Men and woman are artificial polarities, temporary experiences in separation. Men don't need to be more like women and women don't need to be more like men. We are not here to merge the masculine and feminine, as they aren't separate to begin with: All is One – Unity. They are different forms, but not as different as one might think. The social programming we spoke of before creates a greater divide then there really is. Each does think differently, but woman are not more compassionate, more heartfelt more loving then men. This is a myth created by the idea that giving birth corners the market on human compassion. 33 percent of men are compassionate and caring, 33 percent are not and 33 percent are somewhere in between. The percentages are the same in women. In same sense, men are not more aggressive then women – same percentages apply. The duality set-up is a game, a game to show us something, All is One – Unity; the sexuality suits we are using to play the game are not real, they are temporary. We are neither male nor female and we are both.

The fact that we have only two choices for “dating” is the real tragedy here, the fact that we are told by society to choose to date one sex suit and stick to it – so society and government may classify us better, is just plain silly in the context of Unity. For growth, men dating men is a good tool, women dating women is a good tool, men dating women is a good tool, people interacting with both sexes or in a homogeneous fashion is great for growth too. Cultural needs for classification and that ever present need for procreating has created much of the unnecessary conflict here. The amount of energy, money, attention and systems devoted to forcing people together, (for procreation, and to a certain extent distraction) is just plain ridiculous, as it seems not being invested in one of those systems is to be left out. Relationships are about growth, as long as you are growing, the means in which you are doing this is fine. The real conundrum occurs when you are in a perfect, conventional relationship, and are not growing. A relationship in which you are not moving closer to experiencing Unity, not learning about compassion, caring, understanding and growth is the greatest relationship crime of all.

Our parents have a self-evident effect on our relationship process. This is obvious and requires little discourse, as clearly if your parents had a dysfunctional relationship you will imprint on it. What makes this very problematic is younger aspects of you imprint, not adult aspects. The younger parts that imprint the vibe and expressions of your parent's relationships are not developed at all. The brain doesn't get its act together until 9 or 10 and the ability to understand and comprehend cause and effect is nil in a child, as the child does

not have enough actual experience in life, let alone experience in the subtle energies associated with relationships. A child cannot grasp the concept that when dad beats mom and says he does it out of love, that a distortion is present, as the child doesn't know that not all dads show love in that way. Sadly a child imprints on that and rarely does anyone explain the motivations behind the actions once a more rational age sets in – leaving the distortion in place. Trying to explain to the child is often unhelpful due to developmental lag. A child is unable to process things it has no actual experience for, so abject insecurity being taken out on mom via a beating of love cannot be explained to child. The childhood relationship with our parents really isn't a balanced one, as we don't see a complete picture of the evolving individual consciousness but a mommy or daddy, a symbol on many levels, and all that goes with it. Seeing those relationships in an objective fashion from our most mature-self can be very helpful in clearing up young-self confusion. All individual personalities are flawed, evolving beings working stuff out on the earth plane and beyond.

My mother was rather crazy with anger and it wasn't until she left the earth plane that I could see she was riddled with fear and insecurity which fueled the rage. Having children just exasperated the whole network of her imbalances. The younger aspects of me could not see this at the time and sadly she was not about to reveal it to be worked on with us. The younger aspects experienced a relationship with her as one of volatility with no obvious origin to me at the time. Once I saw the complete picture, I asked even the youngest aspects of me to see her irrational behavior was rooted in many of the same insecurities I have had at some time or another. This dramatically alleviated their confusion – mom was no longer the failed mom I got stuck with, but a mom of frailty and weakness struggling as everyone else does. Notice the people in your relationships as individuals, who are flawed and evolving, and stop seeing them as institutional representations – mommy, daddy, boss, teacher. See if that doesn't help get rid of the misunderstood trauma and misplaced expectations.

There is a subversive issue lurking and it will most assuredly destroy the best-laid relationship plans: expectations. Before we delve into this and its effect of relationships, keep this in mind: *Expectations equals disappointment*. This is your equation for life. We have expectations of what we want others to be and more importantly how we want others to see us. We lie, fib, change the truth, hide and resist divulging facts we think might hurt our chances with another. In deeper personal relationships this is really younger dating-self (in high school weakness meant social death), but regardless of the origins, the process of deceit prevents most relationships from working well. Through my dating years the first thing I used to say to dates was that I was not having kids. This was not up to debate, if they wanted children then I'd pick up the check and we'd say good night. Had I hidden this fact in order to get someone to like me, I would have created a relationship time bomb. How often do you hide truthful parts of yourself and your experience because you fear another will not like you – love you, marry you? What do you expect will happen when the issues are revealed?

We have expectations of what our soul mate is supposed to be like, what “the one” is going to be like. All of this is fantasy, stuff made up by younger parts of us day dreaming about the poster boy or girl on our bedroom wall. The expectations are a conglomeration of garbage fed into us by movies, magazines, friends and even family considerations and almost assuredly have no basis in our growth process. Execution of these expectations is the death knell for nearly every relationship. Women commonly feel that their true love will know everything about them without being told – when he doesn't they're beside themselves. It goes deeper, as some expectations have folks thinking that their mate will

like everything they like, even like *everything* about them – but not their flaws as they plan not to reveal them. In some cases people nearly abandon relationships with others as they are under the impression that a mate is the only relationship they need. This is all just utter nonsense. Any relationship is one component to your growth, it is added to work, hobbies, and all the other interactions you have with others – a relationship is not the end or even a means to an end, but a mechanism for growth. A relationship is a growth tool and any and all expectations brought into it other than that are inappropriate and unhelpful. Expectation is one that infects and destroys a great many relationships. What are the origins of your expectations for each relationship? Are they person specific?

Here is a place where expectation is so inappropriate and yet so prevalent. Women, more so than men, somehow feel that their first sexual adventure should be “special” and somehow associated with love and romance. This seems so funny when taken in context. One is doing something for the first time, as an awkward teenager with little or no real experience in relationships and none in sex, and expects (expectations = disappointment) that it will be the defining event of a lifetime. They want the event to be special, yet by definition it can't be, as the two involved haven't a clue as to what they are doing and a let down is sure to be in order - at least some level. What's more, most likely they are going to continue the adventure 15 minutes later and participate countless times after. No one places this kind of pressure on their first Thanksgiving dinner or their first airplane ride but people do place it here – where it is totally inappropriate. The aspect of one self that is bound to be either really disappointed or unreasonably pleased can linger for a lifetime. Again, we'll imprint on that experience and when a sexual adventure of some sort comes up in the present, that aspect moves forward applying totally inappropriate energy to the situation. This of course can be a real challenge for folks whose first experience was as a child or under other nefarious circumstances.

Expectations are not just limited to the present moment but also the perception of the future. One of the most common conflicts, in relationships of all sorts, is the fight about future events. “What if you stop loving me?” “What if we break up?” “What if you get sick and we can't take the vacation?” This of course is all wasted energy. The future does not exist until it exists as the present. One should *never* argue in the present moment about speculative events that may or may not occur in the future. “What if...” is a sign the discussion is about future events, and possibly future fears, and should be stopped. The same goes for the subtle effort to fantasize about the future, from the present, as if it is real. This happens often where couples will actually plan, not dream, but plan on what they are going to when they win the lottery. Stay out of the future in relationships, as the future is a house of horrors, stay in the present and deal with what is.

A real time, present moment assessment must be in order when engaging in any relationship at any time. How does this person, this situation, this relationship fit into my growth? How can I help this person get to a new understanding? How can this person get me to a new understanding? How can we help each other balance some aspects of ourselves? Each and every factor must be accounted for. If the person you are interested in is a total family-oholic and you are not into family at all – factor this in. It could be this is your opportunity to change some belief patterns about family, or it could spell disaster if you choose to ignore this glaring fact. If this person does not want kids and you do, cease thinking that you will help them see the light. Make sure all of this is done from the present-time-self and not the younger-selves, the distorted-selves, the fear based-selves.

Having said all of that, it is important to remember that every relationship is included here: same sex, family, coworker, neighbor etc. All relationships have different levels of connection but all are governed by the same issues and concerns. If any relationship has outlived its resonance connection, regardless of the origin of the relationship (family, school chums, best friends) then one needs to move on and find relationships whose resonance better matches the present time level of your growth. Growth is the key; if a relationship is not facilitating growth, then move on. There are 6 billion people on the planet; many to choose from so find someone who helps the growth process. I can't stress this enough, one needs to continually find a resonance that facilitates growth, not one that indulges distorted aspects, younger aspects or social standards. It is important to keep in mind that when we move on from one relationship, another opens up. If we stay half in and half out of one, a new one cannot open up. We will not bring to us an "escape" relationship that makes leaving one easier – this is very suspect if it does happen. Your system looks for new growth, when you make the choice to move on, something always opens up on the other side – though it might just take a bit of patience to see it unfold.

In order to have a real relationship you need to be there by choice and not convention or contract. The key to this is being comfortable with being alone. A person who is okay with being in a relationship or being alone will be in a relationship by choice. This makes things much better. If you are afraid of being alone, don't want to be alone, you might be under the influence of younger-selves fearing the actual real trauma of being alone – infant-self can't care for itself so being alone is a real concern. This needs to be addressed before an effective relationship can be experienced. The experiences we have where we consciously see and feel our execution of freewill are the best. Those relationships in which we have given up freewill, feel trapped, feel we have no choice, are the least productive. Entering any relationship knowing that you will be fine with it or without it makes the entire process more dynamic and genuine and most definitely expansive.

With all of this information added to your exploration of relationships and interactions with people it should be obvious that you don't actually know how to have a relationship. Nearly everything you have been taught and have seen is counter to a real and powerful relationship. I feel it is important make a commitment to wipe the slate clean and admit to the fact that you aren't an expert on relationships, most likely haven't a clue how to do it, have some really bad ideas – but are interested in the engaging the process to see what you can learn. Ask yourself what you bring to the table for the other person, what are you going to help them balance. Define what you need to balance, you may find that not having a relationship will serve to balance it more easily. You may find that a relationship that does not fit the socially acceptable norms might just be what is needed for maximum growth and for the love of the Creator, reveal your imbalances upfront.

By Allen Ritter, This article is copyrighted 2012. You are not free to publish this work without contacting the author first at [a\\_ritter@rocketmail.com](mailto:a_ritter@rocketmail.com)

This article is imprinted to assist you in releasing belief patterns associated with the topics covered. You may wish to read this more than one time to lock in the shifts.