

Dying to care: The reality of caring for others.

How many of us have had sick or dying relatives, friends or close connections where we have been in a situation of feeling the want to take-care-of? Probably most of us have, or will at some time have contact with people who are sick and say they are in need of help. What is it that is truly in us that makes us want to care for others, or in fact is this an illusion...do we truly care? What is the motivation?

What helps us to best see the true nature of the human being always comes from nature. When we look at nature and see our closest cousins the chimps and bonobos in the jungle we can see our origins and how we could be at our most natural essence. The difficulty however is that we usually interpret the behaviour of these animals as being “human” rather than just seeing it for what it is without an intense layer of our own conditioning.

In the wild, sickness is usually associated with physical injury, never more than that. Sometimes parasitic infection will take place but actually before humans came along and upset the balance of the natural functioning of eco-systems the only real problems were injury due to predators or one animal feeding from another in some way, or as a result of environmental shifts. This carried on for millions of years. The epidemic of dis-ease over the last few thousand years has come along with agriculture and monocropping. In the jungles from whence we are likely to have originated there was a balance which we were once part of. At this time there was no medicine and also there was no healing. There was no idea of one person healing another as there was simply no recognition of a separation between a “you” or a “me”. There was no “problem” made out of pain, it was simply pain with physical injury. If a person could survive the injury they went on, if not then the body died. It was very simple, there was no grief or strife and there was no suffering.

It is only really when the human being gained a sense of “self”-identity that medicine also suddenly arrived at the same time. Religion and healing have always been tied together from the start, therefore from the outset medicine and religion are both contrived things, things that only human beings do which make them very different from all other animals, and not in a “good” way. While for many the ideology of the human being as a great and powerful spiritual being is still held in the mind, the reality is that humans are not so important. We are animals who have the warped notion, the hallucination, that there is an entity within us called “me”, this has been our burden and is the foundation of the human condition of dis-ease.

Therefore medicine is a counter-reaction to the state of dis-ease of the human, as is religion. They were once one thing in ancient Shamanism, where the Shaman was the connection to “spirit” and also the doctor, as there was no divide between these ideas. The “spirit” was sick and so the treatment was to resolve that sickness. The ancient healing approaches were therefore always about ridding the body of “demonic” entities that essentially were forms of the expression of “self” or “me”: the dividing aspect of the mind, the thing that separates things off, or the madness of the mind. Trepanning, the act of making a hole in the head to allow out “evil spirits”, was one of the earliest practices of Stone Age medicine, similarly the practice of scalping of victims of the Native American Indian battles, the idea was that the perpetrators were mad so in fact it was a “good deed” in to free the maddened spirit through scalping.

While these practices seem barbaric today, actually many of the psychiatric drugs simply put to sleep or muffle areas of the brain in a similar way to that of a lobotomy, and a lobotomy is nothing if not similar to the practices that went on in pre-history.

For some reason the human knows something is going on up in the head which isn't quite right and we focus there to cathartically remove something in order for us to feel at peace. Later on, or emerging later on in history, different approaches came. Instead of catharsis, there were processes of attempting to draw the energy downwards into the legs and feet with meditations and the like. All the while and behind all these processes was the "me", the "self" seeking something, it was/is trying to find a sense of peace and stability due to this natural phenomenon of being driven mad. The "self" came from nowhere, it just occurred, there was no blame, no "original sin" was committed, it was simply a natural phenomenon. The human began believing himself to be separate and superior and so religious-medicine become the focus of tribal life and the ideology spread, until today where we still have beliefs which are now often in money or power, or spiritual-capitalism or some other idol. However, all are focused on appeasing the tension of the "self", all are forms of "medicine" and none of them do the job they were supposed to do.

The point is that healing and the ideology of healing comes from an idea that something is wrong and needs to be fixed. It also comes from the idea that there needs to be a person who knows what's right or is essentially the healer and a person who is confused and needs healing. There are many people who feel that they are "taken over" or are channelling healing through forces other than them and that healing is coming through them, but this does not happen to any other aspect of nature. Why would humans be "healers" or "facilitators" or even "conduits" to universal energy in the form of "healing"? Why, if this was truly the case, would we not all just play with cardboard boxes or eat ice-cream or do something spontaneous, like a child or animal expression might? Even for those of us who naturally are open to a kind of interaction where we are in connection with a person with whom we are in a "healing mode", the whole idea of one person engaging in such a practice is considered to be wholly unnatural, which is an expression of how far we have come from our instinctive sense, from health *instinct*. If we were truly there, there would be no such thing as healing, no such thing as religious thought or any other such abstractions.

We often talk about healing as a profession that is a "calling" or something similar, something that is not a duty but which is done because one is "called" (presumably from above!) to do. But actually while the human animal has the natural senses of smell and touch and taste and so on, there is no natural sense of healing, this is illusory. There is no sense within us that makes us suddenly go and want to heal a person. The only thing that is there is actually a situation where the "other" person is not seen as "another" but seen as one-with, but in this case the response is like that of a dog or a cat, when we are feeling sick or tired or we are hurt, they come straight up and stay close to us in a protective stance or in a mode of still connection which makes no attempt to "do" anything as such but is really just "being", the animal responds as you are part of it, that is all.

In healing the confusion is that one needs to "do" something, but in fact the key is in being able to do absolutely nothing, to do less and less, in fact to simply be able to just "be" around a person, in the same way a child or a cat or dog would. This

connection has a healing effect because it has no intention, it's purely innocent, moreover it is not meant to do anything and as a result it is the most powerful. This is why a person who is set up as with healing as her/his focus very often cannot make contact with a person and the simplicity of a long-lost cousin turning up at the door-step who in fact "always was themselves" is a much stronger connection than anything a healer can muster in intention.

Everything we see around us in the world today is constructed by the mind of the human and thus has the human's warped ideology. Medicine and caring is no different. The true nature of "caring" is about allowing things to happen naturally, to literally do nothing, in fact not to engage with an ideology of "care" or "medicine". So it's all backwards, what seems like care and treatment often isn't and what seems like absolutely nothing at all is actually the essential nature of connectedness. There is no fear of death in the process of the natural sense of connection, with the fear of death everything becomes about survival and about pushing forward and getting better. At whatever level a healer/carer engages with this, by the nature of their being in this role they are colluding with it, whether knowingly or unknowingly.

U.G Krishnamurti pointed out the nature of connectedness in a situation where his eldest son was dying of cancer:

"Recently my eldest son was dying of cancer in a hospital nearby. I was in the area and visited him often. Friends said that I was in intense pain during the whole time, until he died. I cannot do anything. It (pain) is an expression of life. They wanted me to attempt some kind of healing for his cancer. If I touch that tumour it will grow, for I am adding life to it. Cancer is a multiplication of cells, another expression of life, and anything I might do only strengthens it." - from collected interviews with U.G in "Mind is a Myth", Chapter 1.

When we think about caring and healing we often believe it either has some kind of altruism behind it, some duty-bound expression of what it is that we should do, or some ideal that we are "healers" of some kind or other. While it is clear that some people are by nature much more suited to the ideology of being a healer simply due to their temperament, this doesn't negate the fact that the whole ideology of being a healer is absolutely mad.

The ideology of being a healer is a form of egoism, it is either an externalized egoism of being a powerful master and controller of people and having the power to cure, or it is an internalized egoism of feeling broken and needing to find the cure and therefore treating others as a means to verify oneself or to find a way of "fixing" oneself. There is no other reason one would have the drive to heal, or the drive and the process to become any form of healer. Even an interest in the process of healing is a process that has its inherent limitation. Why is it that you want to "be better"... from what? In the end it is the death of "me" that is feared beyond anything else. Having formed within the body as a kind of internally-generated mutated state, the "self" needs to perpetuate its process, needs to find an absolute ground upon which to stand and form itself. Whether this is a formation which is big and strong or a formation which is weak and small, in either case the energy is exactly the same, simply that one has gone in and the other has gone outwards, other than in appearance there is no difference.

It is true that some of us have the innate ability to be patient or tolerant, to be able to deal with things in a way that is calm or grounded, and while this is “helpful” in the general use of the word, but is this real? Actually it is just fitting in with a societal norm, it is fitting into a system of service, being seen as “doing your bit” and so on. They say healing is an “art” but it is not simply an expression of something, it is based around intent to heal otherwise the situation would not arise. Generally it is quite clear that healers are often the most sick within society, why, because when there are people clinging to a position of power or to a position of being needed, neither of these ideologies is part of the natural-human, they are part of the warped human ideology of “self”.

So what’s the alternative? What am I suggesting to “do” about this? I’m not. Really this is just to investigate the reality of the illusion of being a carer, being someone involved in medicine. If we break out of that illusion and we ask the question “what do I want to do?”, what is the reality of it? How many nurses would go back to work, how many doctors? Without the duty-call or the guilt or the perception of doing something that will inflate the ego, or allowing myself to feel “important” to many when I feel so small, when all this falls away, what is left of medicine? As our civilization begins to falter and fall, so too will all the ideologies of our culture. The things that we feel are “selfish” acts will be seen as self-less acts and the aspects that we thought were self-less will be seen as being full of “self”. How a person “should” or “should not” behave is really not the point, it is only what is felt.

U.G exposes the myth of “caring” and “healing” in one fell swoop when he points out the situation he was in with his son where it was simply a draw, a magnetic draw to be around his son, and all he felt was pain. Is it possible for us to respond to a situation without ideologies of what should or could be, or what another person wants you to be? Can it be simply a draw from within to connect with a person for an unknown reason, or is it possible for us to see that *not* being with a person who is suffering and in pain is just as appropriate a response as the one who sits by? Is it possible to really and truly see that Love is unconditional? When we place conditions on how we care and what we should or should not feel, we place conditions on Love/ Oneness, and so split it from reality and turn it into pure suffering.

David Nassim
28/ 4/ 2013