

## **Science, “divisive” treatment and the instinct to heal: when tools, analysis and equipment override natural sensitivity.**

What is healing? Often we fall into the technicalities but forget the root. In fact healing is the sense of not being separate, simply that connection with another person or the connection with something for a short period that allows us for a moment or longer to forget that we believe we are separate. In that time something changes, and the qualities of rest and calm occur and as a result nature returns health to the previously tense body.

In today’s world analysis has taken over from senses. Doctors and practitioners of many kinds will very easily forego and forget the natural sensitivity of the body and instead use machines and equipment... from the primitive acupuncture needle to the complex scanners and implements of modern medicine. As time has gone on we have distanced ourselves ever further from actual person to person contact.

The most pure situations of healing are actually not about healing at all, they are healing without intention, healing that occurs in the moment unintended when a person just naturally feels drawn to do or say something or connect to someone and something just “happens”, where for some reason there is a ripeness of moment for healing to occur. As soon as human intention comes in, firstly we move to a patient and practitioner dualism, then from there tools are added on to seemingly “aid” the practitioner. Even the most primitive of tools from the natural medicines of the ancient world such as acupuncture were essentially aids to the practitioner rather than the patient, they were to help move the energy of the body, so the energy of the patient was the focus, not the tool. In today’s world we believe that acupuncture “does something” that massage cannot not, we believe there is a difference between qi gong and reiki, and a difference between all the different medical tools and scanners and bio-energetic machines and methodologies of using them. Of course there are differences, but these are like those between the different shapes of chisels or hammers, disparate forms of subtlety or coarseness for different jobs. The problem is that reliance on these items means the practitioner associates him or herself with the tools, they become synonymous with the tools and so become stuck at the point of forcing their natural energy through the funnel of different tools, rather than using them as an extension of the effect they know needs to happen through a felt response.

The most basic form of treatment of just the hands and the sense is very often the most vital base for practitioners to return to and recognize. When you let go of all the tools and just feel what you feel, or even without touching the body you just sense what you sense and respond to these instincts, this is actually the foundation of the use of specific tools. Then when there is a job that requires a specific tool, you know what to add. From this perspective it is a patient-practitioner-energetic responsiveness that is the foundation of treatment, not that you are focusing on one tool or another.

Inevitably this leads to the practitioner’s own energetic field being the basis of treatment and so some people will benefit or gravitate towards this, others will not. Referral should also be based on the practitioner’s energy and marrying it with the specific patient’s energetics. This was the very old way of the Shamans which is now a forgotten expression. In today’s society if the practitioner has become adhered to their tools, it is all too often down to what a person “does” and to their “qualifications”, not what a practitioner is energetically that can be the basis of referral and of treatment.

It is very often a good practice from time to time to let go of all the tools of your trade and start from scratch again, to see what you actually feel, not what you thought you felt, to be minimal with the use of tools and not to use as many devices in treatment, to analyse less and feel more. This is a way into the instinctual sensing of the body, which is way beyond any form of device or external tool devised by the mind. No machine can be beyond the diagnostic ability of the practitioner's sense, but if the practitioner is unwilling or afraid of getting it "wrong" through using his or her natural senses then the machine will always be a limited crutch that they are tied to and that way it is often hard to see the bigger picture of a patient's life.

In society today we are taught to let go of our bodily sense and told that machines know more and are more sensitive, this can be "proved" too it seems, but it only *seems* this way. When a person truly accepts their own limitation the natural sense of the body and their way of being is inherently more accurate. When there is acceptance, what radiates from the open practitioner will simply be what they can do in that moment, no more and no less. This is the basis for treatment and for working in a way that is the reality of what a person can do, not what they imagine they can do. Also they will find that this does not go beyond their own way of being and therefore their judgment will not be distorted and diagnosis is accurate. It will allow them to be receptive to what is going on through their own feeling, not through their heady ideas. This is truly all they can do, it is an authentic response and this kind of response naturally creates resonance between patient and practitioner. Of course this also happens all the time when there are tools and devices and apparatus in the room but eventually these energetically get in the way, in the end they are seen to be the relics of the mental analysis of life via the mind and ego and the ideology of self, which too is the realm of science and all forms of medical ideas which see the world as fragments of chemical and biochemical parts.

The return to instinct has to be in the practitioner for the patient to also respond and go in this way. If the practitioner questions their own senses and distrusts nature this then is also passed on to patients. The exploration of the mind to understand the body, to get a set of beliefs about the body and how it works is only the mind. In fact as the brilliant farmer Fukuoka Masanobu states "humans can never know nature". This is true because "knowing" is really the tool attempting to take over the instinct. The point is that when the head is given prowess over the body, and when science therefore is given prowess over the instinct, then we start to move away from the reality of treatment and we enter into a dot-to-dot approach of engaging with the body that looks at the parts and does not see the whole.

The ancient medicines are energetic based, they see all of life as a continuum of experienced and sensed energy, there is no duality, no different levels of life and nothing separate from anything else. Their theories are not actually theory but simply ways of expressing what is felt instinctively. Actually there is no theory, it is all reality. This is very different to the ideologies of science and the modern day ways of placing machines in front of instinct and of replacing sense-based traditions with scientific rigour.

The day we can let go of the complexity of analysis and of attempting to understand the world is the day there is actually no requirement for healing, for it is the very act of moving into the observatory separate state that is the opposite of the healing response. When we do this we are encouraging the dis-ease and the nature of humans to be separate from one another. Thus it is for the practitioner to be "courageous", to listen to their own senses and to be "honest", to recognize they have limits that other people are far better adjusted to respond to specific situations or certain people.

Moving from “divisive” treatments to ones that are instinctually expressed is a sure way to bring about change to whatever extent it can be changed in the ripening process of a patient’s movement to health, even if this means having a smooth and easily freeing death. The practitioner is not the person who judges that health and tranquility are “better” than tension and strife, they are simply the extension of nature that moves things towards tranquility as this is their way. There is nothing more to it than this, a practitioner is simply what they are, being this is not a choice but a response from within.

For more on this topic please read my book "Medical Oneness: the way to unite all forms of medicine" .

(...and for a recent insight into the impossibility of differentiating science from so called “pseudo-science” please read this article: [NYT article](#))

David Nassim  
11/9/2013