

Healing

Ram (James Swartz)

2013-10-29

Source: <http://www.shiningworld.com/site/satsang/read/418>

Meg: Dear James, thanks and *pranams* to you and your crew in Spain. When and if *Isvara* provides it will be great to hear and see more of the class.

In the meantime a stumbling block around the subject of healing has arisen. Besides the high *shakti* experiences we received while working with a *guru* in India, we were taught numerous *shakti* healing techniques and knowledge – just to give you a bit of background about why I am asking about this subject. In fact we were all trained to be soul healers and promised upon our return to the West that we would continue our healing practices.

From the big-picture perspective healing is Vedanta, in my humble opinion. What greater healing can there possibly be than the knowledge without one single doubt that we are awareness?

James: Yes, indeed.

Meg: And to implement that knowledge as a *jiva* in the duality of day-to-day life called *maya*? Non-dual, ordinary awareness masquerading, playing in duality, as it were. But I suppose all this brings up the subject of how one defines healing. Reduction of pain is not necessarily a healing though I realize most people would call it such.

So the I has a *jiva*-mind, *jiva*-body, *jiva*-thoughts, etc. They are constantly in flux as is the nature of *maya*. As you said during the class, it's okay to brush *Isvara*'s teeth. And as you shared in class, you had to decide how to handle your *jiva*-body health situation.

So is it okay to be a conduit for *shakti* in a way that encourages, say, the birth of a divine baby or heals *jiva*-depression or reduces *jiva-kama* energy or cleans out *jiva*-arteries so *jiva*-blood circulates freely, etc?

James: Okay? Sure, it's okay but what does the healer actually believe he or she is doing? And why does a healer want to to heal? Is it an unconscious response to suffering devoid of a sense of doership or is it an attempt to bolster the doer's sense of virtue? There is nothing wrong with virtue per se but it may mask a sense of incompleteness and dissatisfaction with oneself and the world. It can easily mask the upside of suffering.

Meg: Of course at one level the person calling themselves a healer is not doing the healing. Whether a technique appears to work or not is up to *Isvara*.

James: Yes. And there is blessed little evidence that healing is little more than a temporary fix. Plus the nature of *maya* is such that what is healed gets unhealed and what is unhealed gets healed quite apart from the efforts of human beings. *Isvara* is in charge of *dharma* and *adharma*.

Furthermore, a person suffers for a reason and if you take away the suffering it usually masks the reason, so the person continues to indulge in the thoughts and actions that created an unhealed situation in the first place. However, if it is your nature to heal, then heal. But don't make a story about it.

Meg: I suppose this subject is also a function of *dharma* – personal and otherwise. You say in one of your talks that you came into the presence of a high *shakti* field and *jiva*-James regained feeling in a finger that you had put into a planer. The nerve endings had reattached themselves by *Ishvara's* grace in that *shakti* field.

So if one's *dharma* is to be a vessel for concentrated *shakti*... just let the *shakti* do whatever *Ishvara* wants it to do?

James: If your *dharma* is to heal you will not think you are a healer. Healing will happen in your presence without effort. Learning techniques seems a bit suspect but it is not the kiss of death.

Meg: Don't call yourself a healer? Just be the *jiva Ishvara* designated and if certain changes happen in concentrated *shakti* fields just let them happen, or not?

James: Yes. The self-appointed healer has no actual control of the result. He or she can do the actions but the results are definitely up to *Ishvara*. Sometimes we are supposed to suffer. It may have a very beneficial effect. Or not. Most healers quit after a while because they can't determine the nature of the results. They are typical doers.

Meg: Others may call them healings. They are no different than any other experience *Ishvara* directs in the *maya* field. So are there really any healing techniques per se?

James: No.

Meg: If *Ishvara* decides it's time for a particular *jiva's* depression to stop, well, so be it, and it has nothing to do with any technique that I or any other *jiva* was taught?

James: You are a good thinker, Meg.

Meg: Perhaps my confusion is more about what, if any, control or effect the *jiva* has. In other words, the *jiva* Meg can choose to brush her teeth or not and she will be subject to the structure of *maya*, the rules of *maya* as they pertain to clean teeth, gum disease, cavities, etc. It seems a big step for the *jiva* Meg to act as a transferring or broadcasting mechanism for *shakti* with the understanding that certain physical, emotional and *karmic* changes occur – through *Ishvara's* grace?

James: The *jiva* has control over the technique, not over the result – Karma Yoga 101.

Meg: Any clarity on this subject to point my inquiry in a more fruitful direction would be appreciated. I have stopped talking with most of the people who lived in the *ashram* and received these *shakti* healing techniques and knowledge. Well, it's more accurate to say that since diving into Vedanta they have just stopped communicating with me.

James: Not surprising.

Meg: I was not trying to talk to them about Vedanta.

James: That is wise. "Let not the wise unsettle the minds of the ignorant." ~ *Bhagavad Gita*

Meg: But since my immersion in Vedanta they have just naturally dropped away. It is not that I miss them or am attached to them in any way. Rather, it appears that this is a natural Vedanta process, so to speak, that people, places, i.e. objects of all sorts, naturally fall away or appear – like finding you and Vedanta – as a function of whether they support or do not support the *mumukshutva* which led the *jiva* to Vedanta in the first place.

James: This is how it is. Your thinking is correct.

Meg: Anyway, James, I am not attached to these old techniques or practices or to the idea of being a healer. I stopped all of that some time ago. Rather, I share my lack of understanding because I suspect it reveals hidden assumptions or beliefs or desires which need to be resolved so I stand more firmly in the knowledge of Vedanta.

James: That's good. Your lack of understanding is not a lack of understanding. It seems you reasoned it out quite nicely.

~ Much love, James