

## **The impossibility of owning an illness: How modern diagnostic labelling furthers the process of dis-ease.**

Labelling is a product of feeling a sense of separation from everything and everyone. It is fundamentally the expression of “me” and “you” feeling separate. Labelling is a method of categorization in an attempt to make the Unknowable, known and thereby “safe”. This is the basis of modern diagnosis in western allopathic medicine. It is driven by a sense of fear (particularly towards the female-yin by the male-yang). To categorize an illness is seen in today’s world as something which can enable a patient to feel calmer because “at least I know what it is”. The belief is that if there is an understanding and knowledge of something through labelling then one can “deal with it” more easily. This is a totally cognitive approach, a “seeing is believing” visual-only idea. What is felt are symptoms, there is no notion of symptoms being directions back to health.

No matter what the illness label, all symptom patterns are energetic manifestations of the body’s process of healing. The body forms symptoms in its process of adjusting itself, usually under huge and impossible odds of the “self” which is beating the bodyspirit into submission. The symptoms that are created are simply “signs” that the body is reaching a limit-point of this process. The symptoms can be viewed as instincts/directions to what the body wants and requires. The body is cold and tired in its symptoms so it needs heat and rest. The body is hot and stagnated, so it needs clearing and cooling. *It’s really and truly as simple as that.* Could it be possible that this is really the basis of medicine, can we accept that sometimes simplicity is reality, why do we need to make it more complex?

The problem is that through the labelling of symptoms this firstly creates a situation where the dis-ease has been “boxed” and made personal and it then becomes “my” or “your” dis-ease. Secondly, this process of categorization causes these things to appear “actual” or “real”, they have become an absolute quality of “something” rather than simply the name for a collection of symptoms or a quality of energy. In and of themselves the symptoms aren’t important, whether it’s cancer, AIDS, hepatitis or heart disease makes no difference, *in reality it doesn’t matter what the symptoms are.* The simple reason for this is that in energetic medicine we aren’t interested in categorizing the dis-ease, for this is utterly pointless. The interest point is what is going on energetically to form this, what is felt in the bodyspirit, is there heat or cold, tightness or looseness, and this is how we discover what lies behind the façade of symptoms rather than focusing on them and missing the root which is fundamentally always the point of greatest weakness or low-energy within a body.

Symptoms are not “actual” or “real”, they are not absolute/ fixed and so labels are actually something that *encourages* dis-ease... because when the label of the dis-ease is added on to “me”, “I” own it, “I” control it (or might try to), “I” can use it and it’s “mine”. As with every aspect of life, all dis-ease is both deeply intimate and deeply impersonal. As there is no “me” in reality, this means there is also an impossibility of there being “my” dis-ease, it certainly isn’t something that one can use as an identity badge. Fundamentally, the thing that is attempting to identify the dis-ease, is *itself* the dis-ease, like a snake eating its tail. In modern society this is exactly what goes on, dis-ease is owned and it’s that person’s “problem”, it doesn’t concern others unless

it's contagious and then the concern is to get away as fast as possible to "protect yourself".

The point is that personal-health is an absolute fallacy, there is no such thing as "a person" and therefore there is no such thing as personal health. Every human is interconnected, the whole group is a field of energy. Therefore dis-ease has to be looked at in another way: it is firstly not personal, but yet it is intimate, it is occurring and there is often pain, and so the process is always understanding the nature of the "self" that has always disrupted, owned and fragmented the "me" to create the dis-ease pattern in the first place. "Self" is the root of dis-ease so anything which bolsters this sense of "me" is always going to bolster the process of dis-ease. If "I am" then "I have", and if "I have" then dis-ease could be one of these things and if it becomes a definition it adds hugely to the burden.

Medicine becomes a problem when it adds to the burden by focusing on the symptoms. The realization that there is no such thing as "self" underpins everything so it is in itself the healing connection. Anything that has this sense about it is healing because it doesn't add to the idea that "I" have to be something, it's the relief of not "having to be" and/or to agree with the process of personalized illness and ownership of a dis-ease label. This actually explains how damaging are firstly diagnostics that attempt to categorize and offer a label to a patient (no matter what the type of medicine practised, even energetic medicine practised without sense) and secondarily and perhaps even more damaging is the predicted outcome of this diagnosis or "prognostics" explained to the patient. This is often the equivalent of energetically knifing the venerable state of the patient. It is always seen as "coming to terms with" but in nature there are no "terms", life isn't an insurance policy.

To truly realize the nature of healing we have to look beyond all the commonly-held belief systems. Even the notions in Western medicine that are seemingly about "finding the right cure for the right disease" are actually very often a process of cementing an ideology of "me" and "my health" or "my dis-ease". Any attempt to heal in these terms can often be a process of the disease itself.

When we look at illnesses of epidemic proportions such as cancer, HIV, heart disease etc, we are concerned with segregated people who are all on so-called "journeys" of "their own" in order to unravel and "attain" health. However, the unravelling is occurring by itself, it doesn't need a person in there pulling the strings. Those people who embark on a "journey" always find themselves back at square one, inevitably the seeking never results in their finding anything, except for some there occurs the realization at the end of the process that there *is* nothing to seek. *This is exactly the same for cancer patients as it is for everyone.* No matter whether it's alcoholism, workaholism, depression, cancer, heart disease or HIV, *all* of these produce symptoms that constantly draw one to the sensory and away from the ideological and cognitive processes associated with the sense of "me", the dis-ease. They all draw to a realization of health that is beyond the idea that "I" can "do" something but rather that life is *living through* this human being's expression.

The movement away from intention and seeking, pushing and forcing, avoiding, owning and claiming, and fundamentally away from "me", to the ultimate end of these is a universal process. No matter what the dis-ease, the unravelling and the

nature of the “self” and how it functions is the same in every single case, although of course every time will be a unique expression. In the brilliant film “The Matrix” we notice how “Agent Smith”, which represents the processing of the “self” and all its beliefs of “I am”, is replicated a million times. The nature of this is the same no matter what type of “self” it is or how uniquely it is dressed up, its processes are exactly the same in every case, it's a clone of a clone of a clone of the original misperception of “me” as separate. This is the dis-ease and this is why the superficialities of what it's called are unimportant.

All the dis-ease knows is “me”, which means anything that is curative will always be without this concept, hence as always we look towards such rare expressions of non-duality as Tony Parsons (<http://www.theopensecret.com>), and the nature of the infant child, the nature of the indigenous person, the nature of the primate and wild-nature, and as a guide also the maps of energetics from ancient times passed on from generations. These expression unify to provide a cognitive picture. Beyond this there are just the 5 senses which are at the threshold of the natural-reality of “without me” for in fact there is no-one sensing.

While the unravelling or dissolving of “me” is the end of all dis-ease, this doesn't mean an immediate return to physical health. When necrosis of the body tissues has overtaken the body's ability to heal then a bodyspirit will definitely die and will do so without the dis-ease process at the centre as “me” dissolves, so there will be no suffering in the process. This is the big difference between a realization of what is actually beneficial as opposed to what we “think” is beneficial. Instead of mechanically alleviating pain or keeping the body “going”, when suffering is alleviated then 100% of the time some pain is also alleviated. The “me” can't tolerate pain, but without “me” pain is accepted by nature. “Me” is sufferance, is dis-ease, pain is just pain. This is why infant children accept death and other difficulties more easily than the average adult going through the same things. For the infant there is just pain, for an adult there is pain plus the “me” suffering and being in pain, which magnifies the pain to the point of death.

In order to realize the nature of healing and for diagnostics to have any relevance, one has to understand the nature of dis-ease, dis-ease is sufferance of “being a separate me”, it is not pain. If the foundations of one's ideology are built on the shifting sands of “me” then there will be no satisfaction in treatment. If the diagnostics are built on solid realization that everything is symptomatic of the same dis-ease, and the specific pattern of symptoms is of interest but not the main focus, only then is medicine something that heals, through this observation alone. Western science and medicine are absolute and this is actually the biggest blindness rather than so-called “accuracy”. When something has a broad outlook and incorporates the whole view it is bound to yield an understanding that is out of the box of “myself”.

For more on this as applied to the spectrum of medical disciplines please see my book “Medical Oneness” here:

[http://www.healthinstinct.org/index.php?main\\_page=page&id=3](http://www.healthinstinct.org/index.php?main_page=page&id=3)

David Nassim  
5/6/ 2012