

## **Without Identity - losing “me” religion: The failed attempts at labelling the sexual-orientation of emptiness**

*“I think people tend to be really obsessed with transgender people’s physical configurations. But transgender is a condition of the spirit, you know? There’s something very reductive that tends to occur in perceiving transgender people and even gay people, in that society tends to want to reduce them, in almost a crude way, around an obsession with their sexuality or even their genital configuration, which has... there’s a kind of a cruelty to that, when, in fact, what we are dealing with is people whose spirits are different.” - Antony Hegarty*

Antony Hegarty is a well-known singer/song-writer who expresses very openly something known as a “transgender” nature. Hegarty points to something which is very clearly true, that gender is just another label and identification with gender or indeed with anything is actually just another trap of “myself”. While “transgender” can be just another label, what it does recognize is that there is no absolute category for gender and also therefore no absolute category for sexual attraction, or simply attraction as to some degree all attraction is “sexual”.

The point is that of the closest and seemingly most “obvious” identity processes, sexuality is one of the key “roles” played. It is a kind of identity of nakedness, because as Hegarty points out it is interesting how genital-configuration seems the absolute determinant of “me as a male” or “me as a female”, whereas this is clearly not the case either in humans or in nature.

When there is a very deep questioning of this “me”, all parameters are questioned and questionable. The point is that without a sure sense that “I” truly “am”, how can we then add onto this a label of being heterosexual or homosexual or any kind of sexual. What “transgender” allows for is the possibility of a non-absolute expression. Very often in the media there is a question about public figures: “is he this”, “is she that”, “how do we categorise or define this person or that person”. When definition or identification occurs there is an immediate blocking off of being able to connect directly with true nature. Hegarty points this out well, as he says it is a quality of the “spirit” that is different.

If we broadly look at society in terms of the general or non-absolute description of yinyang energetics, we can divide society into 4 quarters:

*Yang-male*

*Yin-male*

*Yang-female*

*Yin-female*

These expressions are decrypts of the body (male or female) and the expression or quality of personality (yin or yang). The yang-male has a characteristic of being overtly masculine, the yin female has also a characteristic of being overtly feminine, but in-between is the yin-male and yang-female which have a mix of qualities. The Yang-male and yin-female expressions we might call “simple” qualities which tend to define society, they are like north and south poles, winter and summer respectively. However between this black and white there is an array or spectrum of colour that is

the expression the yang-female and yin-male which are the phase in between summer and winter, these are the mixed phases of energetics and so represent the spring and the autumn respectively.

The gay-rights flag promotes the rainbow colours in an attempt to highlight this “difference” in expression. However it is key for us to understand that 50% of the population of the world are a mixture of this qualitative “complex” expression of physical-form and expression/spirit. Whereas fewer within this group will classify themselves as homosexual, in fact a very large number of them have a mix of energetic quality which allows them to see both a male and female perspective of life, not just one side. This is expressed in the yin-male and yang-female expressions.

Of course social norms and role-playing can beat this into a “you”, but if the person is allowed to simply be whatever it is they are, then sometimes it is clear that those such as Antony Hegarty, Sinéad O’Connor, Eddy Izzard or David Bowies of this world (within this very narrow arena of the media world) express something that is very mixed in its qualitative expression. This of course smacks of anarchy, because the polarized expression of the other half of the population find this very difficult to understand. It seems clear than males should behave in one way and females in another and this idea, particularly pertains to sex itself and creating children. However while it is obviously true that male and female bodies are indeed absolutely requiring of each other, so too are the other qualities of expressions of humans. The nature of our time is such that the world is moving into over-population, so the natural forming of sexuality that does not result in children is actually a function of health within society and a natural process of sexuality that can balance that over-population. It is ridiculous to actually think that the whole of humanity is not One, functioning as a single expression just as it is ridiculous how impossible individualism is and how we are part of what some call “Gaia” or the whole expression of the earth’s energy. The point is that the larger picture encompasses something far more than that which is routinely seen and is so narrowly judged.

As with anything else, sexuality cannot be an identity. No animals in nature have a sexual identity. All sexual expressions are totally spontaneous, they are not considered in terms such as “I am a male and that is a female”, it’s simply energy expressing itself and is appropriate on all levels, no matter how this occurs. We must also realize that humans are by far the largest group of primates on the planet and the nature of such a massive population gradually changes the nature of sexuality as a collective. In wild nature there is no bisexuality, homosexuality or heterosexuality because there is no labelling of anything, there is just energy. I once heard a deeply phobic person giving advice to someone about expressing themselves sexually wherein he said: *“whatever you do be clear about it... if you’re straight then be straight, if you’re gay then be gay. But don’t do this thing where it’s all wishy-washy, that’s bullshit!”*. It’s the last two words that sum up his ideology for me. This however is the norm, for people who need to categorise and identify and hammer everything down in order to try and make the world the way they want it to be. It is the stuff of male-dominated, genetically-modified dis-ease, having little or no understanding of the true nature of health wholeness through its arrogance.

*"The world is divided into two kinds of people: those who divide the world into two kinds of people, and those who don't."*

- The Manchurian Candidate 1962

When we look at nature, no form or mould is being applied, no absolute is being forced. There is just an openness and a realization that what "I am" is actually an open vessel that life flows through. There cannot be an identity, so the ideology of surgically creating oneself into a particular form, as expressed in the idealism of the "transsexual" surgical operation, is total and utter madness. There is a deep psychological problem in the ideology that a person can literally attack the body in order to make it the way their identity of "self" thinks it should be. This is a form of psychosis and there is no acceptance here at all.

Also the so-called heterosexual or homosexual "style" as an absolute way of expressing, speaking and behaving is again a total fallacy devoid of reality. In the energetic field of life there is attraction and repulsion, say it can be towards a male or female body, let's say in fact that it is totally open and anything goes, this isn't going to suddenly mean that you "become gay" or "become straight" it simply means that whatever is, expresses itself *as it is*. There is a feeling of a hyper-flamboyancy about the stereotypical "gay" expression which is about huge drama and a bouquet of campness, but actually it needn't be anything like this, it is part of the exteriorization of a group of people who have been held back or held down and are now "allowed" to be what they are, which therefore creates this explosion. But in truth most of this is not actually that real.

The question of "how do you know your sexuality?" really needs to be left alone. It's like asking "how do you know you exist?", the same question just wrapped up in different terms. It need not be a question of sexuality, but about other labels like being a political member or person of a particular colour, creed, religion and so on. We all carry around a list as long as our arm of what "I am" but in fact none of this is true. We will never answer the original premise of "who or what am I?" because we haven't realised that at root this "I" does not really exist! If the original person at the base of this house of cards doesn't have an absoluteness then the cards just fall, they let go and are blown away by the wind. There isn't a person, so there isn't an identity. This is hard to deal with, no matter who you think you are, no matter what colour or creed you believe yourself to be. Sure, the African might look in the mirror and say "I'm black" or the Russian looks and says "I'm white", but actually both are looking through at the mirror from the same empty-space or "headless-state" of the visual-field. We are constantly looking through emptiness together, in fact it's the same emptiness we are looking out of at each other. This is an expression of the key interest of Douglas Harding, please see <http://www.headless.org>.

So who is afraid of difference? Well at least half the population is, because it is easier for the polarized summer-winter types to be more absolutist by nature. It is important that we see the energy of the poles as more forming of polarity, but when this polarity starts to believe that everything must be in accord with it then we get perpetual summer or perpetual winter which essentially is the greenhouse effect! And yes, the yang-masculine is the driving force of the world as it is now, almost completely devoid of feminine earth-based understanding. The point is that there is a mix of energy, and for those who deeply feel the nature of "mixed quality" without the need

to define it or to place it as a particular thing, then what emerges is a purely unique expression that is utterly uncompromising in its expression. The stylism or fashion of identity is utterly superficial and acts as a mask to the true nature of what is expressing - from no-where.

The end of identity is the state of losing the religion of “myself” and allowing there to just be what there is emanating or arising, without questioning or attempting to control or manipulate it. The expression of the “transgender” movement to some feels threatening. It is more deeply anarchic than others because it simply can’t be pinned down and as a result it allows a realization of non-absolute in a world where absolutes are the norm. In the end there is nothing that “I” truly know about “myself” for it is an illusion of the senses that there is anyone here at all.

*"Wherever the bird with no feet flew, she found trees with no limbs."*

- Audre Lorde

David Nassim

4/ 5/ 2012