

The Natural Touch: unlocking the armour of “self”

Of all modern India’s Gurus, Osho or Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh is one of the most famous and also the most infamous. In the worldwide movement of “free-love” during the 70’s and 80’s Osho was possibly the key figure, invoking both massive interest and opening doorways for many people but also having an equal energy of control and corruption, which is typical of anyone who would call themselves a teacher. In Osho we find a perfect expression of a situation which applies to most of us, that of the child-like nature or the freedom of clarity beneath, and then the adult added on top of this, or one could say the cap of dis-ease on top of a purely natural clear health. Osho had moments of profound clarity interspersed with longer periods of essentially madness, as most teachers do. When there is something beyond the identified “me” that comes through and it is the truth, this really has nothing to do with the individual. In relationship the connection happens despite the so-called “individuals” involved, in healing the healing occurs despite the roles of patient and practitioner being set up, in unlearning and let-go the true message occurs despite the teacher and student mentality. Here is an example of nature expressing through that which we call Osho, but which is actually beyond the man, it is a key statement made about the nature of true healing, I have added notes in order to bring out the true message through some of the more dualistic notions here:-

The Art of Hugging by Osho

*"Analysis is the way of the mind [“self], hugging is the way of the heart. The mind [“self] is the cause of all diseases, and the heart is the source of all healing."
Osho*

Man needs to be needed [at-one-with]. It is one of the most fundamental needs of human beings. Unless one is cared for, one starts dying....[...]..... Hugging is only a gesture of love [Oneness], of warmth, of caring. The very feel of the warmth flowing from the other person melts many illnesses in you, melts the ice-like, cold ego. It makes you again a child.

The psychologists are now well aware of the fact that unless a child is hugged, kissed, he misses some nourishment. As the body needs food, the soul needs love [connection/intimacy]. You can give to the child all the physical needs, all the physical comforts, but if hugging is missing, the child will not grow into a wholesome being. He will remain sad somewhere deep down, uncared for, neglected, ignored. He was nursed, but not mothered.

It has been observed that if a child is not hugged, he starts shrinking - he can even die - although everything else was provided for. As far as the body is concerned, every care was taken, but no love surrounded the child. He became isolated; he became disconnected from existence.

[Unconditional] Love is our connection; [Unconditional] love is our very root. As you breathe - for the body it is absolutely essential; stop breathing and you are no more - in the same way, love is the inner breath. [...]

Analysis won't do it. Wit and clarity, knowledge and scholarship won't do it. You can know all there is to know about therapy, you can become an expert, but if you don't know the art of love [intimacy], you remain only on the surface of the miracle of therapy. The moment you start feeling for the patient, for the one who is suffering... out of a hundred cases, ninety people are suffering because they have not been loved [connected-to]. If you start feeling the need of the patient for love [connection], and if you can fulfill the need; there will be an almost magical change in the condition of the patient.

Sigmund Freud was very much afraid of love [intimacy]; he was afraid of his own repressed love [nature]. He was afraid that he might get in some entanglement, involvement. He wanted to be outside, not to be involved with the person, not to become part of his interiority, not to enter into deep waters, but to remain a scientific observer, aloof, detached, cool, far away. He wanted to create psychoanalysis as if it was a science. It is not a science, and it is never going to be a science! It is an art, and it is far closer to love than to logic.

The real psychoanalyst will not avoid getting deep into the interiority of the patient - he will take the risk. It is risky, it is going into troubled waters. You may be drowned yourself - after all, you are human! You may get into some trouble, complexity; you may create some problems for yourself, but that risk has to be taken.

That's why I love Wilhelm Reich very much. He is the man who transformed the whole face of psychoanalysis - by getting involved with the patient. He discarded the couch, he discarded this detached aloofness. He is a far greater revolutionary than Sigmund Freud. Sigmund Freud remained traditional; he was afraid of his own repressions. If you are not afraid of your own repressions, you can help tremendously. If you are not afraid of your own unconscious, if you have solved your problems a little bit, you can help greatly by getting involved in the world of the patient, by becoming a participant rather than remaining an observer. In fact, because psychoanalysts are having their own problems, sometimes even more than the patient himself, one can understand Sigmund Freud's fear. As far as I am concerned, I would like to make a categorical statement about it:

Only a Buddha [that which is without "self"] can be a real therapist because he has no problems left. He can merge and melt into the patient; in fact, for him the patient is not the patient at all.

That's the difference between the relationship that exists between a patient and his therapist and the relationship that exists between a disciple ["self" or seeking energy] and a Master [that which is without "self"]. The disciple ["self" or seeking energy] is not a patient; the disciple ["self" or seeking energy] is a beloved, a loved one. The Master [that which is without "self"] is not an observer; he has become a participant. They have lost their separate identities, they have become one, and that oneness helps. Hugging is only a gesture of oneness - even the gesture helps. You are right; you ask: Why is hugging such an incredibly effective therapeutic tool? It is, and it is only a gesture. If it is true - not only a gesture but if your heart is in it - it can be magical tool, it can be a miracle. It can transform the whole situation instantly.

A few things have to be understood about it. One is: the idea that the child dies and the man becomes adolescent, then the adolescent dies and the man becomes young, then the young man dies and he becomes middle-aged, and so on and so forth, this is wrong. The child never dies - nothing ever dies. The child is there, always is there, wrapped by other experiences - wrapped by adolescence, then by youth, then by middle age, then by old age - but the child is always there.

You are like an onion, layers upon layers, but if you peel the onion, soon you will find fresher layers inside. Go on deeper and you find more and more, fresher layers. The same is true about man: if you go deep into him, you will always find the innocent child - and to contact that innocent child is therapeutic.

Hugging gives you an immediate contact with the child. If you hug somebody with warmth, love [intimacy], if it is not an impotent gesture, if it is meaningful, significant, true, if your heart is flowing through it, immediately you come in contact with the child, with the innocent child. The innocent child surfacing even for a single moment makes a tremendous difference, because the innocence of the child is always healthy and whole; it is uncorrupted. You have reached to the innermost core of the person where no corruption has ever entered, you have reached to the virgin core, and making the virgin core throb again with life is enough. have started, triggered a process of healing.

When you love [connect/ resonate-with] a person, verbal expressions are not enough; words are not enough; something more substantial is needed; words are only abstract. You have to do something! Hold the hand, hug the person, kiss the person, and embrace the person. It is going to help you both: if you can melt in the hug, you will feel both become again younger, fresher, livelier. That's the whole process of healing.

(from: The Wild Geese and the Water #4, 1981)

While the above implies many dualisms that obscure somewhat the clarity of this message, it yet holds key points. Love in Osho's terminology can very fast move into a romanticized and altruistic "loving the world" ideology, but in-fact the true nature of love is that it is absolutely everything. In humans this energy of love or boundless-energy it is totally-internally-reflected into an idea of "self" which seems to form a trap of "individuality" and seeming separateness, and illusion which cannot be undone by "itself" but simply has to decay and die away. The above is not a statement of the truth of Non-duality but merely the truth about the nature of therapy and why the patient and practitioner blur in healing.

Osho used many applications built upon not only the Tantra traditions of India. Tantra often associated with some of the sexual practices of the letting go of identification with "self" are perhaps some of the oldest and core understanding of Vedic understanding relating to sexual rites in many numerous traditions world wide. However as with all practices they often become "enlightenment" or "goal" focused and as a result lose touch of their original clarity of simply a natural expression of intimacy and can easily move into dualistic notions. Osho also based some of ideas on those of Wilhelm Reich. As Osho so rightly points out Reich is often overlooked in the psychoanalysis processes devised by Freud and then later embellished and re-

moulded by Jung. The Freudian-Jungian basis was all about professional boundaries and the terror of misconduct, both men made themselves overtly pious due to their positions in life and community. Whereas Jung was more open and delved deeper into other cultures and other ways of thinking than Freud, Reich was utterly anarchic in his approach to understanding the nature of healing. He was fringe, and has always been taken up by song-writers like Bob Dylan and in the writing of Jack Kerouac and the beat generation, Reich's work was always seen as flying in the face of the mainstream in a way that Freud and even Jung could not muster. But because of his radical departures from the psychoanalytic ideology and his deep interest in the breaking down of the formal patient-practitioner divide, he was ridiculed and exiled by the therapeutic community. His ideas were seen as foolhardy and ridiculous.

However, Osho could see the clear base expressed in Reich's work. Naturally Reich was a healer, whereas both Freud and Jung had other interests, there were other motives driving them other than healing, but Reich was actually a healer by nature and as a result he himself was the very tool of this nature and was naturally committed to get to the bottom or truth of healing, and this led him towards understanding a way of thinking that was energetic rather than Newtonian-scientific, something almost unheard of at this time in the West apart from within religious ideology. He had a clear instinct that body and mind were one and that the body was primary, and therefore that cognition was a secondary, not the primary route. Also he knew that breaking taboos and social mores had to be part of the healing process, which in itself showed that society was itself sick, which is something we all know but which very few have engaged with as Reich did.

As Osho describes above, the nature of healing or simply "what helps" is genuine connection. In Osho's terminology love is always referring to a naturally-felt and wanted connection between people, it is not forced or seen as being an ideological process to change the world, but "helps" literally meaning that it makes people feel less isolated and separate, in fact it lessens the "self". Though it seems a very simple gesture/expression, the hug is the key intimate and impersonal base of connection, intimate because it is simply the re-discovery of Oneness, and impersonal because there is No-one in the driver's seat "doing it". Sex is the very same thing, or it can be. When humans come close to one another it makes for an intensification of the senses, there is a unified field.

Whereas Freud and Jung most often remained on the practitioner pedestal and only engaged with the process of healing at arms' length (unless it was a hidden and secretive affair) Reich went straight through this, diving headlong into the nature of sex and connection as being the foundation of healing and of the nature of actual physical connection being vital for the healing process, realising that the healing process was constipated when kept at arms' length.

Rudolph Steiner also saw the value of massage and connection in this way and the "Bio-dynamic massage" movement was inspired by his ideas of the possibility of unified body and mind in treatment. Steiner's ideas came from an interest in Greek medicine which has a base and philosophy that was actually beyond the narrowness of Steiner's own vision which was a retrospective approach, in ancient Greece the bodyspirit/mind was always a unified principle and therefore far broader. Reich's interest however was in sensory discovery, he invented and tested theories as did all

of these early psychologists, but he was part of the experiment not absent from it, he was deeply involved as all of the true ancient doctors had been, he was not looking from the sidelines. This is something that Freud, Jung and Steiner did with the head but not with the whole, and this is what makes Reich a vitally important connector of the modern and ancient worlds.

Osho also was this, connected to the tranta of India and brought up in the modern world, he could see the bridging point, so naturally both he and Reich are adhered in many ways. The key message of Osho above is that “love” as he expresses it is unconditional, yet is something that we place conditions over. We can’t suddenly *make* love free, love is naturally free because it is everything in existence. But if it is everything in existence it isn’t only within the hug or within the physical connection, it is already present, so the hug is really only a trigger for humans to realize this. The message of “I love you”, so often wanted to be heard by women and so often refused by men, is a verbal expression of the same message, it is really a reiteration of “I am you” which is a better way of dissolving all the words. However these are “only words”, it is the energy behind these words which counts. As a result one could say “we are the table” with an energy of connection and it will sound as deep as the ocean, but instead we use arbitrary words like “love” because this means something that is beyond the imaginings. Even so people imagine all kinds of things that “love is” and as a result 99% of the time it is used it isn’t what is meant. Very often it deeply involves the “me” which is reiterated in the statement itself, in fact it is very arrogant, how can “I” have the power to “love” a “you” when everything is love? It’s actually an owning of “me”, a confirming of the separation of “you” and the determination that I control “love” and can choose to offer it or not! As such the meaning must go beyond this statement for otherwise it is literally a mantra of division. Hence Osho’s message is really not pointing out that love is missing but that a sense of Oneness is, hugging/authentic or natural touch triggers this sense and bypasses cognition.

In healing, when you have sifted through all the things that “help” and don't “help” it comes down to very little, simply that when a person feels less-separate, usually without words, they actually feel a sensory connection which immediately allows for a person to heal, the “self” starts to drop away. The brilliant Dr. Patch Adams commented once that he dealt with patients with paranoid schizophrenia by hugging them for three hours and telling them that he loved them! Adams is also one of the few who understood the message of the ancients, as is Fukushima Kodo, the acupuncturist, who explains,

“Originally, medicine was a system of benevolent healing practices rooted in a tradition of neighbourly love.” (Fukushima, 1999).

Ikeda Masakazu, the key proponent of Classical East-Asian medicine today, has explained in lectures that the nature of the touch needs to be warm and with natural care and that without this no healing will occur. This is not an imposition that one should attempt to “attain” or practise, in fact it is simply the nature of being a healer. The nature of healing is being freely authentically open, then simply life does the rest. If one is like infant, nothing is outside-of-love it’s all within Love. This is Osho’s expression here. Healing doesn't have to be in a room, it is connection at any point with anything where “self” lets go. As a result healing in a room only works for some

people, for others it will be in contact with nature in some form, not necessarily human, but something where there will be a moment of recognition of Oneness beyond “me”. The hug is simply the social medium of healing.

Tony Parsons (<http://www.theopensecret.com>) points out that love is intimate and impersonal, it isn't one or the other but both, so while it's in the hug it's also when there is no hug and no outer expression of wanting this. It is in fact in utter tyranny and anxiety just as it is in the healing process, because love is Unconditional that is what it means. However in tyranny and anxiety and the expression of these situations, both the so-called victim or the so-called perpetrator roles are wrapped up within the conflict of dualism. From the broadest perspective, this in itself is within Unconditional Love yet in the human it is all about the belief in the separate “self”, the experience of being within it is hell. The hug represents when there is a recognition or openness to the possibility of non-separateness. (This is “Year of the Rat” by Badly Drawn Boy, Osho's statement is mirrored here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PScUdYTO0UM>)

In the process of natural healing it is therefore vital to understand the message expressed by Osho at the root. If there is this kind of non-verbal presence (even behind the words being used, such as the work of Milton Erickson), of actually physically hugging or a qualitative energy of “being-hugged”, being really connected to beyond the individual, where the armour of “self” is let go and one is metaphorically naked, herein lies the potential for healing to occur. Anything other simply impedes, from the ridiculousness of hierarchy and power which is Osho's other side, to the ideology of being “out-to-get” or “end-gaining”.

For humans the hug is a doorway into the Unknown-Eden, the lessening of the bounds of “I am” and the opening of the reality of “No-edgeness/No-oneness”. People often suggest that there is a world of “reality” and a world of “fantasy” and that the “real world” is one of violence, hatred, separation and madness. This “real” world is in fact the world of the fantasist. The “real” world is not the world of the idealist or the altruist or any other such expression. The natural-reality is what is right now, that's all there is. When people say they are “in two-minds” about something this is dualism playing out, in actual fact whenever we see two it's always Oneness being seen as two, unity being seen as separation. This is only an appearance and this appearance is suffering, a pure fantasy!

In the 1st chapter of the Tao Te Ching it says:-

The so-called “natural-way” that can be explained is not true Naturalness

The “name” that can be spoken of is not the Eternal Name.

The nameless-Void was the beginning of Heaven and Earth

The Named is called “Mother” by the manifestation of the life it forms.

When describing “love” the above is key. Loving touch simply means natural-touch, and the hug is therefore a way to break free of the boundaries of the body as being separate and realize it is and always was at-one with life.

David Nassim
18/ 2/ 2012