

The non-psychology of the vertical centre: The death of psychology and psychotherapeutics:

Psychotherapy, and its origin psychology, is now a broad and complex subject, however its roots remain relatively basic and easy to understand. One must look at the roots of its conception in the western world in order to understand the basis of why, with ever- greater influxes of Eastern understanding that now influence the nature of psychotherapy, there is less and less use for this whole subject area.

We can think of Sigmund Freud as one of the originators of this approach. Freud was all about the body as a mechanism. One could say he was materialist in his approach to the psyche, devoting massive focus to the sexuality of the body and to the development of psychological pathology when sexuality is not expressed. Carl Jung reacted against this material focus, who simply suggested that the material wasn't the only thing going on but that there were other factors, and so introduced his spirituality thus pointing out there was a “spiritual” element, it wasn't all material. In a way this is the exact struggle between science and religion. Freud was most definitely the materialist scientist and Jung was the religious man with beliefs and ideals. In a way they were polarizations of each other's pathological dispositions and this is a form of duality in itself. The nature of the collective Freudian-Jungian approach is one of continual misunderstanding of the nature of existence: whereas Freud believed only in the physical and the solid, so Jung believed only in the immaterial and the invisible. Both therefore miss the point.

Wilhelm Reich's is the most ridiculed of the 3 most influential expressions of psychological theorem at the time. He saw that there was a unity in body-material and expression-spirit, pointing out that there was no division between the two and even suggested that all of life was energetic. This was a hugely different perspective. It was a realization to some degree of all energy being one at root and therefore “real” and “invisible” both occurring at once...something that modern physics is still struggling with in the Higgs-Boson debate where the so-called “god particle” literally exists and doesn't exist at the same time!

With Wilhelm Reich came considerable connection with Eastern philosophy and to the philosophy of the ancient world including Greek, where there was a focus on energetic understanding of things, a non-absolute approach. However psychological theory was not based on the seeming ridiculous ideology of Wilhelm Reich, who even went so far as to relegate the practitioner to a mere energetic-interaction with the patient, so there was no patient or practitioner in a sense. This potentially demoralizing idea to the medical profession and to all in hierarchy was never going to be taken on by those who came after him (including Osho who used his theories in part), and so psychology was founded on the theories of Freud and later Jung at base.

These two men were similar in that they traced the past. They were both archeologists of the psyche, trying to find roots and origins of things that had happened before in order to root out and clarify what is going on now. While to the linear mind this seems like the logical thing to do, the original premise of this argument being that there is indeed, a) a problem that has a causality that is “fixable”, and b) that if you dig around in past events eventually you will come up with the reason and so by

finding the reason you will find the solution or antidote to the issue that has been going on for so long.

This remains the main premise of almost all psychotherapeutic methods including most modern techniques of therapy. From “constellation” work, to NLP, CBT, transactional analysis and numerous other new off-shoots of psychotherapy, even those influenced by some of the more modern-dualistic aspects of Eastern philosophy that trace back “karmic patterns”, all of these have a similar element in that they are trying to trace back past issues and look at how one did something in the past in order to look at how one can respond differently today. Being heavily influenced by Zen, Gestalt therapy is perhaps the least past-orientated but still points out past-created patterns and challenges them in the present moment.

However all of these draw from a commonality of a focus in the psyche and an engaging with it in order to somehow “become more aware” or get to a point where something can be “let-go” and “laid to rest”. But as ever, when one pattern is let-go another one inevitably fills the space just like a Russian doll, the layers of tension seem to be always there and, like chasing the end of a rainbow, one is never quite done with therapeutic work. There are those brief-psychotherapists who have the innate wisdom to realize that the process they are engaging with is not a cure-all and can only quickly trigger something for a short period and then it becomes a psychosis in itself, but this is a rarity.

The issue is that really all psychotherapy is looking at are the *expressions* of the “self” or “mind”. These expressions or fantasies are the symptoms, always on a search which psychotherapy itself corroborates by its nature, that of “getting better”, whether this be by “letting go” of something or “re-programming” or “re-awakening” something, it is always a rejection of what is going on in this moment and an attempt to move to something else....something idealistically “better”.

In Freud’s world the “self” is very mechanistic and physical. He would be very happy to have found an organ called “the soul” which one could influence with drugs and much of psychiatry and the chemistry of the mind and so neurology can draw connective ties to Freudian thinking. Jung’s picture would be very different, much less physical, but instead the mind-spirit takes on an ideological expression that has “a dream”, “a direction”, “a reason”, “a choice” and “a purpose”. Similar to Rudolph Steiner and others of his generation Jung tried to make science and religion join and to find a common ground, not realizing that they are the same side of the same coin just with different language. While Freud’s thinking is the dis-ease of cold and clinical masculinity, Jung’s pathology is of the personalization and ego-centricity of femininity.

The misunderstood and demoralized expression of Reich, however, opened the potential to being able to realize that life was not about the human “self” as centre, and in fact everything is energetic and all expressions are one-energy. This deeply anarchic expression points out a total lack of hierarchy, a total loss of placement for the “healer” and the “to-be-healed”....who is it that's healing who? It completely obliterates the idea of “getting better” and also of past and future and of time.

As with most things, it is those ideologies that have been discarded as rubbish which are on the outer-edges of the Western world's perceptions that actually have any true clarity. Reich's philosophy and general point would actually have ended psychology before it had begun to tie itself into the knots that it has formed today. However people move with their feet, as time has gone on and there is a move away from both science and religion, so too there is a falling away of a feeling of security at the hands of the psychologist and psychotherapist. A feeling of distrust is apparent in all forms of medicine and quite rightly, because very often it is a situation of the blind leading the blind. There has been a guru-worship of the therapist and psychologist and also of the doctor and priest, but now this illusion also fading. As Tony Parsons (<http://www.theopensecret.com>) points out, there is the beginning of a realization that no-one knows and that there is no solution to the ultimate underlying problem that all of these therapies skim over the top of, that of "self" and the ideology/ felt-contraction of "I".

The bio-energetics of Reich in the West was a millionth of the expression of the nature of energetic throughout the Eastern philosophy of the ancient world (although it too became warped and turned into dualistic ideology many times in its later history). Here there is no possibility even theoretically of a "self", there is just energy occurring for no reason. In Zen and in Buddhist philosophy there is still a dualism in the goal of enlightenment and a focus on breaking through the "self" is enforced. So this ties up nicely with psychology and in particular can be seen in Fritz Perls' "Gestalt" therapy. It is interesting that many of the text and traditions taken from the body of Eastern thought by Western psychology have been all the stuff that they can work into a western mind-set, and as such these aspects of the Eastern Cannon tend to be the most dualistic and hold the least clarity, in some cases corroborating the mistaken picture of dualism. East does not necessarily mean "clear", although it can do, but it's a rarity there also, however clear understanding in the West is almost totally obscured in literature and this gets passed on. The East is clearly founded in a non-dual realization, as is the ancient Western thinking, but the roots of both are now hard to see through the thicket of dualism. Before Zen and in the deeper ancient clarity there was a situation without teaching and where there was nothing to add. Books such as the Tao Te Ching illustrate some of this expression, this a text from around 500BC, but even here we can easily misinterpret a dualistic picture.

The point is that while there is a message in the air of non-dualism and of a recognition that "nothing is broken" and that the whole notion of health and healing is an illusion, this is almost never sensed. This message has always been known and is timeless and in everything, so as Tony Parsons puts it, it's an "open secret", yet is almost completely unseen. The innate instinct is the realization that health or wholeness never left, it was always there and also the realization that there is no-one that health "belongs" to. As Tony Parsons says, "*....everything outside of the liberated state is seeking.*". This profoundly key statement points out that both the dis-ease and also the response to this dis-ease must be part and parcel of the same thing. If one is presented with an illusion like "the cat is blue...what colour is his head?" then to respond "blue" would be a colluding with the illusion...but this is exactly what the therapeutic process is mostly about. It is not that there is anything right or wrong about it, but we should not be surprised that it doesn't come up with any long-term or "permanent" solutions to the issue that is fundamental, that of "self" and the sense of "being separate".

So here begs the question “what do we do then?... if I am pulling out psychotherapy and sending it to the cleaners, what do I replace it with ?”...What am I suggesting is better or will improve things? Actually I’m not suggesting anything because I’ve come to that point where I don’t know....but what I am happy to say is that I *really* don’t know and I think a lot of people who say they do know and are sure of it, actually really don’t, simply because they can’t know, no-one can.

The nature of healing happens for no-reason and healing response occurs irrationally, not because one wants it or wills it to happen, it occurs spontaneously. A person can be healed of cancer but another won’t be healed of a painful toenail, why? Why should one thing let-go and another stay firmly rigid? There is no answer to this that can be clearly understood and logically analyzed from outside of it. In a way it could be called an energetic ripeness and when things in nature are ready to change and energy reaches a certain point then there will be a shift. However this is not necessarily anything to do specifically with the practitioner-energy, it could occur while walking the dog or anything at all. Most of the time we are convinced we are sick and there is something wrong because that’s how we feel, we feel separate, but in actual fact this is living will dark glasses on and saying “why is it always dark?” However to take the glasses off intentionally is impossible, they dissolve eventually when we forget that “it’s so dark” and instead are simply in the moment.

Another key point is that the practitioners cannot “get themselves out of the way” this is pure dualism. One cannot “become” a healer, one is this by nature or is not. One can’t move into a meditative state in order to heal. *Healing occurs despite the practitioner not because of the practitioner.* This is something almost unheard of. It is always assumed that it is the training, lineage or teacher one has had or if one can mediate and “allow oneself to let go” into another “state of consciousness” that is how healing occurs but actually healing and the process of it is innate. It occurs through those people who are healers naturally or who have this temperament innately and it occurs for no known or controllable reason but *through* them. Everything “done”, including “trying” to be in this or that state by the practitioner, is actually a resistance to the natural flow of energy and is utterly futile it in fact builds-up/ re-enforces a perception of the “self” that “I can achieve this state”. This is simply an imposed situation that allows someone who is not a natural-healer to feel calm, it is an attempt to control things and try to make things function in an intended way. Healing, is an expression of childlike spontaneous nature, it has no parameters, knows no bounds and also is completely out of the control of man-made intensions. Often times it is simply the situation of a person who is naturally a healer, coming into contact with some kind of recognition of realization that they need not “do” or “be” anything other than what is, that opens up the potential expression of healing through them. No “training” is needed. Techniques are just skills which can be learned or found through necessity, they are not healing.

Psychotherapeutics end with time. As there is less importance placed upon trying to figure out the root of something and on trying to get to the bottom of the conundrum of “myself”, so there is less focus in the past or the past-projected future. There is a realization that senses and heart beating and breath are all occurring in the background to the mind and thoughts popping-up with various expressions, and none of this requires a “me” at the root of it. It all simply occurs, the thoughts and ideas

coming up like steam from a train with no driver...there doesn't need to be a driver for the mechanism to run...this so brilliantly connects to Reich's energetics even without him having much connection to the bounty of ancient philosophy. This is innate within everything, the fact that all energy is one, there is no place for the separate "me" and therefore there is no space for the seeking of the original "split away" into a "me" that occurred in childhood, as this original split has echoes for millions of years in history, the pit is bottomless and there's no-one to blame.

Nature has no-self and so therefore the human is under the illusion of one, it is this illusion that gradually passes away...there is nothing to be "done" about this as it is passing already and is inevitable. In a way the best thing that can occur in healing is the realization that the dis-ease nothing to do with "me" or that "I" can fix this. This is not a situation of a resignation but a true recognition of life, that nature heals and lives "through us" rather than a "me" needing to be in constant vigilant control of it all. Action can happen, but not through any action of "myself". So healing occurs but because of no-one and for no-body, not "because I've found the cause" or not. There is no requirement of awareness or awakening, for life does not need to be aware of itself nor awake, it is "already enough" as it is.

The nature of psychotherapeutics in all its modes can be boiled down to the simplicity of being given an arena in which to express oneself and the thoughts going on and even going through a self-seeking catharsis to the point of exhaustion of this energy. This in itself can be superficially liberating and counseling is based on this, whether that is known or not. However psychotherapeutics and all other modalities that are about a practitioner involving him or herself in thought patterns and deciphering old-patterns in order to "rectify" them are basically part of the age-old belief system of "self". Outside of these there is the realization that there is no-self and so any action taken and anything that occurs is really not personal, and yet at the same time deeply intimate.

Tony Parsons points out that seeking is like a horizontal wheel...one is always pacing the wheel in order to get to the other side, which never comes as the wheel just revolves in an illusion of time and space. The nature of natural reality is the empty centre of the wheel or the vertical hub that is timeless and constantly sought and yet is constantly present.

David Nassim
29/10/12