

What's Difficult To Understand About Natural Inclusion?

By Alan Rayner

That's a question that has puzzled me over the >20 years that I have been trying to explain the meaning and significance of this fundamental evolutionary principle of Nature. A principle that, when truly and deeply understood, enables us human beings to think and live in a way that is far more compassionate, creative, comprehensive and comprehensible than most of us currently do. A principle that enables us to recognise our selves as dynamically embodied expressions and inclusions OF Nature, not isolated objects and subjects. And so behoves us to love and care for our natural neighbourhood and all its inhabitants as we love and care for ourselves.

A correspondent recently suggested to me: it's not that people CAN'T understand it, it's that they DON'T WANT TO, and will find any excuse they can not to do so.

That rang a bell with me. I have noticed the undertones of pride, betrayal and dismissal – and more than a hint of 'you must be mad if you do' - when people say they don't understand me.

And I have also noticed the insistence of using verbal language in a sense and context that is incompatible with awareness of natural inclusion, e.g. 'wholeness', 'connectedness', 'networking', 'web of life', 'oneness', 'part of the whole' etc. And if I then offer a suitable alternative, to say something like: 'if I use that language, no-one will understand me'.

So, I ask you, now: what do you find difficult to understand about the following sentence, and why?

Every body is a dynamic inclusion of space in form, and form in space

And what if I took the trouble to illustrate visually what this means in a 1.5 minute long video?:- [\(825\) the dynamic inclusion of space in form - YouTube](#)

Could it be that in order to understand it, you will need to admit the truth of something that you have spent much of your life learning to evade and deny? Something that undermines your belief in individual or collective control over your circumstances? Something that requires you to yield utterly to what inescapably resides within you, without you and throughout you and everybody else? Something that isn't a 'thing', but makes the occurrence of every thing possible in the first place? An admission that can only come with the utmost humility and love of life? An awareness that is available to all of us as children, freshly experiencing the natural world as it actually is – not as we might *want* it to be.

Do you want to know? Do you want to understand? Are you prepared to admit what you need to admit in order to do so? Are you prepared to suspend all preconception? If so, I can help you. If not, I can't.

Are you sitting comfortably? Then I'll begin.

Imagine yourself newly born into this world, with no prior knowledge or schooling. You become aware, by moving around, of two distinctive kinds of natural presence, one of which resists and the other of which permits your bodily movement: 'substance' and 'space'.

You also become aware, for example when exposed to sunlight, listening to music or eating or drinking something nutritious, of yet a third kind of presence, 'energy', both within your body and

outside it. This can illuminate, colour, warm and enliven your own and other bodies but is in itself invisible and not graspable in the same way that substance is.

Now try to imagine the existence of any one of these three kinds of presence without the others.

What would space alone, without substance or energy be like? Where would it end? How could you be aware of it? Wouldn't it be endless, frictionless, invisible, formless, motionless *void* – an *intangible* (i.e. not graspable) presence everywhere?

What would substance or energy be like in the absence of space? To put it another way, where would your body be without space? Wouldn't it be utterly without shape or size (i.e. dimensionless) and hence *nowhere discernible*? You'd have to recognise, wouldn't you, that your body, like all material bodies, both includes and is included in space: i.e. *substance and space are distinct from one another, yet mutually inclusive*. How could that possibly be so? That question might tax your imagination a bit.

It might help you to understand what's going on to take a plain sheet of paper to represent 'space' and a pencil to represent what's needed to produce any kind of shape or form on the paper. Notice that *only if you move the pencil around* is it possible to generate a shape that *both includes and is included in space*.

Try using a geometrician's compass to circulate the pencil around a centre-point of space. How does it feel inwardly as you do this? Do you feel yourself focusing your attention around some receptive point in your body at the same time as you focus your attention around the receptive point (the 'hole' made by the needle-point) in the paper?

Do you suddenly realize that this is how tangible material form can only come into being *dynamically*, through some kind of *movement* around a *receptive* still-point that attracts but cannot persistently be reached by the movement. Maybe you might recall the blurry circular form produced by whirling a weight on a string around your hand or watching water swirl around a plug-hole or a tornado forming from a storm cloud?

Great!

You have just discovered for yourself the basic principle of 'natural inclusion'!

Natural inclusion is the evolutionary process through which all natural material forms come into being and diversify as mutual inclusions of space and energy in receptive-responsive relationship.

All material bodies, including our own human bodies, are made of space and circulating energy in mutually inclusive, receptive-responsive relationship - a 'dance' of energy around and within the stillness of space.

Power is sourced in Nature, within, without and throughout our dynamically embodied selves. Neither entirely within nor entirely without but both, in reciprocal, receptive-responsive relationship