

EMERGING WORLD VIEWS :
CULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN
PROCESS - ORIENTED PSYCHOLOGY

A dissertation submitted to the
Graduate School
of The Union Institute
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Clinical Psychology

Dawn Menken
Zurich, Switzerland
December 1989

A L L R I G H T S R E S E R V E D

Dawn Menken
The Process Work Center Of Portland
733 N.W. Everett, Box 11
(503) 223-8188

Please do not make any copies and do
not quote without asking me first.
For your private use only.

Thank you,

Dawn Menken

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Chapter:	
1. Introduction to Process-oriented Psychology.....	20
2. Psychology and Philosophy.....	41
3. The Structure of Life Philosophies and Emerging World Views.....	53
4. The Human Sphere.....	69
5. On Good and Evil.....	95
6. Unveiling the Critic.....	125
7. New Directions in Relationships.....	144
8. Rebels and Rulemakers: An Institutional Conflict.....	178
9. The Growth of God.....	211
Conclusion.....	225
Notes to the Text.....	230
List of References	232

PREFACE

Most of the case studies in this dissertation have been gathered from seminars that took place in the United States and Switzerland. They were recorded on video tape, and the original transcripts were used. I am thankful to all of the individuals who have given me permission to present their stories. Their identities have been disguised for purposes of confidentiality; some of the transcripts have been edited for brevity and easier reading, but the edited versions remain true to the original text.

Most of these cases took place at seminars led by Dr. Arnold Mindell, the founder of Process-oriented Psychology. In order to clarify and prevent confusion I will refer to him as "Arny" within the personal context of the seminar. I will use "Mindell" for all references and citations.

The reader will find that I use the terms, "world view," "life philosophy," and "paradigm" somewhat interchangeably. World view is used commonly, with the meaning that anyone might associate to it. A world view is simply a way of looking at and knowing the world. Life philosophy interfaces with world view, and implies our life long assumptions about ourselves and life and how they color our observation. Life philosophies can be considered world views, and vice versa. I encourage the reader to associate

freely to these terms. My goal is not to make clear cut definitions, as this would be a dissertation unto itself. "An embarrassment for the professional philosopher is that he cannot produce any succinct, or even agreed, definition of his profession. 'What is philosophy?' is itself a philosophical question" (Lacey, 1986, p. 176). The word paradigm is used to refer to shared assumptions which govern ways of looking at things within particular fields of psychology or science.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is dedicated to Arny Mindell who embodies the pioneering and compassionate spirit in which new world views are discovered and lived. My long time association with him as a great teacher, friend, and colleague has had a profound influence on my life. This work reflects that relationship, the spirit of growth and discovery behind it, and years of learning and introspection. I am grateful for his endless support and important comments about the dissertation, but I am especially grateful for the years of learning and relationship which is the spirit behind this work.

I would also like to thank other members of my doctoral committee. I am thankful to Dr. Penny MacElveen-Hoehn who meticulously combed through this manuscript and contributed many helpful comments. I am very grateful to Dr. Max Schuepbach who has been an essential part of my whole learning process. His comments about my work have been crucial and were a turning point in my writing. Arlene Audergon and Sonja Straub helped me to formulate my interests throughout my studies and contributed helpful comments. Thanks go to Dr. Halloway Sells for his reading of the manuscript.

I am grateful to Jan Dworkin for her ongoing inspiration, helpful suggestions, and support. Amy Mindell also read the first

version of the work and offered helpful comments. I want to thank Julie Diamond for nurturing many of these ideas over years while I stewed over them internally, not quite knowing how to bring them out. And finally my deepest thanks go to Leslie Heizer who has been intimately involved with every aspect of this work. Her comments and skillful editing have been essential. Without her support and care this work would not have been nearly as enjoyable.

I am also indebted to the many courageous individuals who kindly gave me their permission to tell their stories. Their contribution is perhaps the most substantial; their collective message speaks stronger than anything I could possibly write.

INTRODUCTION

Inspiration

In 1979 I met Dr. Arnold Mindell, founder of Process-oriented Psychology, for the first time. Process-oriented Psychology did not exist then as a cohesive psychology. Arny was identified as a Jungian Analyst who was doing fascinating and groundbreaking work with the body. My initial contact with him was transforming. In that hour, he supported a part of my personality which I had never been able to support in myself, and which the outer world also did not encourage. Previous to this experience I had been trying to unsuccessfully change myself. The result of my inability to change was a lot of self-hatred and my belief that there must be something essentially wrong with me. I was going to a very progressive university and trying out different kinds of body therapies, counseling, and self-discovery methods. I wanted to have a loose and flexible body, which was the goal of the body-oriented therapies I tried, and I was trying to be peaceful and soft, which was the goal of the talking kinds of therapy I did. I usually ended up hating myself because my body never changed, and I did not feel at peace; I just got more and more depressed. My first hour with Arny ended up in wild fighting and an archaic kind of dance. I was ecstatic. All of those years I had been trying to keep the physical, strong and

passionate parts of myself out of my life. I had never met anyone who supported such things. He leapt and shrieked with me and began to identify me with this new behavior as well.

I was immediately taken by his big heart and immense spirit for life. He had no goals or ideas of how people should be; rather, he genuinely believed in people and that the things they did were in the right direction. Taking Jung's teleological philosophy to heart, he sought for the meaning and purpose in the things that most people found worthless and had rejected. My small-minded view of the world at that time was made up of conventional opinions like being loose and peaceful. Psychology, as a whole, supported my view and therefore was not able to offer me anything different. When I was unable to achieve the goals of this view, the conclusion that we both reached was that there was something wrong with me. There was no view which might understand my tension as useful; it was only to be eliminated.

Arny was not only a talented and gifted therapist, teacher and wonderful human being, but a man with a world view which was forever expanding. His wide view and his own daring to live and to constantly change and turn himself inside out is one of the things that I love most about him and which inspired my initial desire to study with him.

Today, many years later, I strongly feel the inspiration Arny has given me, simply by his presence, to study our life philosophies and beliefs and emerging world views. The study of life philosophies and emerging world views has not had a specific

focus in the literature of Process-oriented Psychology (Process Work), although it is an implicit aspect of the work. Up to this point, books have been written about the theory and practice of process work, including the various areas to which it has been applied, and the scientific and philosophical background on which it is based.

Purpose of the Work

This dissertation introduces process work from the perspective of the various world views or life philosophies which it is able to elicit. The work shows how most world views are self-reinforcing and that a school of psychology is only able to access that which is within its own range of beliefs. Due to its holistic philosophy, which acknowledges the importance of all parts of human experience, its descriptive approach, and its belief in the wisdom of nature, process work is one possible psychological system which is able to work outside of a given governing world view by using the information that is contrary to the known world view.

The introduction takes the reader through an historical progression of my growing interests to bring out the development of my ideas and their interdisciplinary nature. Throughout the text the collective roots of our world views are emphasized by noting their appearance in our religious systems. Some of these world views seem to have no collective origin and suggest the creation of new ways of thinking and being.

Chapter one offers an introduction to Process-oriented Psychology, emphasizing its philosophical background and the structure of following a process. Chapter two demonstrates how a school of psychology can only access that which its philosophy supports. Chapter three discusses the structure and dynamics of world views, how they are maintained and how new ones emerge.

The bulk of the text is dedicated to the direct expression of these world views as they reveal themselves in the lives of individuals, relationships, and groups. I have used case studies to illustrate these emerging world views because the cases contain the original life and excitement of discovery. I have selected cases portraying areas of human experience which are common and cross cultural and therefore laden with collective opinions and ancient beliefs.

My personal goal has been to take the reader to the heart of the seminars where these works occurred. I have wanted to be simple and straightforward, making this work accessible to both psychologist and layperson. The work is an invitation to participate in discovering both our most common world views from our most base human experiences, and those that are trying to emerge, creating new patterns for us to interact in some of the most difficult spots in human life.

Over the years my colleagues and I have discovered that the seminar situation is similar to a tribal shamanic gathering; one person's or couple's work becomes important for the group as

well. Due to the group atmosphere and reaction we can surmise that the world views which emerge there certainly have a collective echo. Thus, my aim has been to make these world views available to a larger public, not because they are right or better or should be every person's belief, but because they are new collective creations, often going against deep-seated collective beliefs. These cases are pattern setters; they have a message which is meant for a larger audience, and search for a place to make their public debut.

Process work shows us that exploring the things which disturb our existing beliefs helps us create new beliefs and gives us the potential to identify with the creation of our existence. No longer victims of experience, we temporarily become that which patterns our fate. One might say that this is to become the godhead or identify with the divinity. The Taoists would say this is following the tao. Jung would assert that this is to work with the collective unconscious. Whatever we might call it, that special numinosity which seems to generate our global development lives in each of us.

Beginning Interests

When I first began this work my intent was to study religious experiences. Over the years I had seen many experiences in seminar situations which, for lack of a better word, I called religious experiences. I had a strong inner calling to write about such numinous experiences. I felt there was something in them that needed to go beyond the seminar room. Indeed, these

experiences were often much larger than the individual and were meant for the seminar participants and the collective at large.

I began to study these experiences and wondered what it was that made them religious. I pondered over defining religious experiences: were they only those which included a godhead, or did the definition include other experiences which had a similar feeling tone?

Rudolf Otto (1917), one of the earliest European authorities on religious experience, said that religion began with a feeling of the uncanny. Religious experience is subjective, and differs in quality from other experiences. Religious experience evokes a sense of mystery and awe which he called numinosity.

William James, the psychologist and pragmatist, in his book The Varieties of Religious Experience (1961) also emphasizes the subjective nature of religious experience. His book includes personal experiences that people have had and the effects these experiences have produced. He is vehemently against what he describes as "medical materialism," which minimalizes spiritual experiences through reductive interpretations (p. 29). He emphasizes the feeling value of religious experience and writes that one of its characteristics is that the feelings are "...much more convincing than results established by mere logic ever are" (p. 73). Through his studies he has found that such experiences tend to awaken a sense of solemnity and a feeling of absolute self surrender (p. 75). Life and nature appear transformed in the subject's eyes (p. 131).

The more I studied and thought, the more I came to realize that religious experience was not something that remained within the confines of organized religious tradition. Even though philosophers like James describe the characteristics of religious experience subjectively and empirically and outside of any religious system, the experiences he relates all have the common theme of a God or divine being. The qualities of numinosity, something uncanny, and something other need not only be connected with a God. Awe and solemnness, absolute surrender to something greater, and the experience of nature changing in a powerful way are the qualities of a wider definition of religious experience. I now understand religious experience as a profound change in world view or life philosophy. A change in world view evokes the qualities described above.

Religion and World Views

Perhaps my need to describe this as a change in world view has to do with the fact that we are living in a time where religion as we have understood it is changing. Organized collective religion, still a strong force all over the world, has needed to share its ground with a growing number of individuals who search for their own kinds of religious experience. Many people experience a mystery in life but do not belong to the conventional structures. Such people may not even speak of God, but experience the numinosity of life just the same.

James asserts that conventional religion comes ready-made for a

person, and is hence already determined. He states that he is interested in the experiences of those who do not observe religion as a dull habit.

We must make search rather for the original experiences which were the pattern-setters to all this mass of suggested feelings and imitated conduct (1961, pp. 24-25).

I have a similar goal. I too, am interested in the creation of original experience and how these experiences create necessary patterns for others. This creation of original experience challenges old life philosophies and gives birth to new ones. Our perceptions uphold our life philosophies or world views.

This "mass of suggested feelings and imitated conduct," which James uses to describe religion which has lost its vibrance, is an essential ingredient in understanding the dynamics which create our life philosophies and world views.

Ninian Smart (1982), in a paper entitled: "Transcendental Humanism: A Paper about God and Humanity," also asserts that established religion makes us experience the world in a certain way.

Part at least of the function of religion is to give us an overall vision of the world as we experience it....it represents an experiment or a series of differing experiments in *living*. It is a mode of orientation for daily life. (p. 392).

In other words, religion confirms the way we already perceive the world. This is a strong contrast to religious experience which creates the world anew. This work will focus on these "visions of the world," that collective religion depicts, in so far as

they are amplifications of our life philosophies and structure our perceptions of the world. Religious experience however, introduces something "other" than this governing vision. It is interesting to note that many of the world's religions were discovered in this way: an individual was forced to go beyond his present view of the world. Jesus had to go against his people and the Jewish belief in order to follow the experience closest to his heart. The prophet, Muhammed, gave Islam its form, and the Buddha Guatama left his wealthy Indian home in search of enlightenment. Each of these religious leaders first struggled to adapt to the religious belief or governing view of his time, and was then pressed to discover something outside of the collective view. As a man in one of James' accounts said: "...he [God] has ordered ways for me very contrary to my ambitions or plans" (p.72).

Religion as a Model for World Views

In my introduction I have written about religion and religious experience, not only because these areas were my initial interests, but because our religious systems are the collective systems of belief which shape our views of the world. Religious experience, however, is transforming because it takes us out of our small worlds. And as the man from James' account asserted, it is God who instigates such experience. While our ruling life philosophies are narrow, our relationship to a divinity compensates these attitudes.

In this work, the various world views which are propagated by organized religion will be used to understand more deeply the individual life philosophies within the case material. We will observe how the roots of much suffering and conflict can be traced to an individual who is trapped within the confines of a particular world view. We can also see how that view finds its support in world religion. I have found that expanding one's view of the world and life philosophy takes one into regions which are literally foreign. Therefore, it is quite common for the westerner to have an earth shattering experience which mirrors the beliefs of the far east, and vice versa. Additionally, new views are born which seem to expand our world religions, and which sometimes have little echo in our known religious systems.

Going into Foreign Regions

When we tread in foreign territory we move on the frontier, discovering new land. This dissertation aims at introducing world views that are less known to us collectively. It is meant to introduce the reader to possibilities which were perhaps previously less available. The goal is not to purport one of these world views, but to simply present various options in an attempt to create patterns, or models. In process work we notice that patterns are created when we get to an edge. An edge is that point on the frontier where the terrain suddenly changes, and the land looks different; we feel we do not know how to step onto it. We feel we cannot, or should not, or we are afraid.

The edge is at the boundaries of our awareness, of the land that we know. Our known pattern is not applicable to the new demands of this untrodden terrain. However, if we see someone walk that land in a way we would never have thought of before, we consider the possibility that maybe it will not be as difficult as we anticipate. Maybe we even go home that night and dream about walking that land in this new way. This is the development of a pattern. In this work we will see how going beyond the boundaries of our known world and discovering new ways of being creates patterns or models of behavior. It is my hope that the case material will serve to create patterns for others to walk the strange lands which we live in and are forever discovering.

Creating Patterns

Information helps to create patterns. I remember a professor I had in college who said: "Poverty is a lack of information." He was a communications professor, and while his statement was meant in terms of financial poverty, I think that it has further applications. We can be poor in many areas of our lives besides financial ones. In fact, our subjective feelings of poverty bear little relationship to our outer situations. We feel poor in feeling or ability, but we also feel poor when we are stuck in a particular state; a condition, mood, affect, or way of being that colors our entire existence at a given moment. Our tendency to completely and often unconsciously identify with one part of ourselves freezes us into one state, making others unavailable. Hence, we feel impoverished when our life philosophy is not able

to take in and incorporate new information which could give us access to another state. As a result, the potential information is perceived as a disturbance that creates suffering. We lack the view that the disturbance is information that might help us create a new pattern.

Gregory Bateson (1987) defined information as "a difference that makes a difference" (p. 17). In other words, if nothing stands out to the observer, there is no new information. As a matter of fact, we do not notice anything. That which stands out, disturbs us, or makes a difference to our perception is information. Process work is a psychology which picks up information. It notices differences, that which does not fit in and is mysterious, and then unravels the communication in the disturbance. This unraveling of information creates patterns¹ which give us access to new ways of being.

The Divine Other

Religious experience also creates new patterns by focusing on those things that are disturbing or mysterious. The main world religions show us that the most divine experience occurs through a confrontation with that which is most foreign. Historically, the devout soul searches for these peak experiences by traveling into regions which are far outside collective belief. The seeker often bears severe austerities and drops out of the accepted cultural consensus.

What we experience as foreign we usually think of as "other."

This "other" can evoke various reactions in us. Sometimes, we are fascinated by it. Other times we want to fight it, and we often fear it. At any rate, we are seldom neutral towards the other. If we were, as Bateson states, it would not be information.

In The Religions of Man (1958), Huston Smith describes the relationship between the Jews and God. The Jews claimed that man's power is clearly limited; he can't move a mountain, or prevent a storm. They came to the conclusion that there exists some inescapable other. They regarded this other as meaningful, rather than hostile, chaotic, or amoral (p. 226). Here we find an early pattern where the other is regarded as meaningful and as a God. Jung (1958) also asserts the "otherness" of God and adds that God is discovered at the borders of our identity.

Psychologically speaking, the domain of "gods" begins where consciousness leaves off, for at that point man is already at the mercy of the natural order, whether he thrive or perish. (p. 156)

Jung then probes deeper into the nature of the psyche and its creation of gods.

Gods are personifications of unconscious contents, for they reveal themselves to us through the unconscious activity of the psyche. (1958, p. 163)

We might say that god is a world view, with each god representing a different view, perspective, or idea. According to Jung, exactly at the point where the known world leaves off, we create a god. Perhaps we must personify the world views we need to discover in order to bring them closer to us.

In many cases we use our relationships to contact this

"otherness," meaning everything with which we would not identify. We often meet someone whom we experience as god-like, who brings our life new meaning or radically changes our perception. Hinduism states that there are many paths to the same god. The most popular path in India is Bhakti yoga, called "the path of love." Here one does not identify with the godhead but needs the love and relationship to the other in order to reach enlightenment (Smith, 1958, p.36). Smith also makes a comparison here to Christianity where relationship can also be a path to contact God.

God figures in the guises of the spouse in the Song of Songs as well as in the writings of the mystics where the marriage of the soul to Christ is a standing image. (p. 39)

It is an ancient idea to be transformed and awed by something with which one previously did not identify, be it in relationship to another person or a God.

Throughout the case material the reader will experience how new world views are born by incorporating disturbances at the periphery of awareness. We have seen how that which disturbs our identity can be understood as mysterious and divine, and how this view has been essential in religious experiences and the subsequent creation of world religion. We have also seen how a communication model reframes the disturbance by acknowledging it as information. Relationships are another route to contact that which is other. Process work has taken the idea of disturbance as information and made it one of the hallmarks of its work. Change need not come from an outer program, because it appears to

be implicit in life's mysterious and disturbing experiences. Thus, individual as well as collective life is never continually homeostatic. We can choose to view life's disturbances as pests to be annihilated in an attempt to keep our homeostasis, or we can adopt a process-oriented view and try to unravel the message in the disturbances. This work has chosen the latter and introduces a diversity of world views that consequently emerge, contributing to the development of culture.

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION TO PROCESS-ORIENTED PSYCHOLOGY

Process-oriented Psychology, founded by Dr. Arnold Mindell, is a recent school of psychological thought with far-reaching applications. Process work has been applied not only to work with individuals, but to relationships, small and large group work, and people in extreme or psychotic states, serious physical conditions, and in comas and other states of profound lack of consciousness. It is a psychology which expands itself rather than defining itself through a specialization. Due to its all-encompassing philosophy and its wide range of applicability, I have found it to be a psychology able to access a wide scope of human experience. Indeed, as I have previously stated, my own personal experiences, as well as the experiences of thousands of others which I have witnessed, have led me to believe that there is something quite unusual about process work which enables the individual to have experiences far beyond the normal range. Therefore, in this section I intend to give the reader an overview of the basic philosophy and theory of process work, because it is this philosophy which enables us to get to the world views that emerge later.

The Inner wisdom of Nature

Jung's teleological approach to the individual and Taoism's devotion to nature contribute to the idea of process. "Tao" is a word which has been historically difficult to define. In the Tao Te Ching, Lao Tzu most often refers to tao as "the way" (1963). Mindell writes that the etymology of the word "tao" implies that tao means following nature as a guide. He compares the word "tao" to "process."

Using process language we can say that the Tao is the flow of events in and between channels. Tao signifies a process which simultaneously manifests in a number of different channels. (1985b, p. 91)

Process work follows the flow of events and perceives them in the channels in which they manifest themselves. Process work differentiates six common channels in which information may be perceived. These are visual, auditory, proprioception (inner feeling), kinesthesia (movement), relationship, and the world channel. One follows the way or inner wisdom of an individual's process by picking up the information within the various channels. All information is important and potentially useful. Taoism also accepts everything and discards nothing (Welch, 1966, p. 138).

Mindell describes two aspects of tao. One is that it is a chance happening, the meaningful flow of nature and life. The second aspect is its unfolding. "The tao that is given waits to be unfolded."² Much of Taoism concentrates on the absoluteness and meaning of tao, but little is written about its unfolding. It is one thing to notice the manifestations of nature, but it is quite

another to pick them up and explore them more deeply in order to discover their implicit meanings. Process work adds to Taoism by expanding how we can unfold and thereby assist the tao or process.

Influenced by Jungian psychology, process work is based in teleological thought, meaning that it observes phenomena as striving towards the fulfillment of some meaning or purpose. Jung sought the potential meaning in a dream, in contrast to a more reductionist view which searches for a cause, and often a pathology. Mindell took this teleological view quite far, applying it not only to dreams, but to body symptoms and illnesses, relationship and group life, and altered states of consciousness. Following a process and encouraging it to unravel itself on its own terms, and thereby allowing the goal or significance to present itself, is indicative of a world view which believes in the inner wisdom of nature.

Process work trusts the individual's inner wisdom. Any psychology which directs the individual in a specific line of development, or professes what is healthy or ill, normal or abnormal, whole or incomplete, or suggests qualities or states which are preferred, does not really trust the inner wisdom of the individual. The methods and tools of process work support a philosophy which believes in implicit meaning and wisdom. This philosophy enables the therapist to follow the creativity of the client and to assist in unraveling the natural process. Thus,

the information comes from the individual and not from an outer person or program. The only exception is, naturally, if an outer person or program happens to mirror the inner process. The goal is the following of the process. Mindell compares this to the early alchemists who claimed that the goal was the method. (1985b, p. 121)

³
Alchemy also stresses an inner wisdom in its cooking of the most base material in order to bring out its value. The alchemist began with the "prima materia," which he described as both an 'imperfect body' and a 'constant soul' (Mindell, 1985b, pp. 123-124). The constancy is indicative of the repetition of a particular process asking for attention:

Any ordinary tumor, itch, anxiety, headache or stroke of fate is an 'imperfect body' asking to be cooked and transformed. Fantasies and tics are 'imperfect' because they are not congruent with the rest of the personality. The prima materia transforms to perfection by unifying all of its separate, incongruent and disharmonious parts, by focusing simultaneously on primary and secondary processes. (Mindell, 1985b, p. 124)

The Structure of Processes: Primary and Secondary Processes

Process work differentiates processes by noting their distance from awareness. Primary processes are those which are closest to our identity and are associated with our intentions. Secondary processes are further from our identities and are experienced as foreign or other (Mindell, 1985b, p. 13). Secondary processes disturb our intentions. For example, my primary process at the moment is writing; my intention and identity is all directed to this goal. Suddenly I notice that I have been trying to ignore my

fatigue. It has been in the background and keeps creeping up on me. The fatigue is another process with which I am less identified. It is disturbing my intention of writing.

These structures are based on the hypothesis that we are not only made up of that with which we identify. In the past such processes were called unconscious; in our dreams and other unconscious behavior we displayed parts of ourselves that were unknown or repressed. Mindell (1985b) observed that the terms "conscious" and "unconscious" were not always functional in practice. He noticed that in psychotic states, near death experiences, and deep bodywork experiences, speaking in terms of conscious and unconscious was not possible (p. 13). He redefined consciousness as our ability to perceive, or our awareness of our awareness. It became clear that people could actually be unconscious of their primary process. In other words, we may be aware of identifying ourselves in a particular way, but we often are not aware of how we do it and actually feel little control over it. For example, a young man, working in a Swiss bank strongly asserts that he is hardworking and ambitious and will do whatever he may need to get ahead. His primary process is this hardworking and ambitious attitude. However, when I encouraged him to additionally be ambitious with me and to make sure that he got everything that he needed, he shied away. His ambitious behavior was difficult to reproduce even though he so strongly identified with it. Additionally, he lacked the awareness of how he was already being ambitious in the moment in our interaction. He was not aware of his loud and demanding voice, nor the subtle

pressures that he was exerting on our work together.

Gaining access to these secondary processes which disturb us gives us more freedom to experience many parts of ourselves. As a matter of fact, the entire person does not experience the disturbance. The primary process is the part which suffers. The secondary process, which is creating the disturbance, does not. For instance, our ambitious banker was coming to me because of chronic colds and fatigue which medical doctors could not help. Working with his body state revealed a baby who just wanted to lie back and be taken care of. The baby was not disturbed or suffering but was very content to lie down and be cared for. As a matter of fact, once he was able to become the baby, he felt much better physically.

Edges

The edge splits processes up into primary ones which the client identifies himself with and secondary ones which he feels are not directly associated with him. (Mindell, 1985b, p. 25)

The edge is the boundary of our awareness; it is the point where we feel that we cannot do something, or where we totally disidentify ourselves. For example, earlier I did not want to stop working. However, something else inside of me was tired and needed a break. The edge is where our beliefs and life philosophies sound strongly. We say, "Well, I shouldn't do this because it isn't right" or "I can't take a break because I'll never finish," or "I am not a person who likes to move," or "I don't believe that people should act like that," and so forth.

The beliefs we have at the edge keep our primary process intact in an attempt to keep our secondary processes out.

Following Processes

Many psychologies are prescriptive and value certain states⁴ more than others; for example, some strive for relaxation and others seek catharsis. They uphold a particular model of health or normality and prescribe behavior in order to attain their goals. Prescriptive world views are hierarchical and static. Change occurs through eliminating one state and introducing behavior which upholds another set state. In a prescriptive view life is still and set and determined by a higher authority.

Process work is based on the following of information. It is value free and descriptive, meaning it describes the information that is there. Process work has no set models and does not strive towards an end state or perfection. Process-oriented thinking understands states like relaxation, tension, catharsis, or enlightenment as temporary resting spots in the flowing river of process. Change is seen as implicit in the individual; it is already there in the incongruent signals and information that go against the primary process.

Process work demonstrates that information is conserved, meaning it cannot be lost or gained; it can only change places. Jung (1960) understood how energy was conserved and applied this law in his theories about the structure and dynamics of the psyche. Parts of the personality can neither be rejected, nor prescribed,

unless of course, the prescription matches what is right for the individual. Even if we want to reject parts of ourselves, most of us know it does not work. Any information which is not processed, including a part of the personality, has an autonomy of its own. Therefore, process work emphasizes picking up information and describing it in the way that it is presenting itself.

The six basic channels that I mentioned earlier help us to differentiate where information is salient and where a process can be unfolded. Our primary process in a given moment will tend to occupy channels to which we have easier access, while secondary processes appear in channels which are not easily organized by our main ways of perceiving. Thus, the channels which are unoccupied by our primary process are more open for information which is outside of the primary identity. For example, when I was writing earlier I was perceiving visually, thinking and looking at my computer. This was my main channel of perception, occupied by my identity. The visual channel was not too available for other kinds of information besides writing. However, another part of me, a secondary process, was tired and needed a break. The fatigue presented itself in the proprioceptive channel. I felt tired. When I focused on it I could feel the weight of my eyelids and the strain in my back. The new information was coming in through the proprioceptive channel, which was unoccupied, meaning "I" didn't occupy that channel. My momentary identity was perceiving itself visually. However, the proprioceptive channel was occupied by another part

of me, one of which I previously was not aware.

The channel concept acknowledges the various ways that information presents itself and creates one system to follow many paths. Working in many channels fills the growing need for holism; the individual need not feel split working with movement with one therapist, relationships with another, and dreams with another. Therefore, the channel concept helps to meet the need for many different kinds of therapy. Additionally, unless we are pressed, we rarely remain in one channel and need to be appreciated for our wholeness in many modes.

The body is a perceptual system which brings its messages across in the best way it can. Symptoms, pain, and illness are seen as parts of the individual which are looking for expression. The body has an intelligence; therefore, process work works with the body by following the sensory grounded information in the channel in which it is manifest, instead of trying to alter or repress it.

Unfolding Processes

One of the most natural ways to unfold a secondary process is to amplify the secondary or unintended signals in the channel in which they occur. I say this is a natural process because we often unconsciously amplify those things which are happening to us. For example, if we have a headache, we unknowingly shake or put pressure on our heads. If we have a rash, we scratch it. The body is trying to experience itself more fully in these

unconscious ways. We can observe an inner wisdom in the human tendency to make symptoms worse. Our symptoms are striving towards a final purpose; by encouraging our tendency to amplify symptoms, Mindell discovered what he called the dreambody.

This discovery is related in Working with the Dreaming Body, (1985a, p. 8) in a story of how Mindell worked with a man who had a tumor in his stomach. When the man's experiences of his tumor were amplified, they turned into an explosion. The night before he had dreamed that the medicine for his disease was like a bomb. From this early experience Mindell began to postulate a dreambody: that which is simultaneously dream and body. The processes that are in our dreams are mirrored in our bodies as well; they are somatic dreams. Actually, the dreambody can manifest itself in many channels. That which is dreaming and unknown presents itself in any channel that is open to it. We can find secondary experiences in our movements, personal relationships, and world events as well as in our dreams.

Amplifying body processes and other types of signals brings us into contact with the living dream. In one case, amplifying a slight movement of the head as it tilted slightly back suddenly turned into an experience of flying. The woman felt herself flying and then looked down at the earth below her. Suddenly she had a new perspective on her life which she had not known before. She had recently dreamed of flying over the city where she lived.

Amplification is an important contribution in the field of psychology. Most often unconscious material has been

interpreted or eliminated. In interpretation one part of the personality interprets another, less known part. The obvious problem here is that the interpretation is clearly only the subjective opinion of one part, whether that part be intrapsychic or in the form of a therapist. There has clearly been a need to have direct communication with that which is unconscious or less known. Amplification is a way in which unconscious material can speak for itself in the same language as it is represented. For example, talking to someone about a pressure they are experiencing on their back is less useful than actually pressing on the back and following the communication through body channels. Interpretation is a meta-experience, but it is not the experience itself. When we amplify a process we encourage the individual to do more of what is already happening in an attempt to discover the meaning behind the signal. For the purposes of this study amplification is essential; it is one of the tools that births a new world view. Interpretation, on the other hand, supports what is already known. Thomas Kuhn (1970) states that interpretation is a deliberative process; we perceive something and then interpret it according to what we already know. He claims that since Descartes perception has been analyzed as an interpretive process and that our interpretations occur quite unconsciously. We think we are perceiving, but we are equating⁵ our perceptions with our already known interpretations (p. 195).

Channels as Modes of Perception

Mindell (1985a) defines a channel as a mode of perception (p. 8).

As stated in the introduction, Smart asserted that religion is a mode of orientation which gives us a vision of the world as we already experience it. We can thus determine our mode of orientation by determining in which channel we perceive. The perceptions we have in this channel confirm the world as we know it. Perceptions that differ present themselves in channels which we use less. Religious experiences or a new world view, for example, will occur in channels that are outside of our everyday mode of perception. In these modes, we feel confused, off center, or plagued. We suffer because our primary mode of perception cannot incorporate the experiences from these other channels, and we thus simply feel victimized by them. Therefore, we remain focused on the modes with which we are more familiar and attempt to avoid those which threaten or disturb us. Process work focuses on the perceptions that throw us off balance. In the case material we will see that new world views are born through the experiences of an unoccupied channel, meaning a channel of perception in which the agent is not the subject. This will be an important point to which we will later return.

The Thread of Interconnectedness

In River's Way (1985b), Mindell discusses various one world concepts that show the non-causal relationships and connections of our world. This one world is characterized by the interconnectedness of all the events in the universe, regardless of their localities. Separate and independent entities do not exist in isolation; rather the world functions as one enormous

organism. Mindell mentions the fields of physics, biology, and psychology in addition to Buddhist and Taoist thought which have added to this view, and asserts that,

The most modern thinkers realize that physical theory is a reflection of the human personality. (p. 56)

I bring this to the attention of the reader at this point because process work applies this one world concept. In this concept everything that is considered "other" also belongs to the individual or group. This perspective reflects the taoist thought which accepts all information and discards nothing. In a world where everything is one, where could we even possibly deposit something and claim no relationship to it? Everything fits somewhere. Even if we end a relationship with a loved one and leave the country, hoping to get away, we dream about it. Nothing simply vanishes. The world is a complicated web of interconnected experience and meaning. Therefore, in Process work, information can come from anywhere; the channels we have already mentioned, the world itself in terms of synchronicity and other worldly and spiritual experiences, other people, and even the therapist.

This one world view takes its form in process work as an all-encompassing paradigm which can be expressed in one sentence: that which is happening to us is meaningful and significant. The world is highly patterned and ordered and these happenings are its connecting principles.

As I have mentioned, many modern thinkers in various fields have

come to similar conclusions about the interconnectedness of the world; this idea has also asserted itself throughout time in various ancient beliefs and eastern religion. Taoism clearly asserts that "...our inner nature is an extension of the nature of the universe" (Welch, 1966, p. 45). It is interesting to note that Judeo-Christian religion asserts a one-world universe made up of God, although most westerners rarely consider this. For the early Jews, it was meaning and teaching which connected and held the universe together.

God was the ruler of history; nothing, therefore, happened by accident. His hand was at work in every event - in Eden, the Flood, the Tower of Babel, the years in the wilderness - shaping each sequence into a teaching experience for those who had the wit to learn. (Smith, 1958, p. 236)

Rather than go more deeply into the background of one-world concepts, my interest here is to state that process work illustrates this paradigm in its practice on a human level.

The Need for Process-oriented Psychology

Every development in psychology, as in all fields, has grown out of a particular need; a place where what was presently practiced was no longer sufficient. For example, Freud's assertion of an unconscious was radical for Europe at that time, which believed strongly in a conscious will. Jung's introduction of a collective unconscious made up of archetypes and timeless collective experience expanded Freud's concept. Reich's hands on work with the body added an important element to the predominantly verbal methods of his time. Thomas Kuhn, in his book, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions describes this

phenomenon in terms of a paradigm change. He says that a paradigm is effective as long as its tools are able to solve the problems that it defines. When a problem emerges that is outside the realm of applicability of these tools, a crisis occurs and this crisis precedes the birth of a new paradigm (p. 76).

A complete review of the various paradigm changes and the explicit need for their development in the history of psychology is another dissertation unto itself. For the intents and purposes of this work, I will content myself with introducing the reader to process work in a way which emphasizes the various needs that its paradigm and philosophy fulfills, and perhaps hint at the holes from which it emerged. Another study would be to investigate the limits of process work and predict the next step in its growth.

By noting what people find appealing about process work, we might extract some of the needs which it seems to fill. Over the years I have listened to many people who have had some kind of experience or encounter with process work, and they describe their impressions in only a handful of ways. They are drawn to the work because:

1. It unifies what they have already learned.
2. It formulates something that they have always felt or known, but have never been able to fully grasp.
3. It supports them for experiences which had never before been supported by other therapies, in relationships, internally, or within the culture they lived. Thus, people feel there is a

lot of love in the work.

4. The work is fun and seems to generate happiness.

These statements concerning unification, formulation, support, and fun hint at the various needs that process work fills. The theoretical and philosophical foundation have generated the following conceptions which support these spontaneous reactions.

People feel supported because:

- The individual possesses her own creativity and inner wisdom.
- All states have a value. Without a specific model of health, all states feel appreciated.
- There is no final state : no individuation, enlightenment, normality, health, or completion. These are all states in a larger process. State-oriented thinking is directed towards attaining a state of being. With a process-oriented paradigm, an individual need not strive towards an ultimate state because the process is its own solution. What is needed is already there and simply needs to be picked up. This relieves one of our most common western world views which emphasizes striving and achieving and is not right for everyone.
- There is a love of the unknown and a curiosity about discovering that which is foreign and furthering that which is least accessible. Therefore, parts of the personality which were previously unknown and had little conscious use suddenly feel supported.

Unification occurs because:

- Access to various parts of the personality which were previously

considered other and foreign is gained.

-People experience different parts of themselves through various modes of expression because process work values and incorporates the multi-channeled tools of various psychological schools. Thus, it indirectly attempts to bring many schools of psychology together and integrates scientific and spiritual thought.

-Due to the one-world concept, the individual is not considered an isolated being, but is seen as part of the whole. Therefore, the outer world is a reflection of individual psychology and vice versa. Because of this philosophy, people tend to feel more connected with something larger than themselves. Additionally, the individual is a channel for the world, and the world is one for the individual. This means that the collective process can be expressed through an individual in the form of dreams, body symptoms, relationships, and various other channel experiences. Individual processes are also expressed through world processes like war, environmental disasters, and terrorism. For example, many of us find it difficult to express anger and have conflicts. Because we have no forum for processing our aggression in our personal lives it emerges on a national level as war.

-At the present time process work also faces a crisis. It is growing out of its identity as a psychology. Due to its work in various fields: medicine, social work, politics, spiritual realms, and art, the definition of psychology has to expand or process work has to define itself in a new way, larger than the scope of psychology. It seems that many psychologies share this experience and are also searching for ways to branch out. This natural growth contributes to the sense of unification that

people experience with process work, as it takes us outside of the psychological practice.

Process work is fun because:

-The therapist is also encouraged to bring in her own process. In a world which is one, her experiences are also important to the whole field. This makes the work more engaging for the therapist. There is also very little "burn out," a term coined for those working in the helping professions where they feel they are too exhausted and overwhelmed in their work. Burn out is in part due to not being connected with our own energy. In process work the therapist is encouraged to believe that her reactions are a meaningful part of the work.

-Changing identities is also fun and adds to the lightness of this work. We feel heavy when we are stuck in one part of ourselves and cannot find a way out.

-This is a very creative psychology; all experience is created anew. Surprising solutions are the norm and the spontaneity in which they emerge and the irrational means that are often applied give the work a happy feeling.

When people speak of process work formulating something they have always felt I think they are referring to the explanatory power of this work. Process work theory explains that which has seemed disturbing in a useful and easily applied way. It has incorporated many diverse fields and seems to have created a world view based on one-world concepts. Thus, it takes us outside of therapy; focusing on psychology and individual

problems becomes one aspect of a larger life process. The division between therapy and life seems less clear, but rather process work seems to suggest a way of living, a lifestyle.

Altered States and Collective Growth

The rapid growth of process work could also be indicative of the human need for experiences which lie outside the collective consensus. Collectively, we have been fascinated with altered states of consciousness. In fact, culture has not existed without them.

In religion we find that various kinds of trance states and divine experiences have been essential in the creation and maintenance of any religious system. The ingestion of alcohol, drugs, herbs, tobaccos, chemicals, and foods have been common means used to change one's state. Movement has been another access: dance, sports, martial arts, warfare, and so forth. Other activities like meditation, vision quests, sex, art, and creative work as well as everyday activities like watching television, going to a movie, or listening to music also serve to take us out of our present state. Proprioceptive experiences strongly change our states; illness is the most common example.

Over time each culture has had varied relationships to these states. Some of them have been seen as divine or creative, others as dangerous or forbidden. Any state can be an altered state; they are relative to a given culture and our own primary processes. We go into an altered state when we are overwhelmed

by perceptions in a channel which we do not usually occupy. Charles Tart (1975), well-known in his research about altered states of consciousness writes about the cultural relationship we have towards such states.

The small number of experiential potentials selected by our cultural, plus some random factors, constitute the structural elements from which our ordinary state of consciousness is constructed. We are at once the beneficiaries and the victims of our culture's particular selection. The possibility of tapping and developing latent potentials, which lie outside the cultural norm, by entering an altered state of consciousness, by temporarily *restructuring* consciousness, is the basis of the great interest in such states. (p. 4)

Tart comes to a similar conclusion; collectively we are searching for experiences which are altered or "other." People are not happy living within the constraints of our collective world views and are searching for new ones. Altered states, by their nature as states different from the collective, introduce new world views. Process work, which follows the changing nature of our states, helps create a rapid access to various states. Perhaps this is one of the reasons for its rapid growth; it helps people to have greater access to various states and therefore, contributes to the discovery of our individual and collective totality. By following altered states that are always present, but with which we do not identify, we might even consider the existence of a collective spirit in each of us which lives outside the cultural norm. As a culture we are challenged to develop new attitudes to altered states, perhaps perceiving them as harbingers of new experience rather than as disturbances to be eliminated.

The Process-oriented World View

The world view of process work is one which incorporates others. Thus, a process-oriented approach sees many world views existing side by side. It sees world views which are closer to and further from our awareness. Those which are further are ones which seem to be trying to emerge into our consciousness. The world view of process work is not exclusive but follows the flow of information by developing it and bringing out its meaning. Paradoxically, it is a world view which would have difficulty in proving itself because it sees itself as one of many.

CHAPTER TWO:

PSYCHOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY

The beliefs and assumptions of a psychology effect the work it does and the nature of the experiences that emerge. A particular psychology will not be able to support or access that which is outside of its own particular beliefs or philosophies. Philosophies tend to be self-reinforcing; all information is seen from a particular philosophical perspective which reflects back onto itself. This is the nature of a governing paradigm:

Paradigms differ in more than substance, for they are directed not only to nature but also back upon the science that produced them. They are the source of the methods, problem-field, and standards of solution accepted by any mature scientific community at any given time. (Kuhn, 1970, p. 103)

In other words, a paradigm is inseparable from its philosophy and methods, its observations and subject matter and its outcomes. Therefore, there is very little new information. For example, a school of psychology which believes in freedom and being open will not perceive lack of freedom or being closed as important information in and of itself. Being closed, for example, will be understood as that which should not exist and which prevents openness. Schools which emphasize extraverted expression will be unable to support internal processes. The internal experience

will be understood as blocking the goal of expression. When our goals as psychologists are not fulfilled, it is easier to attribute blame to either the client or therapist, rather than to examine our paradigms. We usually try to incorporate new information by first seeing it as the same, not noticing an anomaly. Hence, the information has to strongly disturb the paradigm or primary belief in order to be noticed. We will see throughout the case material how process work is repeatedly working with disturbances, noticing them as the next step in the process.

Interpretation is a useful method, one which many psychologies share. However, its use becomes limited when the interpretation doesn't go along with the inner process of the individual. As mentioned before, in order to make an interpretation, the therapist must have some already known basis of experience. The effect that this often has in psychology is a profound lack of totally unknown experience. Most content that emerges within a psychological session is organized by a given theory; thus, there are rarely surprises or unusual outcomes.

At the Edge of Philosophy

The edge is the crucial point where the philosophy of a psychology will strongly come into play and influence the work. The edge is the point of philosophical crisis for the individual. It is at this point that the person's governing identity is threatened by something new, and the current philosophical viewpoint is intent on keeping the new information out. Thus, the philosophy of the school will have a deciding role in the

outcome of the work. The new information cannot be incorporated by the individual if the governing philosophy does not have the tools to appreciate it sufficiently. Similarly, the governing philosophy of a particular school also may not have the tools necessary to unfold that which is trying to emerge.

An Example

Fran sits down in a seminar group to work on something. As she comes into the circle, the group is very loud, cheering her on. She comments that she feels like she is walking into a track meet, and slaps her thighs. She makes lots of arm motions, stretching and flinging her arms above her head. Then the mood changes; her voice gets low and serious, and she looks down, saying that she thinks she wants to work on trusting her own perceptions. She says that for the last few weeks she has been feeling pretty well, but people have been telling her that she looks sad.

Fran's goal is to work on trusting her own perceptions. Her goal is indicative of a philosophy of working and analyzing and thinking, and this philosophy organizes her perceptions. She is not identified with the wild and cheering group atmosphere that spontaneously arose around her. The track meet, excitement, and movements that she makes are all part of another process which is further from her identity. Another way to describe her primary process is as someone who doesn't trust her perceptions. Her secondary process can be seen in the description of other people.

Other people tell her how she feels. She does not identify herself as these other people, but feels disturbed by them. Thus, they are a secondary process with which she needs more contact. In other words, in her secondary process she has a part that does believe and trust in its own perceptions; trusting in perceptions is a quality that she feels she lacks, but which she attributes to others. In this sense, what these people perceive is superfluous; the point is that they believe in what they perceive.

Fran asks her therapist what she should do and wants to know if the therapist thinks that she looks sad. She does this in quite a provocative way, champing on her gum like a little girl, and smiling. Here she is identified with the one who does not perceive and does not believe in her perceptions. The way she has identified herself up until now has been as a person who is sad and does not believe in herself. What she really means by not believing in herself is that she does not believe in part of herself. She certainly does believe in the serious and sad one who wants to work on things. However, she does not believe in her own beaming smile at the moment, and her excitement and movements. Within her primary belief system, she does not have the tools to perceive this other happy part. Her primary belief of herself is that she is sad, depressed, and that she should work in a very analytical and rational way in order to trust herself. This part does not have the philosophy to even approach perceiving happiness. Therefore, there is a certain intelligence in projecting the perceiver and asking the therapist and others

what they think. Asking others is an attempt to discover another view of herself, another way of perceiving the world.

Fran has an edge to this new belief in herself. It is a perceptual edge where she has no pattern to perceive herself any differently. If we are from a psychology that emphasizes thinking, insight, analysis, and the working out of problems, we will mirror her primary philosophy. If we are aware of her belief system and our own we can use them as an intervention which could be very helpful to her. We can be absurdly analytical and mirror what is always going on inside of her, so that she then can react to it. However, if the thinking and analytical method of working is applied unconsciously, the therapist will probably get annoyed at Fran for not changing and picking up the insights, and Fran will probably feel like she is in the same place as she was before. Therefore, working outside of a serious and analytical mode is at the edge of Fran's personal philosophical beliefs and could also be at the edge of the beliefs of a given psychology.

Process work acknowledges that the information that we need is already present. Hopefully, our philosophy will be open enough to pick it up. Finding the right mode of communication is essential. Chances are that talking will not be effective because it mirrors the philosophical system to which she already has good access. Using this route, the philosophy would circle around on itself.

If we observe Fran for the information that looks least

understood and least represented, we would have to say that her movements, smiling and provocation appear incongruent with the style of her governing philosophical approach. Therefore, working directly with movement will probably be useful.

The therapist did get Fran on her feet and encouraged her movements by unfolding the ones that were least comprehensible and less controlled by her intentions. At this point, we are working in areas which are way outside of Fran's normal mode of organizing her perceptions. In her movements, she begins shaking and flinging her arms up in the air. These very movements were already present in the beginning when she sat down and spoke about being at a track meet. She begins to spin, slowly and with a rhythm. She is beaming and looks ecstatic. After a while, she stops and tears roll down her face. "It's just me." she says softly, crying tears of joy. "It's just being alive!" She reveled in her happiness and then became very moved. "I saw myself going out in the world and I wasn't afraid!" she exclaims, barely able to believe it herself. Fran is very touched, filled with a new belief in herself. They complete the work by spontaneously bringing Fran's vision into an auditory channel. They sing a touching children's song about going into the world without fear.

Discussion

The new philosophy was organized by a deep belief in herself, where she trusts her perceptions in all of their various modes of expression. This philosophy is characterized by happiness and a

belief in the unknown. Here was a world which was not organized by fear. Her experience was a dance of life, celebrating and not fearing. It is a view which is free from the cumbersome and heavy thoughts of her primary approach, which organizes the world she lives in and perceives it as a scary place.

The philosophy of process work which allows her access to this new view is its trust in her own inner wisdom. Theoretically, the channel concept helps the therapist to discover where this wisdom is manifest. The new life philosophy is in the perceptual channel which is not occupied by the governing one. Only in those channels which are outside the governing philosophy can it retain its own unique and autonomous expression. Therefore, working with Fran's spontaneous movements was the key.⁶ Process work follows that which is most incomprehensible and numinous, understanding that this is where the living unconscious is and where all potential creativity lies.

The tools available to Fran were the tools of her primary belief system. These included being analytical, finding causes and solutions, and rational understanding. These tools match those of most psychologies. Such a therapeutic outlook which works on itself would keep Fran where she is. A movement therapist would be very helpful in this case and Fran would probably have a breakthrough and feel happy. However, a movement therapist might not have been able to help her with her vision and song at the end, or to bring the whole work back to her initial conflict.

One of the conclusions to be reached here is that in order to

truly support an individual, the philosophy of a psychology has to be as open as the individual diversity that it will find in the world. As we can see, the philosophy of a psychology can function exactly like the governing philosophy of an individual. They can both share an edge to a new view for which they may even both be searching. It could be that we choose psychologies that mirror the philosophies we live by.

Subjective Vs. Objective Experience

Fran's work hints at one of our most widespread universal questions: What is real? Are my experiences valid? Are they only subjective? What is an objective experience?

The many philosophical viewpoints on these questions fill volumes. In chapter one we saw that Rudolf Otto and William James were both strong supporters of the individual's subjective experience in determining the validity of religious experience. However, these opinions are not of the norm.

The prophetic religions all emphasize the reality of objective experience. The rational mind is God. Judaism knows God through hearing His word and Christianity and Islam add seeing Him. It is interesting to note that in our western culture especially, these two senses are our main channels of perception. Additionally, they are used more than other channels to assert the reality of an experience. Extraverted seeing and hearing can be shared by other eyes and ears. The Concise Encyclopedia of Living Faiths (Zaehner, 1967) confirms the rational and

intellectual emphasis of the Word of God in which there is little room for interpretation (p. 69). The Old and New Testaments and the Koran serve as God's final words. The validity of religious experience is determined by the spiritual authorities in the respective religions; there has been little official acknowledgement of the possibility of personal interpretation. Zaehner notes that in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam there is no dispute about the existence of God as an absolute, objective reality. The controversy in these religions has been around the validity of later revelations, namely, the authenticity of Christ as the Son of God and Muhammed as the "Seal of the Prophets" sent by God (p. 414). It appears that our collective conflict lies with the spontaneous generation of new revelation and experience. Jung (1958) claims that modern day religion protects people from immediate religious experience by demanding that such experiences be confirmed by an outer authority (p. 43).

Hinduism and Buddhism reduce the importance of the individual ego. Seeing all individual experience as illusory, they seek release from human existence (Zaehner, 1967, p. 415). This world view states that all subjective experience is delusion and relative and that people attempt to make their subjectivity into fixed states (Evans-Wentz, 1978, p. xx).

Psychology has had a diverse relationship to acknowledging the reality of subjective experience. Both Freud and Jung fought for the existence of the unconscious and the reality of the psyche, which is still not accepted as a reality in all fields of

psychology. However, in psychoanalytic circles subjective experience is often considered neurotic because it has no relation to outer reality.

...the neurotic process - the persistent unconscious fantasies of childhood serve to create a mental set according to which the individual in a selective and idiosyncratic way interprets everything that happens to him. Therefore, the neurotic conflicts do not represent conflicts with reality. They are intrapsychic conflicts. (Corsini, quoted from Arlow, 1963, p.39)

In psychology, the therapist is often the one who determines which experiences are considered "real." The therapeutic relationship is often characterized by the therapist being in the role of knowing more than the client. This immediately creates an atmosphere where the client gives up his own perception to the therapist. This is also an important process and has its value, but troubles begin when the client would like to integrate the the therapist's role and contact his or her own inner guide.

People in psychotic or extreme states are rejected by the collective and thought to be outside of reality. Mindell shows in City Shadows (1988) that the subjective reality of these people is not only personal but also belongs to a collective field. Physics too has realized that reality cannot be separated from the psychology of the observer. Therefore, the subjective perceptions of the observer are essential to the experiment and cannot be eliminated (Capra, 1975).

The point is, that in most parts of the world we suffer from a collective philosophy which does not trust our own perceptions. Our perception and our own ability to nurture that which is new

and unusual inside of us is projected onto a God, psychologist, religious leader or simply others. We learn to think in this way as very young children. We grow up in families perceiving something in the air. We feel the tension that is unspoken, or the love that is not expressed, or the expectations that we do not question. We attribute them to the air because no one will identify with them. Therefore, children learn quickly to stifle their perceptions and reactions to what they perceive. They are made to feel stupid and are told that what they are perceiving is simply not accurate.

This long history of devaluing and not believing in subjective experience and personal revelation is a deep-seated philosophical problem. Various life philosophies stem from this lack of belief.

1. We are worthless and what we experience cannot be trusted or believed in.
2. There are some realities which are better than others.
3. Personal experience is pathological and delusional and should be transcended.
- 4 Other people know what is best. The majority perception or that of another person is the correct perception.
5. The only perceptions that should be trusted are those which can be externally verified. Inner feelings, spontaneous movements, internal seeing and hearing, and so forth, are not to be trusted.

I could go on but I think this gives the reader an idea of the

enormous power of the particular world view which devalues subjective experience.

Religious experience often has to do with the creation and belief in something new; the experience is so awesome that one must believe. Believing happens to us. Certain strong experiences, through their splendor, circumvent our primary doubts and convince us to believe in them. One definition of a religious experience is a new world view or a belief that is trying to happen.

CHAPTER THREE:

THE STRUCTURE OF LIFE PHILOSOPHIES AND EMERGING WORLD VIEWS

This chapter will address the structure and dynamics of life philosophies: how they are maintained and function, how they come into times of crisis, and how new ones emerge.

Gregory Bateson has a lot to say in this area; he spent much of his life studying the patterns and implicit order of our universe. He was fascinated by how

...we create the world that we perceive, not because there is no reality outside of our heads, but because we select and edit the reality we see to conform to our beliefs about what sort of world we live in. (1972, p. vii)

He claimed that this was a natural process and equated our life philosophies to cultural myths.

...it is part of human nature to learn not only details but also deep unconscious philosophies - to become that which we pretend - to take the shape and character our culture imposes upon us. The myths in which our lives are embedded acquire credibility as they become part of us. Such myths become unquestionable and are built deep into our character, often below awareness, so that they are essentially religious, matters of faith. (1987, p. 182)

Such culturally acquired life philosophies stem from the religions and myths of our world. Therefore, the individual

working in these realms of basic life philosophies is involved in a collective process.

Life philosophies are mythical because they are larger life patterns, governing principles which shape our perceptions. They can be understood as beliefs, although they seem to be larger and structure our beliefs. Beliefs are usually more conscious; a person can tell you what they believe in. However, the life philosophy is implicit in our beliefs and is often not directly stated. Bateson (1972) says that we build our experiences into a whole philosophy of life and that these experiences then become philosophies which structure our behavior in future contexts into patterns (p. 164). The life philosophy colors our whole view of the world. It is a determining factor as to how well we feel on the planet and is responsible for creating our most basic world views.

The Function and Maintenance of Life Philosophies

We often feel controlled by our life philosophies; it is almost impossible to perceive outside of them. Therefore, even considering them is a huge challenge. Bohm (1987) understands this as the challenge of a program to be aware of its program, and he claims that the brain was never set up to be aware of its programs (p.46). Mindell demonstrates in his forthcoming book Working On Yourself Alone with Process-Oriented Meditation (1989c) that being aware of our awareness is an essential tool in process-oriented meditation as well as in many eastern meditation

practices.

Life philosophies often function quite unconsciously, even though we identify with them. The primary process is an example: it is closer to our identity, but possesses a certain amount of autonomy which we cannot control. We cannot stop it on demand and we often have little awareness as to its varied expressions.

The self-reflecting, and therefore, self-reinforcing nature of a life philosophy enables it to maintain itself. The perceptual channels to which we have the easiest access are habitually used, and we have little awareness both of which channels we usually use and of those which are rarely used. Thus, the life philosophy seems to be especially cemented in those channels of habitual use. In these channels the primary process has more control and can direct perception. "Channels themselves are like gods corresponding to people's psychology and beliefs" (Mindell, 1985b, p. 86). Here, Mindell notes how the beliefs that we have are synonymous with our respective channel experiences. For example, most westerners habitually use their external vision to organize their perceptions. The visions that they have reflect back to their life philosophies. In this channel, nothing out of the ordinary occurs. Therefore, the channels we occupy reinforce the world views that we already have.

Crisis and Change

Experiences which arise in channels less occupied are often experienced as disturbances, because they distract us from our

intended perceptions. Thus, symptoms, pain, and illness are experiences occurring in body channels; spontaneous movements, twitches and tics, movement difficulties, and accidents are experiences occurring in a movement channel. Relationship conflicts and worldly events that impress, trouble, or interrupt us are another kind of disturbance. Disturbing, spontaneous, or repeated visions and sounds also occur outside of our intentions.

In unoccupied channels our perception is not organized by the governing life philosophy. The primary process is no longer the agent of experiences occurring in our unoccupied channels. Therefore, the unoccupied channel is the entry way to new perception. Here we find parts of ourselves that behave with the freedom of figures in a dream. In fact, these personalities are dream figures and can actually be found in our dream life or somatic experiences. They function autonomously, outside of the organization of our habitual means of perceiving.

Our life philosophies are actually states in a larger process. However, we rarely become aware of this. Identifying with the unconscious maxims of the life philosophy, we are prisoners of its constancy and think that it is our totality. Until, of course, a crisis comes. A crisis occurs when the governing philosophy is faced with something that lies outside of its realms. It is unable to incorporate the new information into its ruling paradigm. Often it has tried, and the disturbance is reformulated in the language of the governing philosophy, but the reformulation does not hold and the disturbance reoccurs. The disturbance is stronger and more profound and demands a whole

uprooting and radical change. Life can no longer go on as is; the primary belief is unable to stretch itself.

...sometimes the dissonance between reality and false beliefs reaches a point when it becomes impossible to avoid the awareness that the world no longer makes sense. Only then is it possible for the mind to consider radically different ideas and perceptions. (Bateson, 1972, p. vii)

Bateson called our basic perception-determining beliefs epistemological premises and stated that for us to change them, we must first become aware that reality is not as we believe it to be. Another way to say this is that we have been aware of one reality, and it is not until this reality is no longer applicable that we reach a point of crisis and other realities become possible. Bohm (1987) also asserts that our thinking functions like a program which conceals itself. An attack on the program will be understood as an attack on the person, and therefore the person will prevent the attack (p. 108). This obviously occurs because we are identified with these programs. Since we do not yet have an access to other parts of ourselves, the identity needs to defend itself, unaware that anything else exists.

When such a crisis occurs the governing philosophy is limited; it lacks access to that which is new. What would be potentially relieving for the individual is not acceptable to the primary process which is suffering. This is hopelessness; our lack of access to something new and our complete identification with the old system. However, that part of us possessing new information and a new way of perceiving the world is not at all

in a crisis. That part is searching for a perceiver. Messages from that part are being sent in an attempt to be unraveled, and they have been disturbing enough to be perceived. We stand now at the edge between two worlds; the edge creates strong philosophical beliefs and stops others from being created.

The Seeds of Emerging World Views

Jung (1960) discovered that at these times of personal philosophical crisis big dreams often occur. He noticed that archetypal dreams often occurred at critical life phases like puberty and death where the personal and subjective unconscious had little to offer, and room was created for archetypal dreams to emerge. Jung found that where the personal unconscious left off the collective unconscious began, creating new patterns for the individual (pp. 291-292).

Dreams do help us to create patterns. However, we can also discover the living dream. Working directly with the new and disturbing information by amplifying it and letting it express itself in its own terms is a way to circumvent hopelessness and contact the living nature of the new pattern. In Fran's case, if her therapist had worked rationally and verbally, she would have become more strongly stationed in her primary belief and remained hopeless about anything else.

In process work, getting beyond the primary philosophy means picking up that which does not fit and is most mysterious. Bohm (1987) confirms this. "...the thing unexplained is the sign of

something much deeper" (p. 101). The reader will thus observe in the case material that all of the manifold and strange occurrences in our world and individual experience which happen as if they had a life of their own are explored in an attempt to uncover their mystery. Such events include: body symptoms and signals, movements that stand out, sentences that are incomplete or words that are odd, events that are mysterious, and relationship issues which are unfinished.

7

A Trip into the Nagual: The Unoccupied Channel

As I have briefly mentioned, going into the unoccupied channels of perception brings about new world views. We will see how amplifying the most subtle signals can lead to a strongly transforming experience. Carlos Castaneda (1972) relates his experiences of going into an unoccupied channel and how he managed to 'stop the world.' Castaneda's governing philosophy was characterized by a powerful rational component that insisted on reason and explanation as his highest gods. Stopping the world meant going outside of the realm of his reason. In order to do this, Don Juan explained that he needed to employ the practice of 'not doing,' and to follow his body. Mindell explains 'not doing' as stopping the doings of the primary process.⁸ Castaneda succeeded in doing this; he stopped the doings of his primary process and stopped the world. The world as he had known it no longer existed. For Castaneda, the unoccupied channel that led to his new perceiving was proprioception; his descriptions are in words which indicate

inner feeling sensation.

I felt something warm and soothing oozing out of the world and out of my own body. I knew I had discovered a secret. It was so simple. I experienced an unknown flood of feelings. Never in my life had I had such a divine euphoria, such peace, such an encompassing grasp, and yet I could not put the discovered secret into words, or even into thoughts, but my body knew it. (1972, pp. 252-253)

In Castaneda's account we can see that his normal way of thinking was not effective in his known world. He had stopped his old world and was plunged into one which was less known: the world governed by his body channels and irrational perceptions.

Following the Stream of Awareness

When we go into an unoccupied channel, like Carlos, our awareness changes. One of the strong points in process work which enables it to access experiences and perceptions which are outside of the governing philosophy is that it acknowledges and differentiates between primary and secondary awareness. The primary awareness is our normal awareness that we carry with us, and rarely question or reflect on. The primary awareness perceives new information as a disturbance and it suffers from the disruption. The secondary awareness is not the primary awareness of a secondary process, but the awareness of the secondary process itself. For example, a man has a pounding heart. The therapist asks the man what the pounding is like, and he says it is nurturing. The primary awareness of this man is not the awareness of the heart itself. The therapist does something typical here. She poses a question to the primary process about

the secondary process. She can only get an answer from the awareness of the primary process. She does not yet have access to the stream of awareness that the secondary process possesses. How do we know that the answer of 'nurturing' is not an answer from the heart itself? We know this because the heart is pounding, and this is incongruent with nurturing. To get into the awareness process of the heart itself we could encourage the man to actually pound and become the heart. Metacommunicating or talking about the experience too soon skips over having the experience. The pounding heart has a whole way of perceiving the world, one which possesses the intensity of its pounding; it is this awareness that we are calling the awareness stream of the secondary process. This will become more apparent in the case work.

When people talk about themselves they frequently speak about the secondary process from the standpoint of the primary one. Thus, the formulations usually give little information about the secondary process and are often inaccurate descriptions. This is similar to the disease names which are given to specific individual feeling states. These names become meaningless when the individual goes into the perception and individual feeling experiences of the disease. For example, a woman comes into my practice and complains that she is depressed. The word 'depression' is a primary process description of a state that she knows very little about. I ask her how she experiences her depression and she says that it stops her from getting up in the morning and doing things. I physically encourage her to be the

one who stops me from getting up in the morning. She lies on top of me and gets very heavy, extending her limbs and puffing up her cheeks. She says that she feels like a blob and has an image of a tire advertisement of a fat cartoon-like character with many tires around him. He is called the Michelin tire man, and rolls around making silly noises and funny faces. He finally says "No, you can't get up. I am not interested in the things that you do. You drive yourself. I like lying around and cuddling." The words the tireman says and the experience of rolling and being silly and cuddling is the awareness of the secondary process. Depression was a description of something to which the primary process had no access. The primary process could describe the experience from its effects, but could not speak from the experience itself. It is important that the therapist be able to differentiate between descriptions of secondary material made by the primary process and descriptions unfolding from the secondary process itself.

Using the unoccupied channel, following that which is most unknown and mysterious, accessing the awareness of the secondary process, and unraveling information which is disturbing on its own terms are various ways of contacting new world views.

Bohm (1987) also talks about following the things which go against our intentions.

At the limit of what has at any moment been comprehended there are always unclarities, unsatisfactory features, failures of intention to fit what is actually displayed or what is actually done. And the yet deeper intention is to be aware of all these discrepancies and to allow the whole structure to change if necessary. (p. 82)

He then continues to describe the birth of new world views.

...the discrepancies between what is displayed and what is intended would lead to a change of intention aimed at decreasing this discrepancy, ... it is only when one's purpose of intention changes that a new meaning can be realized. Then often in a flash that seems to take no time at all, a coherent new whole of meaning is formed, within which the older meanings may be comprehended as having a limited validity within their proper context. (p. 94)

This is a very whole description in which there is the birth of the new world view and an acknowledgement of the old one. It is not just a simple flip, substituting one for the other; the world view gets larger, including both.

Creating the World

When we follow the awareness stream of the secondary process we begin to identify with it and thus identify with its creative potential. We are no longer the victim of something unknown and disturbing. We do not experience the world as happening to us, but we are suddenly in the position of creating the world. We are identifying with the energy which creates our body symptoms, relationship troubles, movements, worldly experiences, or fate, in whatever form it may manifest.

One of the empirical observations in process work with people in lots of pain, is that the entire personality does not suffer. The primary process, the one who experiences the symptom, feels pain and suffers. However, the one who is creating the pain, the secondary process, does not suffer. Let's take a look at

Matthew.

At a recent seminar Arny worked with people from the general public who were suffering from serious illnesses. Matthew was a seven year old boy in awful pain from leukemia. He sits very still and tells us that he has lots of pains in his arms. His mother wishes she could help him when he is in so much pain.

Arny first tries to find out how Matthew experiences his pain, since Matthew's personal experience of the pain is the key to the creative element in the background, with which he is not identified. Up to this point, his identity has been as the one who suffers from something unknown which causes him pain. The pains are sharp and like spears. This information leads to a game called 'spears.' Suddenly, this sick little boy, his parents, and Arny are engaging in the spear game. Matthew is on his feet, clutching a pen, stabbing pillows and people and beaming. There is no pain in this state of the spear thrower.

The stabbing pains occurring in his somatic experience of leukemia are painful only when he is the victim of them. When he expresses and lives the energy of the stabbing there is no pain, but ecstasy.

This is a normal occurrence in process work and need not be expressed in such a dramatic case where questions of life and death come into play. Identifying with the creative element poses an immense philosophical challenge to the individual. Most of us do not identify with those things which are creating our existence. A common collective world view is to be a victim of

circumstance; we are worthless and powerless in a big powerful world. We can only wait and respond. We are not the creators. However, many of us try to create some small safe world for ourselves and hope that the big bad powerful world or fate passes over our small lives with minimal disturbance.

This particular world view in which one feels the victim of something greater is the basis of Judeo-Christian belief. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam all agree that there is a God who is an external and objective reality, and who created the universe from nothing (Zaehner, 1967, p. 17). They all emphasize humankind's relationship to God (p.415). These religions are based on serving and obeying this external God. All remind us that the creator is separate from the creature and warn us of the dangers of identifying with the godhead.

For this, according to tradition, [referring to Protestant tradition] is what the devil is, - the highest angel who, not content to be second, determined to be God himself. (Smith, 1958, p.305)

The message in the religions of the prophetic tradition is clearly that humankind is separate from God. Identifying with the creator is heretical and goes against religious morality. However, in the more mystical traditions of the eastern orthodoxy, Kabbalism, Gnosticism, and Sufism, the mystical union between the individual and God is the most divine experience. However, here too, these mystics held back in their descriptions of identifying with God, for fear of being accused of heresy (Welch, 1966, pp. 61-62).

The religions of the far east do not emphasize an external

relationship to a divinity. These mystical traditions advocate freeing the soul from the body. This is achieved by individual efforts and not by the interventions of a god. The individual must free herself. The soul is the godhead in the east; that which is divine is all pervading and exists in everything (Zaehner, 1967, p. 18). If there were to be a goal it would be to identify with the godhead (Welch, 1966, pp. 61-62).

In the Eastern religions we find a model for identifying with the creator. However, this mystical experience presents a terrific challenge to the common person, and is often reserved for only the very religious.

Lacking access to the creator is one of the reasons spontaneous religious experience is so limited in our world. Process work brings us into contact with the inherent creator within us, a creator which is outside of the realms of the primary identity. Thus, people are able to create in ways which are outside of individual and collective belief. In the case studies we will see examples of people who are creating on the edge of culture. Some of their creations uphold culture as it is, mirroring the beliefs of our religious systems. Others go beyond these beliefs, creating the world anew, walking a path that few have tread.

In Sacred Dance: Encounter with the Gods (1986), Maria-Gabriele Wosien quotes an Hermetic Dictum:

If you cannot equate yourself with God
You cannot know him,
For like is known by like. (p. 9)

She adds that the creation hides the creator just as the physical form of man hides his spiritual being. In process work, all phenomena can be seen as creations, and by working with the phenomena we may discover the agent of the creation. We normally identify with the creation: the body, matter or material. Less known to us is the creator, spirit, or agent.

At a recent seminar on the theme of "Creativity," led by Mindell, a group of forty of us studied some of the various creation myths of the world. Mindell pointed out that in these creation myths, change does not occur through man or woman. It is the gods or magical beings who change the world. Creation through man is still a pattern to be created.

...most of our myths show only divine awareness ruling our universe. And in these myths, human consciousness usually has no influence on the gods! (Mindell, The Journal for Process-oriented Psychology, Vol. 2, 1989, p. 50)

Therefore, it is a tremendous philosophical challenge for the individual to dare to identify with the creator and to believe in his or her creative abilities.

It is interesting to note that in all of the main religions, even Judeo-Christian tradition, there is some signal indicating that the divinity does in fact exist in each of us, even though it may not be understood that way. Buddhism tells us to find our own Buddha nature. Hinduism leads the individual to the experience of the living Shiva or Shakti. The Old Testament says we are created in God's image. Catholicism professes that the holy ghost is that part of God which resides in man. Taoism is based

on the direct and unifying experience of the tao. The idea of the divinity existing in each of us is ancient. However, it is still something the world as a whole has not yet picked up; it is like a dream that is trying to complete itself, waiting for the dreamer to live its message.

To conclude this section, I would like to suggest that many of the philosophies that process work is built on appear to be those which are collectively not very accessible to us. Indeed, such things as identifying with the creator, believing in our own experiences, and understanding our inner world as an extension of the outer one are far from our cultural norms. Those aspects of psychology which direct the content of experience are based on the philosophies of a collective primary process. Upholding culture is also essential; process work makes an addition. The sense of unification that people experience in this work is due to the fact that it has the ability to simultaneously maintain the life philosophies of culture and to support those that are on the outside. Process work has proven itself successful in working with a wide range of people from various cultures: American and European, Indian and Asian, Mid-eastern, Eastern European, South American, and African. In part this is due to its neutral, value-free theories, as well as its ability to access a wide range of life philosophies and world views.

CHAPTER FOUR:

THE HUMAN SPHERE

Rage, jealousy, greed, ambition, and lust all belong to the human sphere of life; and yet these emotional states have been historically troublesome. This chapter will introduce our collective world views which have governed these states throughout time, and portray new views which emerge from the case material.

Humankind has always had difficulty getting along in this world, and most religions promise either an afterlife of eternal paradise or an enlightened experience on earth. Some of the main human problems seem to be pain and suffering, and learning how to get along with the wild affect and emotions that possess us all from time to time. All the major systems of religious thought deem these affective states lowly, degenerate, and the cause of suffering.

A common way to deal with the difficult emotional states of human life has been to create laws to govern them. The Ten Commandments have been the most powerful laws for half of the world population: Christians, Jews, and Muslims (Smith, 1958, pp. 239-241). Jealousy, rage, lust, greed, ambition, and murder are unintegrated parts of ourselves: these parts are forbidden

by external laws. The prophetic religions all possess a strong moral code to which people must adhere if they are to attain God's favor. In Christianity, salvation occurs through emulating Christ; having joy, hope, faith, and love. One should be god-centered and not self-centered (Zaehner, 1967, p. 75). Other qualities such as anger and greed are part of the Judeo-Christian world view only in so far as one should not have them.

Before the prophet Muhammed gave Islam its form, the world around him was an absolute chaos, overrun with the raw affect of humanity. Chaos, violence, drunkenness, orgies, gambling, fighting, and proving virility were the governing forces of the day. This wild state was the enemy Muhammed set out to conquer (Smith, 1958, p. 195). At first Muhammed influenced those in Mecca by love and his convincing abilities as a statesman. However, by the time of his death he and his army of followers had conquered Armenia, Persia, Syria, Palestine, Iraq, Egypt, and Spain, and had crossed the Pyrenees into France (Smith, 1958, pp. 200-202). It is interesting to note that, paradoxically, the brutality he had been against became his means.

Again, the far east differs from the west in its means of dealing with human trouble, but the disdain for human affect is similar. The eastern goal is to transcend the human condition. In Hinduism, the world is not real; it is maya or illusion (Smith, 1958, p. 227). The only reality is the Absolute reality; an impersonal world soul, Brahman. The goal is to unite the atman, or individual soul, with Brahman (p. 238). In Buddhism, the goal

is also to become selfless and one with the absolute. our own Buddha nature (p. 101). Buddhism states that life is not right how it is. There is too much pain and suffering and our desire to fulfill our sensory selves creates our suffering (p. 99).

Taoism urges us to do away with morality and ambition and return to our original nature (Welch, 1966, p. 36). Uniting with the tao means giving up our worldly affairs and emptying ourselves of all personal desires (Zaehner, 1967, p. 386). For Lao Tzu, the father of Taoism, money, power, wisdom, and reputation did not exist (Welch, 1966, p. 35).

Pursuing the main religions we find that the existing model for dealing with affect and personal desire is to eliminate it. And yet, as a planet we seem unable to achieve this end, and remain haunted by individual and collective outbreaks. We try to control ourselves and our world by inner and outer prescriptions, but to no avail. Indeed, as a world, we all share a lack of ability to process the emotional turmoil of the human sphere.

In the west, psychology recognizes the need to deal with affect and tackles the problem in various ways. However, culturally we are prejudiced against affects like rage, jealousy, greed, and so forth, and psychology often reflects this. The goal of health is usually a calm, peaceful, "adult," or centered state. Affect is analyzed, reduced to childhood, expressed during a breakthrough, or transformed by doing physical activities, meditating, or gaining insight. These are all useful means at different times. However, the feeling attitude around these affectual processes is

that we should get beyond them. Process work by its philosophy of also appreciating every state, even troublesome ones, attempts to complete the difficult states and thereby bring out their value. This chapter will introduce case material with work in the area of disturbing affects in an attempt to discover other models for dealing with this difficult realm of human existence.

The Cases

1. The Queen

Interestingly enough, this work begins not with an explicit desire to work on a troublesome emotional state, but with an allergy. Sue tells the seminar group that her hay fever is like an itch that cannot be satisfied. It is an eternal itch and she has felt it for millennia. She sneezes and people are in a playful mood. They suggest different things she might do to satisfy the itch in her inner ear. Sue suddenly has a strong fantasy.

S: You know what I feel like? I feel like a queen who gets her ears scratched.

A: Oh my queen, may I scratch your royal ear?

Arny immediately enters the system of her fantasy by not talking about it, but by engaging with it and letting it unfold on its own terms.

S: This is a really fat queen, enormous. I really see her. She is mean and fat and has malnourished slaves. Two people are doing my ears, one is doing my back. I am so fat that I can't get to the itchy spots, so I need someone to do it.

A: I am at your service, my royal highness. May I scratch your royal ass?

The group enthusiastically picks up on Sue's vision and everyone serves the queen. The queen stuffs pillows in her shirt and surrounds herself with blankets so she appears quite enormous. She then decides that she wants to eat, and is served wild boar. She begins to bellow; every sound she makes is loud and in the most demanding tone possible. She orders that people in her queendom should be killed for bringing the wrong food. She shrieks and roars that she is hungry. The queen is evidently furious about something, but any inquiry or intervention into finding out what that might be receives a queenly roar or insult. At one point Sue comes out of her queenly ecstasy for a couple of minutes:

S: This is how royalty are. They have everything in the world but they can't be satisfied. They have this indescribable problem: existence. Living is an itch.

A: What about existence?

S: Existence, UGHH. YOU HAVE TO WORK! YOU HAVE TO GO TO SCHOOOOOOOOOOOLLLLLLLL! YOU HAVE THESE TEENAGE STUDENTS AND THEY ARE DISGUSTING! (she is a teacher) AND HE GOES AWAY FOR WEEKS AT A TIME. YOU ARE MY PERSONAL SLAVE AND YOU DON'T LEAVE MY KINGDOM! AND YOU, (she points to another friend) YOU HAVE SPLIT ALLEGIANCE AND I WON'T HAVE IT! AND YOU BITCH, YOU LOUSY STINKING BITCH, (she is now addressing a woman who received more votes than she did in a recent community election for a position) YOU ARE ALL A BITCH. WHO DIDN'T VOTE FOR ME? RAISE YOUR HAND IF YOU DIDN'T AND SAY YOUR PRAYERS. YOU WORMS YOU ARE GOING TO DIE!

Participant: I voted for you queen!

S: Good, you can kill the others.

The queen goes on in this fashion, roaring and bellowing, insulting and provoking people. She feeds off the group, which

provokes her as well. The atmosphere is like a cabaret. People are laughing uproariously as Sue expresses everything that she normally would not. She is also quite funny and daring in her comments, saying the unspeakable. It is a difficult atmosphere in which to intervene. Every intervention serves as fuel for the queen. She goes on for quite a while, roaring about various feeling issues in her life that are disturbing. Finally, after a half hour of sheer joy and cabaret, intervening by not trying to change her is effective.

A: I like the way you laugh about the queen, too. You love her yourself.

S: Don't take me out of this role. I haven't had so much fun in years!

A: How could we keep you in this role for the next fifty years? (to the group) How can we keep her here? She will certainly have an edge against this stuff. The edge is against expressing all of her needs, so, she has an allergy attack. How can we keep her here?

Sue then says that while she was bellowing like the queen she was breathing in a way which reminded her of her mother. A story about her mother then unfolds. Her mother is oppressed by her father, she says, who is very rational. Sue tells us that her mother is really warm and emotional and needy, outgoing and related. She needs lots of love and support and has lived in an environment where no one has given it to her, except Sue, who is very supportive of her. The mother is normally very serving to those around her.

Sue and Arny engage in a role play of the mother and father and it becomes clear that the mother does serve the father; she gives

up all of her feeling needs and becomes very rational. It is this rational father principle which prevents the queen from living. The role play slightly changes and the mother and father are now trying to convince Sue in a very rational way that the mother's benign tumors are not to be worried about. Sue has a realization here:

S: They would both resemble each other. They get cool and normal and sensible and would accuse me of being hysterical and flipped out. Then what would be really difficult for me would be to be that bellowing queen and to say: I THINK SHE SHOULD BE PUT IN A HOSPITAL! (Sue's voice suddenly changes now; she growls like the queen, and glares at everyone.)

A: I am satisfied. I am satisfied with that outbreak, because in the middle of being like the rational parents, you have suddenly been able to bring in the queen. So there is a pattern for you to be able to bring a piece of her personality outside.

S: I am feeling how being hysterical with my needs is just what I can't do. I am either rational with or very innocuous with what I need. The only way to bring out a need would be if it were for survival or some very sensible reason. But to be an hysterical woman, gee, I can hardly imagine.

A: Well, someone has to be hysterical in the group.

S: But me? I can think of ten people who could do it better.

People in the group laugh, because she was able to do it so well. Sue feels finished and she joins the group in a discussion about the work.

One of the fascinating things in this work is that the role of the queen was not able to complete itself until she was sufficiently acknowledged and appreciated. Interventions to discover where she might be needed or which demanded her to come out of the role and reflect on it were not effective. This was

due to the rational father, who is the figure on the edge. He prevents her from living this wonderful character. Therefore, interventions appeared to Sue as statements from the father's world. It was only when the group supported Sue in remaining in the role of the queen that the work could go further. Otherwise, the fight between queen and father went on unconsciously, cycling.

Sue additionally wanted to remain in the role of the queen because it was so much fun. She was ecstatic and the group was ecstatic as well. Afterwards, the entire group was actually jealous of her; this is an indication of the collective nature of Sue's process. In our world we have very few models for being needy, irrational, and affectful. The jovial and sassy atmosphere was infectious and every person was drawn in, living similar parts of themselves through Sue's process. The involvement of the group is a characteristic of a collective process. Sue created a model which many people need. I am sure that the atmosphere was as extreme as it was due in part to the inspiration of the collective field. Too much of our world is ruled by the rational principles of old world fathers. Thus, this irrational and needy principle needs to be exalted to the status of a queen. In Sue's case, the hysterical and irrational part of her, in this case, the mother, is all too often serving the rational father. In this work the tables were really turned.

We can observe the lack of a collective pattern by noticing how frozen most of us are around such emotional areas. We never see a public figure being in need, or expressing anger or jealousy.

Such irrational states rarely come into our lives except when we are in private or when they overwhelm us. The more common pattern for dealing with affect is expressed in a beautiful Swiss German word for which English unfortunately lacks a good translation. "muff sein," is used by the Swiss to refer to a state where all of our affect is internalized and outwardly we are sulking, appearing superiorly insulted.

Sue's work added another possibility in the affectual dimension. The content of what the queen expressed was not the point here; the point was the queen herself. The more everyday experience of such feeling states is to suffer from them and to try to avoid having them. Sue discovered a pattern for enjoying them; her ecstasy was intoxicating! A critical point which frequently prevents us from expressing such things is that we are often too attached to the content of what we feel, and look for a particular response. Thus, we reject the content as well as the energy behind our emotional states and inadvertently become the rejecting father. This is why the role of the queen herself was so essential; she had little attachment to her verbal content and was indifferent to people's reactions. I have seen over and over that even if an individual is rejected for the content of what she says, she herself is more apt not to become devastated because she has not rejected the internal and energetic component. It is often the case that simply expressing these so-called childlike or needy or demanding feelings is the point, and the person is no longer attached to the actual content. For Sue, the queen reframes the whole idea of being an hysterical woman

into a royal and ecstatic experience.

The queen can be seen as Mara, a zealous spirit who, possessed with affect and human desires, embraces the world in the Tibetan wheel of becoming (Cavendish, Ling, Eds., 1980, p. 51). Mara is the spirit that keeps the world of samsara, the world of living and dying, going. The figure of Mara gives us a pattern for embracing such irrational and affectual states. However, we rarely identify with Mara, but feel ourselves more often as the victims of its desires. As Mara's victims, we suffer from irrational affects, which is why the east proposes getting off the wheel of samsara, the endless circle of life and death. However, another pattern is to become this zealous and affective personality when it is active, and then leave it when it is not.

Sue's experience emerged from working on her allergies which she has had since childhood. Mindell (1985a) has discovered that such chronic symptoms are part of lifetime patterns or core processes which structure our lives and create our personal myths (p.67). The queen is a mythical figure, one that Sue is sure to come back to throughout her life. Such processes are difficult to integrate; they are like an individual's personal piece of the collective field; the personal myth one is called to live. Sue described her symptom as an eternal itch, meaning it is not something only personal which goes back to her childhood, but a problem with which humanity has been struggling for eternity. Therefore, the figure emerges as a queen, a new ruler, an archetype of the highest order.

We can see here how the symptom is really its own solution. The itch is what accesses the queen; it is the queen who has this eternal itch or dissatisfaction, suffering under the rational father. When Sue became the queen, she was immediately relieved of her hay fever. Thus, the queen or the itch is not really the problem, but the rationality that prevents it is. In this case we can see how Sue's allergy contained the seeds of a new world view, conceived by Sue contacting the spirit of the queen.

2. Becoming the Tao

It is the last day of a five day training seminar where participants have had the opportunity to work with one another. Many people usually want to work at any given time and a pen is spun between them in order to determine who will work. Eric has been wanting to work for days now and the pen has finally chosen him.

E: I have been waiting for days now to work on something. I have been in a panic and frantic about not getting picked. I feel so greedy. Last night I just thought that maybe there is some meaning that I am not getting picked. Maybe it is the tao or something like that. But I feel so poor. I feel I am always like this. Primarily I feel greedy and poor and I suffer so much. I feel so poor in that I don't get what I want in life, like in relationships, (he is crying) and I feel like I don't have anything. I don't have any love, or friends. Even though I actually do, I don't feel that I get it. There is something empty, a bottomless pit and I feel so greedy all of the time. I am grabbing and it is not making me friends and not giving me what I want. I suffer from it a lot. Last night I had a dream which I think has something to do with it. I dreamt that I was hanging out with Zorba the Greek and we were giving each other presents. It makes me think that there is something in the background that is very generous that I don't have enough contact with.

Looking at what Eric says, we can determine that his primary process is that of suffering. He is identified with his suffering and his greediness and poverty. He says he is always greedy and grabbing. The secondary process, the thing that is the least represented and least known, seems to be that which prevents him from getting what he wants in the world and in his relationships. He referred to this unknown part earlier as tao. The tao does not choose him. The therapist decides to try and discover what this "tao" figure is about and encourages him to be the tao that does not pick him. I will call the therapist Lynn; she takes up the role opposite the tao. Eric stands up as the tao and looks into the distance.

L: Pick me! How come you don't pick me?? The whole seminar will go by and I won't be picked.

E: I am seeing the world pass you by. It is like a flow. (he moves his hands slightly across his body in slow movements like Tai Chi) It passes you by and you stand there grabbing. Why don't you stop grabbing and start walking with it?

The therapist encourages his movements and he moves consistently from side to side, his arms gracefully sweeping the air, back and forth across his body. It looks like Tai Chi, the slow, gentle, meditative martial art form, although Eric has never done this before in his life. The therapist, frantically pleading, begs him to notice her. But Eric, now being the world which passes the frantic one by, barely notices her. He does not skip a beat, but keeps his slow and constant movements. From the outside, we can observe how the frantic one is constantly passed by; their rhythms are completely different. The frantic one is speedy in speech and the world is slow and constant in movement.

Lynn then walks forward and stands in the way of Eric's arm movements, trying to interrupt his movement pattern. However, nothing stops or intervenes with the tao. Eric casually and smoothly lifts her up by the pants, without changing his rhythm at all, and carries her from side to side, suspended in the air, integrating her into his movement dance. Lynn shrieks:

L: Hey you! Pay attention to me! Stop this tao shit!

But Eric is unmoved and keeps up his constant movements.

E: I feel like there is nothing you can do to change me.

L: I am starting to realize that. It is beautiful, very strong and powerful.

Lynn and others are admiring the beauty and presence of this world or tao-like presence. Lynn begins to ask this state questions about the state that Eric normally suffers from. Eric keeps his movement which is the access to the awareness of this process, and which will enable him to answer as the tao and not Eric.

L: (being the everyday Eric) What should I do about my suffering?

E: There are no questions. (pause) It is very simple, being the tao, having awareness of what it is doing, and that's it. If I am in pain that is what I should be, that is the tao at that moment. Then that passes by.

L: What is it at this moment?

E: I notice it happening right now. I notice that I am clinging to the moment, instead of watching it go by. I notice myself getting greedy again for the moment and I should watch it go by too. It is detachment.

The work ends with this insight and Eric is totally at peace,

aware now of another part of himself which is more detached and watches things go by.

Here is an experience structurally very different than that of the queen. The queen was less identified with her affect. Eric, however, is very identified with his poverty, greed, and neediness. He is suffering because his governing philosophy has to do with gaining and achieving love by grabbing, and he has no access to that part of himself that is not involved in this struggle. Therefore, this lack of involvement happens to him in that other people are not sufficiently interested, in him, or the tao or the pen leaves him out by not choosing him. Like most of us, he is disturbed by any information that goes against the intentions of his primary philosophy. He has lacked the taoistic philosophy which would see this information, being left out, as meaningful and not simply as a disturbance. However, that which is grabbing and poor does not possess the tools or belief to approach it any differently.

Eric's poverty is really due to being poor in patterns. Remaining within the confines of his poverty-stricken view, he has only one option: to keep trying to be picked, or noticed, or loved by grabbing as much as he can, and seeing anything that thwarts his intentions as a disturbance. The new pattern is the tao or the world which is deep and centered and immovable. This is the process of becoming the tao or becoming your fate. Our collective world view is to identify as the victim of fate and to fight against it. This is also important; fighting against fate

allows us to realize that we are out of contact with it. Perceiving ourselves out of tao or off center is the first step in returning to the tao. In ancient China the only problem is being out of tao. Chinese medicine is built essentially on this concept (Weith, 1966). In both Hinduism and Buddhism one of the goals in meditation is to become the enlightened observer who simply watches things go by. The Hindu is recommended to see himself in the third person in order to get to the detached state, and he is encouraged to visualize himself from a distance (Smith, 1958, p. 35).

The dream about Zorba the Greek gives Eric a colorful pattern for this new process. Zorba (Kazantzakis, 1961) was a very strong and sensual man interested in living a full and simple life. He liked women, music and drink, and stayed up late drinking and engaged in profound discussion. He is actually a model of a detached and simultaneously earthy person. A good example of Zorba's nature is found when his prized pulley system collapses during its celebrated unveiling. Zorba and his comrade watch the project in which they had invested lots of time, money, and effort crash into the sea. Zorba, true to his nature, rocked with laughter, leaped into the air and danced ecstatically.

We can find Zorba's double in a group of Taoists called the Seven Sages of Bamboo Grove, who were known as "feng liu" or those wandering from convention. These sages spent their days drinking wine, playing the lute, and making up poetry. They would indulge in philosophical conversation which would end

...when they reached the Unnameable and then 'stopped talking and silently understood each other with a smile.' Their strolls invariably wound up at the local tavern. There they would turn to serious drinking. By the end of the evening they would be in a stupor of glorious indifference to the world and intimacy with Tao. (Welch, 1966, p. 124)

Zorba, a simple and satisfied figure, detached from the twists of fate, seems to have been what Eric needed to contact. This figure is the generous and satisfied part of him. Lao Tzu, the great Taoist sage, also claimed that one should satisfy his physical needs, filling his belly and weakening his ambition (Welch, 1966, p. 35). Zorba offered this advice as well. Eric knows the ambitious state, the state of striving and grabbing, well. The state of Zorba, of perceiving the world through the perception of the tao is a life philosophy which, in Eric's case, fills up his emptiness. This is very different than the more common world view of suffering from fate and unconsciously reacting to it. It is a powerful process of finding contact with that wisdom which creates our fate.

3. On the Edge of Culture

This next case gives us a radical view of so-called psychotic episodes in regard to their relationship to culture. Mindell's groundbreaking work in this area (1988) has shown that psychosis is an extreme state; extreme in the sense that it is rare in occurrence; and a state in the sense that it portrays a momentary picture of an evolving process. The infrequency with which an extreme state occurs is dependent upon the culture which perceives such states as extreme. In other words, what is

psychotic or extreme for one culture is not so for another. Mindell shows how psychotic or extreme states are culturally based. People who go through these states are 'city shadows,' those who live the darkest corner of any given society (p. 13).

Maria comes from a southern European country and is attending a seminar on the theme of Creativity. After seeing another member of the seminar work on something emotionally moving, she comes forward and says she would like to work on something that she needs a great deal of courage to do. People are supportive of her and she tells us her story. She is a very shy and compliant woman, polite and friendly. She speaks in a quiet and even voice.

M: I was at home with my boyfriend and my daughter. The whole day I wasn't feeling well. I had bad fantasies. I thought that he was going to kill me or I was going to kill him. But I only had these fantasies when we were apart, not when we were together. So I tried to stay near him. Then it was evening and he was bored. I was in another room and I had the fantasy that he was going to kill me. So I took the key and left the house. I went to a girlfriend's house. When I left, though, I had the fantasy that he had committed suicide and I would find him dead in the elevator. I don't know why. (She makes a fist.) He just died. Then, when I was at my girlfriend's house I had the fantasy that my daughter wanted to kill me and that she had a knife. I told my girlfriend and she came back home with me. When we arrived, I saw that my boyfriend had called some of his friends over to the house and he was very friendly with them. One of the friends is a doctor. They gave me lots of sleeping pills and I went to bed. I didn't know it but they had called a nurse in to stay during the night. Then I don't remember waking up or going to the nurse, but I was there, and I remember having a lot of strength (she uses her hands describing how she was choking the nurse) and then she screamed and my boyfriend came and pulled me off of her.

A: The nurse was okay?

M: Yeah, and then I went back to bed.

A: It is very courageous of you to tell this story. First of all I have to congratulate you that you have had the courage to do this. It is a big thing to talk about it. I also want to tell you that what I hope will happen is that through doing this you will be able to create meaning out of what happened and understand it a little better. My assumption is that you were trying to do something, and it wasn't a bad thing. Let's try to find out what it was about.

What Arny is doing here is obviously supporting her, but his belief that there is something meaningful in what occurred is an intervention in itself. Due to the theme of the seminar, which was on creativity, they decide to work on it by re-enacting the scene. Maria chooses people to play herself, the boyfriend, the daughter, the girlfriend, and the nurse. She herself is going to look on. She gives more information about the various people. One important detail is that the daughter does not like the boyfriend or Maria.

The scene is enacted and exaggerated a bit. Maria watches, sitting and holding her legs together tightly. When the people playing the scene are sleeping, and the confrontation with the nurse occurs, Maria moves around.

A: Now, when you look in from the outside, what feelings and ideas do you have?

M: When they went into the lift that was strong for me, because I felt guilty that I was causing him to die.

A: Yeah, that was strong. How come you think there was so much suicide and murder in that scene? Why do you think she got up in the night and wanted to strangle the nurse?

M: She was angry.

A: Exactly. What was she angry about?

M: It was a ball, full of water and it exploded. (she makes exploding hand motions)

A: Why was she so full of water and wanting to explode?

M: I don't know but maybe it came from the past.

A story comes out about how she had been jealous in the past, but is not really anymore. Her boyfriend is married and also occasionally saw other women. Earlier, she said, she could get jealous. Arny tries to access the jealousy and models it for her, demonstrating how a jealous person might express her jealousy. However, Maria does not take this route for herself. Arny then suggests that they re-enact the scene again and that this time Maria should play herself and accompany the woman who was playing her.

A: Go through the night again and do what you want. You can repeat it, change it; use your creativity and do what you need. Would you like to do it?

M: Yes, but I don't want to have the same night.

A: Great, let's make a different night. You can get up and go to the nurse but don't have to strangle her. It would be interesting to know what you do this time. You can do something different.

Maria and her counterpart approach the sleeping nurse. Arny, who had been playing the boyfriend, and also helping by carrying a lot of the awareness, came with them and began to talk for them.

A: We came for a little night time visit. We decided to get up in the middle of the night and make a little visit. You have such a nice neck.

It is at this point that a surprising and very realistic thing occurs. Maria, who has been so compliant and passive, pushes her hands outward to Arny, gesturing that he stop talking and move away. He gets the message. She then turns to the woman who was

playing the nurse.

M: Why don't you go home?!

Nurse: Your boyfriend called me to help.

M: (shakes her head 'no') You are a stranger here. Go home.

A: That's great. You are doing great. (to the nurse) She discovered that she doesn't want you here. She doesn't need people's help and she feels irritated. (now he speaks as the boyfriend) My girlfriend here is irritated at me that I have called people into the house to help and she is upset about that. She feels that you are a stranger.

M: Yes, you are a stranger.

A: (as boyfriend) Yes, I have made mistakes in my life and one of the mistakes I have made was assuming that she wasn't well and that she needed help. She is a woman who has her own mind and can control her own situation. I didn't know how independent she was.

Maria is nodding approvingly as Arny voices the feelings of the boyfriend while explaining what Maria has done. Maria now shakes hands with the nurse and tells her to leave. This interchange is fascinating because at one point the situation took itself out of the role play. Above, when Maria and the other woman were approaching the nurse, Arny intervened by simply narrating what was going on, setting the scene, so to speak. Remember that Maria pushed Arny out. That is an essential point in her work. At that moment, she was also pushing Arny out, saying to him as well as to the nurse or to her boyfriend, that she is independent and did not need his help as a therapist. Not only could she assert herself to the nurse, but she was able to be assertive in the real-life situation with Arny, when she was unhappy that he was leading her.

At various times Maria has brought out, seemingly out of context, that she was thinking about the daughter. This theme now repeats.

M: I am now thinking about the daughter. Sometimes she is impossible. (She says this smiling.)

A: You think she is impossible. But are you satisfied with what happened here. (Arny has not yet caught on to the possible importance of the daughter and is very concerned that she was able to get something from her previous interaction with the nurse.)

M: Yes.

A: Do you have an idea about why you put your hands on her neck?

M: No, except maybe instead of my boyfriend, I did it to her.

Addressing this new piece of information is a dead end. Maria brings up the daughter again. Arny picks up on this now and asks her why the daughter is so impossible. Maria explains that the daughter likes her father better than she likes Maria and that she does exactly what she wants. The daughter has been the missing piece. She is the part of Maria who really is an independent person and does whatever she wants. This is the pattern that Maria has been looking for. Arny now tries to put her in contact with this.

A: What does your daughter do?

M: She does whatever she wants.

A: Can you show me? Be the daughter for a while.

Maria sticks out her tongue at Arny and then makes other provocative noises and smiles.

M: She kicks and never does what I want to her to do.

A: She has a mind of her own and doesn't follow others, does she?

M: No, she doesn't. She says "I will go and live with my father and I am very happy to not see you for fifteen days."

Arny suggests that they make an experiment and go back to the scene with the nurse and see what the daughter would do if someone whom she did not like came into the house. Maria immediately corrects him and says that she wants to do it with the boyfriend and not the nurse. This is indicative that the scene with the nurse is really finished. She said before that she went for the nurse, but really wanted to go for the boyfriend. Therefore, it makes sense that she would direct things back to the interaction with the boyfriend. It is also impressive that she is leading the direction of the work, asserting which route is important for her. She is already using this new-found independence in her interactions with Arny by having her own ideas and desires.

Maria now uses the daughter's behavior with the boyfriend. She tells him to go away and says that she does what she wants to do. She tells him that he cannot press her. The word "press" is a word implying movement; throughout the work there have been lots of hand and arm motions, and there is also the strangling activity with the hands. Therefore, it is important for Maria to also engage in movement. She invites the pressing in this case, challenging the boyfriend by saying that he cannot press her. Arny takes up this challenge and tells her he can press her. He then physically engages by pushing and pressing her.

Maria, formerly so shy and adapted, now pushes him back and beams with pleasure. Arny verbalizes his part, telling her to be nice and that he does not like women who have their own minds. She then asserts that she can do things for herself and protect herself. In one strong gesture she presses him up against the wall, looking happy and lively. She says that she feels finished and sits down triumphantly.

Discussion

Besides the obvious power of the content of this work, there are also interesting structural elements. The whole taoist idea that nothing be discarded is applicable here. The daughter was a crucial part for Maria, even though she always seemed to mention her out of context. However, it only appears out of context to an observer; the daughter was mentioned when Maria was at an edge to be independent and was searching for a pattern to do so. Maria needed to get to the daughter because the daughter was the one who was really able to stand up for her own independent self. She could fight back. Maria went through the other interventions; it was true she did tell the nurse to leave. However, it soon became clear that the boyfriend, rather than the nurse, was the true problem. Maria needed to be assertive with him, and for this behavior she needed the model of the daughter to help her.

A big discussion revolving around the culture that Maria comes from occurred after this work. In this culture women are

supposed to follow men and be subservient to them. Women must walk in back of the men and only men are allowed to talk. Women cannot argue with men, nor are they allowed to fight with them. In this culture women are forbidden affect and expected to stay at home. The women, however, may fight with each other. Therefore, what Maria attempted to do with the nurse was behavior that was allowed. For her to fight and interact with Arny the way she did was far outside of her cultural belief and was a huge accomplishment.

The governing cultural beliefs also explain why all of her earlier fantasies about killing did not occur when she was with her boyfriend. They were not allowed to occur there. When she and her boyfriend are separate she is independent enough to feel her independence and contact the rage and jealousy that she has towards him. The fantasy about the boyfriend committing suicide in the lift was due to the fact that she really would have liked to have had a violent interaction with him. However, she could not do it, so the lift had the affect forbidden to her. Her unconscious desire to have a violent interaction with him explains why she said after they had enacted the scene that she felt guilty about causing him to die in the lift. Her aggression was also present when she initially told the story and simultaneously made fists.

In a culture where women are forbidden affect, especially anger and physical fighting, the affect is projected into a fantasy, or it comes out in her sleep, bypassing her normal waking

consciousness. The extremity of the affect is due to the fact that it is forbidden. There are no models in this culture for men and women having a fight together where the woman is powerful and capable of bringing in her various feeling states. This case shows us the relativity of so-called psychotic states and how they are actually in part created by the cultural atmosphere (Mindell, 1988). Maria is really a city shadow, trying to live part of her individuation process in a culture which totally represses her. Being an independent woman is something which is perhaps easier now in western culture, but for Maria it is a new world view, and from her cultural standpoint she is undertaking a heroic task.

Learning how to process rage and violence and to bring it out in a useful way is a collective problem for all of us. Maria's process presents the dangers of a culture which forbids affect and its free expression to one of the parts of the culture, in this case, women. A culture which forbids anger and aggression inadvertently creates a tendency for a more violent and brutal expression of these states and cannot use the potential growth and liveliness inherent in such expressions.

Afterthoughts

This chapter has shown a few examples of people dealing with common human situations, trying to make something out of the most base and rejected drives of human existence. It is heroic to go down into these murky areas with little pattern and to find something meaningful. As I have written, we do not receive much

guidance in affectual matters in our religious systems. However, I find it interesting to note that the gods do not seem to do much better than we do. Most mythology is full of jealous and angry gods, the Greek pantheon perhaps being the most infamous. Additionally, we find in the Judeo-Christian background that

The original sin of eating the fruit was a sin of man against God, one of infinite proportion. 'Sin must be compensated for, otherwise God's justice is outraged.'
(Smith, 1958, p. 290)

Here we find a pervasive governing pattern of a god who is also prone to big affect. No wonder we have so much work to do!

CHAPTER FIVE:

ON GOOD AND EVIL

Background of Evil in Religion

In the last chapter we focused on some of humanity's strong affectual states and how they can be not only a cause of suffering but also a meaningful part of existence. The world has lacked sufficient tools to make these states meaningful and has thus tried to eliminate them. Another common world view deems these states evil. This chapter will discuss some of our world views connected to the issues of good and evil. Much literature has been written in this area, and there is of course more to be said: I will surely not be able to give this theme the detailed attention it merits. Nevertheless, I will give an overview of some of our life philosophies concerning good and evil and introduce Jake, a man who is struggling with questions in this area.

The prophetic religions all share a similar myth in which jealousy, ambition, and the need for love are the background motivations for evil. In an Islamic myth Allah creates man from clay and the angels come to look at the new creations. One of the angels, Iblis, which means "despair", kicks the new creations because he knows that Allah intends to make Adam more important

than any angel. Iblis is too puffed up with pride, and refuses to honor Adam. In anger Allah declares that Iblis is to be cast out of heaven. Iblis then pleads with Allah to grant him time, and to allow him to tempt Adam and his sons to see if they will be worthy of Allah's honor and have faith. Allah grants his wish until the Day of Judgment. Then Iblis will pay for his evil deeds and be cast out of heaven into a dark pit, never again to harm any souls (Mercatante, 1978, p. 68).

The test proposed to Allah by Iblis recalls Satan's proposal to God in the Book of Job in the Old Testament, and Iblis's final punishment recalls the last days of Satan described in the Book of Revelation in the New Testament, when he will be finally bound in a bottomless pit. (Mercatante, 1978, p. 68)

The similarities of the Islamic myth and the story of Job are striking, and present us with a God who appears somewhat less than moral. Both Allah and Yahweh fall prey to the thoughts of Iblis and Satan, and cruelly test their most faithful servants. Jung, in one of his most moving and passionate books, Answer to Job (1954), clearly reveals a God who is amoral, made up of a totality of good and evil and lacks consciousness of himself.

If Yahweh, as we would expect of a sensible human being, were really conscious of himself, he would, in view of the true facts of the case, at least have put an end to the panegyrics on his justice. But he is too unconscious to be moral. Morality presupposes consciousness. (1958, p. 372)

Jung remarks that Satan always escapes punishment by God, and that God therefore lacks an awareness of his own darker side. Through the incarnation of Christ, God clearly identifies himself with his lighter aspects and believes in his own goodness. His

darker nature falls by the wayside and Jung claims that this split could well be the meaning of the belief in the coming of the Antichrist (1958, p. 433). Jung questions our human abilities in light of those of the divinity.

But Yahweh is forgetting his son Satan, to whose wiles even he occasionally succumbs. How then could he expect man with limited consciousness and imperfect knowledge to do any better? (1958, p. 415)

Jung's daring book is a challenge to us all; its main thesis, based on Job's heroic victory by being able to simultaneously keep his faith in God and become conscious of God's dual nature, is a plea to us all to reflect and become aware of this darker side of the divinity.

Religious myths, such as the above, have been very disturbing to the monotheistic world view and the belief in a good and merciful God. Iblis and Satan cannot act unless the one supreme god grants them permission. There is no equality between God and Iblis or Satan. The supreme ruler is God who allows or prevents the presence of evil (Mercatante, 1978, p. 68). Believing in one god implies that our world view has to include both good and evil. If we do not believe that god is the source of evil then we are not monotheistic and have to believe in some higher authority which is responsible for evil. Jung (1958) claims that the Bible does not deal with evil and offers a provocative reason why it cannot. "In a monotheistic religion everything that goes against God can only be traced back to God himself" (p. 169).

Such conflicts and questions have filled volumes on the topics of humanity's free will, the Trinity, and the nature of the

divinity. However, two main views have been established in the debate over the question of good and evil. One is the idea of a god who creates everything, including good and evil. The other is the idea of a god who transcends evil, removing himself from the sphere of human action.

While the Jews, Christians, and Muslims have occupied themselves with the disturbing ramifications of positing one god who embodies the highest good in a world full of both good and evil, the more mystical religions of the far east understand duality in another way. Since all perception and sensory experience is an illusion, dualities of good and evil do not exist. There is one absolute and undivided whole, and even naming good or evil will imply its opposite. All separation and duality is false, and nirvana is the only true reality (Zaehner, 1967, p.307). If evil had to be named it would be seen as the finite world, the world of illusion or maya. This world is the world of duality, and thus the world of suffering. In the Hindu world, to transcend maya is to transcend evil (Murti, 1982, p. 33). Within the finite world evil does exist and humankind is totally responsible for it. The Buddha is detached and unaffected, but man is angry, needy, and greedy and therefore creates his own evil (Mercatante, 1978, p. 119).

Side by side with the above world views of one transcendent being, are the Hindu and Buddhist concepts of various gods, goddesses and demons. In one of the Hindu creation myths Brahma creates both gods and demons (Mercatante, 1978, p. 108). The God

Vishnu is recognized by many as the supreme being from which all things originate. He manifests himself in the world in various incarnations, incarnating in order to correct some form of evil in the world (Mercatante, 1978, pp. 110-111). In Buddhism, Mara, the evil one, tries to distract the future Buddha with earthly desires. The far eastern picture of evil manifests itself in the world of earthly desires, the world of duality and suffering.

The Taoist standpoint is also to transcend the concepts of good and evil. Categorizing one constellates the other. The Taoist recognizes the relativity and subjectivity of such concepts and thinks that everything is right and in order according to its nature (Welch, 1966, chap. 1). Taoism later developed a pantheon of gods. In the earliest stories they were located in different parts of the body, and later they were externalized (p. 130). In a strong contrast to Judeo-Christian belief, government officials and Taoist priests would gather and judge the gods! If a god was not doing his job he was informed that he was only powerful because the people worshipped him and that if he did not shape up they would no longer trust his powers (pp. 138-139). In the Taoist pantheon the gods were not powerful as actual individuals but were identified with the roles and offices they held (p. 138). This would be a radical model for the Judeo-Christian world.

The State-Oriented Nature of Evil

Eliminating or transcending evil is a pervasive world view. Mercatante (1978) has collected myths on the theme of good and

evil from all over the world. Besides Iblis and Satan, is Mara, the evil one in Buddhist mythology, and there are others whose evil doings are motivated by ambition, greed, jealousy, hurt, and anger. An accurate picture of how most people deal with their feelings appears in these myths. Iblis was "puffed up with pride," too proud to ask Allah for the attention he needed. It appears that what is called evil emerges from unprocessed feelings, or as Jung says, unconsciousness.

One of the toughest roots of all evil is unconsciousness, and I wish that the saying of Jesus, 'Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed, but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed, and a transgressor of the law,' were still in the gospels, even though it has only one authentic source. It might well be the motto for a new morality. (Jung, 1958, p. 197)

The governing view of evil is that it is a state to be eliminated. Evil has been understood as the world, maya, Satan, or particular qualities and affects. All these descriptions are of certain states. That which we do not understand we tend to make static. We label it and freeze its dynamism because we lack the ability to unfold it. Process work shows that evil is a process. Jung (1958) understands the process-oriented nature of evil when he says that:

Life, being an energetic process, needs the opposites, for without opposition there is, as we know, no energy. Good and evil are simply the moral aspects of this natural polarity. (p. 197)

Good and evil are state-oriented terms which enable us to define, and through defining, catch a particular process. However, the states are only entry points, which assist us in going further to

contact the flow or energetic quality which unfolds. The attitude which considers good and evil to be starting points in larger processes is more useful than simply banishing a person or a quality. To this point, eliminating that which is considered evil has been the most common option. We have seen how both Iblis and Satan will be destroyed and cast away in a bottomless pit. This theme also occurs in a Persian myth in which Anriman, the evil one, is imprisoned in a cave (Mercatante, 1978, p. 36). In Jewish folklore Asmodeus, "the destroyer," is a demon of lust and is responsible for many bad things. He is imprisoned in a large jar. The theme of confining evil in matter or banishing it repeats itself over and over. We clearly have a tendency to confine that which we do not understand to a state.

Dr. Scott Peck, author of People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil (1983), suffers over this problem of evil as do most people. He too, naturally disturbed by the horror of innumerable human problems, approaches evil by attempting to confine it. His work sets out to prove that absolute evil exists, that some people are absolutely evil, and that evil should be a category of mental illness. He defines evil as anything that is against life and kills spirit, and suggests that one develops a 'revulsion countertransference' in reaction to evil people (pp. 66-67). His diagnosis of evil as a mental illness and his specific definition of what is evil enforce the already extremely static concept of evil. By making anything into a state we have less access to its potential living wisdom. Our normal behavior is to isolate and define that which we think is bad and to thus

disidentify with it.

This disidentification does not work well. Process work has shown that that with which we do not identify with lives autonomously in the form of body symptoms and illnesses (Mindell, 1982, 1985a). Therefore, making a process into a state can be compared to locking the spirit up in the body. The Gnostics too believed that the soul or divine spark was imprisoned in the body and had to escape. Matter was believed to be evil and it was only by gnosis, or "knowledge", that the spirit could free itself of the body (Mercatante, 1978, p. 55). Far eastern thought, similar to alchemical thought, understood the goal of life to be transcending the body and freeing the spirit. Another potential view of evil could be that that which is cast into matter is only evil in so far as it is unable to connect up to its energetic process. It thus remains steady and fixed in a dormant state, waiting to be unfolded.

Our world-wide ambition to rid the planet of so-called evil has never been realized. The prison system is ineffective in that people often leave prisons more angry than when they arrived. Released prisoners often offend repeatedly, committing the same crimes for which they were originally incarcerated. The concept of capital punishment supports the idea that there is such an entity as absolute unchangeable evil. Leaving the state-oriented attitudes of evil could be a new direction; for example, attempting to discover the meaning or purpose of the criminal behavior. For example, a brutal and violent man discovers that he needs this brutality because in many areas of his life he is

too weak and adapted. This particular man was 40 years old and living with his mother. He was unable to stand up to her and live on his own. Standing up to and leaving his mother was a brutal act for this overly adapted man. His ability to do this¹¹ alleviated his other violent outbursts.

Intrapsychically, we are also not successful in simply weeding out evil; our means mirror those of society. Seeing certain qualities as states, we attempt to banish the devilish, critical, and tyrannical parts of our personalities. Repression is sometimes useful; when we are unable to work with something volatile or frightening, we sometimes need to put it away while we explore other resources. However, as mentioned earlier, parts or information cannot be lost; they can only change places or become less accessible to us. Hence, any part pushed away as evil does not disappear, and the problem persists on another level. Qualities which are considered evil are like any others; they search for someone to perceive their messages and spirits. Process work shows that parts of the personality become more aggressive, hurtful, and troublesome in their methods when their message is not sufficiently understood. Let's take a look at Jake.

The Detached Devil

Jake is attending a seminar on the theme of serious illness and dying. This seminar is meant for the public and all sorts of people are attending. Jake is a young man in his 30s who has

difficulty walking. He drags one of his legs behind him. On the third morning of the seminar, Jake spontaneously addresses the group. He says that he has been very affected by the seminar, and needs to get something off his chest. He asks the group if it would be all right for him to speak. The group warmly encourages him. He takes out a piece of paper and refers to it as he speaks.

J: Since I have been diagnosed with a fatal disease, I have felt strongly about writing things down. For such a long time now I have tried to express my anger, my fear, my hatred, my embarrassment, and my humiliation with only one person; myself. However, after trying different things I still find myself full of those feelings and I think they are stronger now than they were before.

I want a concrete answer to my problems. I want to be cured of my disease. I don't want any maybes. I keep searching for the answer that I want to hear, but when I listen for that answer there is only silence. So, I keep asking the question and I continue to hear nothing. So my simple question has become my fulltime enemy. It is a question that lets me feel like there is a chance to get a little closer to the answer but then it returns with the strength that is so overpowering. It knocks me back further than I was before. Then I become exhausted to the point of falling to its persistent ability to drive me nuts and nag me to pieces. (He desperately flings the paper around.) And, yesterday, for the first time in my life I actually got to see and touch that bastard question. I felt it. (He drops his paper and speaks with lots of feeling, anger and tears, pauses and then goes on.) I hate it. I am having a hard time dealing with it and it doesn't go away. (It is hard for Jake to speak, his voice is shaky and he is holding himself up with his elbows on his knees.) I am having a hard time arguing with this persistent nag that there is no solution for it this time. And I think it is going to make me bananas if I don't learn how to confront it and deal with it and set it aside. It is the essential question. Just when I think I have gotten a little bit of a solution and relief, it comes back and hits me right between the eyes. What in the hell is the use of trying!

The room of 100 people is totally silent; people are all entranced by his power and passion.

A: You know, I think you are asking this question for everybody,

because everyone asks it, but most people are shy about formulating it. So,...

J: So what can I do? I guess I am stereotyped in the sense that there is not a pill that I can take for my solution.

A: Let's work on it. Should we do it right now?

The whole group enthusiastically agrees to focus on Jake, who drags himself slowly into the center of the room. His emotion and intensity are very powerful and moving. For structural purposes, however, I would like to mention that the question that Jake is disturbed by is his secondary process. He calls it his enemy. He suffers from it. In fact, it is so unknown to him that he never states the question directly. Along with a great deal of emotion is a profound lack of information. We can guess that the question has to do with his disease; he says he wants a concrete answer to his problems, a cure, and that there is no pill which will be his solution. He appears to be struggling with the essential question of life and fate. Jake is in a position we all experience, suffering and begging for an explanation of our fate. We are reminded of Jesus on the cross, turning in agony to the heavens and pleading, "Why hast thou forsaken me?"

A: The disease that is bugging you, the diagnosed thing, you didn't mention its name. Is it difficult to talk about? (Jake sighs.) Is it AIDS?

J: Yeah. It is not difficult to talk about. It was for a while. It made me feel dirty. Unclean. But I have changed a lot of things in my life so I would make sure I would not... (pause) How could I say this? I don't want anyone to get AIDS, ever. If I had the power to stop anybody from getting AIDS I would.

A: How long have you had it and what were your first symptoms?

J: My first symptom was a red spot on my chin and nose. They biopsied the spot and it was carposi's sarcoma, a common cancer with AIDS patients. Back then they didn't have the HIV test. In a few months it will be six years. So, you could understand why it's eating me. It's getting a little tiring.

A: It is eating at you.

J: It is eating at me. I always feel it is a relief to go to the doctor and take a pill and go home and feel better. Well, there is no pill for this. The only relief is that you are supposed to die within twenty-four months. Well, I am sorry but it has been a lot longer and every day feels like a year. I do enjoy being alive. But I have about one friend left that isn't dead. I watch what is going to happen to me. I don't want it to happen to me and somehow I have been preventing it from happening to me.

A: What do you think you are doing that is keeping you over the twenty-four month statistic? You needn't know, but I just wondered if you had a hunch.

J: I have a very strong (He pauses for a long time, and points to his chest as he speaks.) desire to not hurt my mother's feelings. (He is sad but then looks sheepish, like a shy little boy.)

A: (Arny looks at him incredulously) Ahh. (Jake laughs and looks down, covering his mouth like a child who has said something forbidden. Everyone giggles.) It is so irrational, it must be right. Yeah, your mother's feelings.

J: She saved my life. She dropped everything to come be with me. She held me when I was bedridden for almost a year. I couldn't walk. I could barely go to the bathroom myself. She left an important job to sit with me by my bed for four months and hold me like her baby. I didn't get better and then she finally threw all of my things in boxes and said "If I have to tape your legs and arms together, you are coming home with me and I am going to make you well." That is when I weighed 118 pounds and my skin was ash grey and I looked like a skeleton. I gained 43 pounds in about six months and felt fine. I think it must be really the pits to visualize myself as a mother, where you give birth to this baby, (He is very moved, teary and holds an imaginary baby in his hands.) and you nurture it and raise it (crying) and you feel great and then you have to sit there and watch it die and IT MUST SUCK! (He is furious now.) And god damn it, I am not going to ruin her feelings like that! She's better than that. And I am not going to let AIDS make me do that to her. I resent that. And I don't know what you call that kind of power that she had.

A: Love.

J: That is one reason I don't want to die, the strongest

reason. Another reason was I wanted to go to Disneyland before I died. (Everyone laughs and he shyly looks down.) And I did. I did it all. It is nice to do it in a wheelchair: you don't have to wait in line.

Arny asks if his mother is at the seminar. Jake says no, she is not but points to his heart and says she is there. He then complains again about not finding a cure and about how his search for a solution and his question make him crazy. After the long introduction and moving story, Arny now wants to find out Jake's direct and individual experience of AIDS. Arny asks him how he would know he had AIDS if there were no diagnosis. What is his experience of the cancer?

Jake's experience of cancer is that it is ugly, "terribly ugly." He experiences the cancer in a visual channel, by seeing it. He speaks with disgust as he explains that the cancer is everywhere, on his legs, back, thighs, arms, the roof of his mouth, between his toes, and on his butt. He also informs us that his difficulty in walking is not due to the cancer itself, but to the radiation treatment designed to fight the cancer. The doctors destroyed his leg by forgetting that the machine was on and leaving him too long. Jake is angry and resentful and says that he felt like he was being burnt.

A: What I would like to do is to try and be helpful to you by getting you in touch with the parts that disturb you the most and learning how to transform some of that disturbance. Now, you say you see it, all over. If you look at yourself in the mirror, what does it look like?

J: It looks like blemishes. (Jake sounds disgusted.) It looks like hell. They are unattractive. It bugs me because being gay in our society right now, if you are not attractive, you better just grab a book and sit in a rocking chair by yourself. It is a fact for right now, a social fact. I don't

want to be ugly and it is ugly.

A: That is helpful. I don't want to be ugly either. I know you don't want to be ugly, but since this ugly thing that is happening, I am guessing that there might be something of value in it. Obviously, 99% of it is just troubles and wrecks parts of your life. But in that ugliness could be something very important, and I would like to get closer to what you are calling that ugly spot. I am going to guess that it is not really ugly, and I want to get closer to it.

Arny wants to get closer to the ugliness because this is Jake's own unique experience of his AIDS. It is the part which disturbs him and which is other than him. Jake says that "It" is ugly, rather than "I" am ugly. This indicates that the experience of the ugliness is further from his identity, something with which he has little contact. Arny asks him if he can imagine something ugly, or make an ugly movement, or sound. Jake responds immediately.

J: The way Linda Blair looked when the devil possessed her body in the movie The Exorcist. It was the most horrifying thing I could ever visualize happening to a human being. The devil possessed the girl, not only her mind, but her body. It was so disgusting and it was downright dirty. It was grotesque and enough to make me not turn my lights out for a week. (People laugh and feel with him.) It was really ugly.

A: What you are talking about sounds very real. What I would like to try now is to let you or me get a little bit of the devil in him just for a minute. Sometimes the devil isn't as bad as it looks at first sight. Let's pretend that a little bit of something devilish could get into me or you and let's process it together. You want to try?

J: Okay. I can be the devil.

Jake now becomes the devil and talks to Arny. As the devil, he speaks in a slimy and manipulative tone.

J: If you could have anything in the world that you like, (He puts his hands on Arny's shoulders.) and there was someone around who could give it to you, would you ask for it?

A: Sure.

J: (patting him on the back) Well, you met the right guy. It won't cost you a penny.

A: What a deal. First of all, I like what you are doing. You put your hand on my back and it feels good.

J: That is because I am going to be your best friend. You are going to love me to death.

A: You need me?

J: Yeah.

A: Well, take me.

J: Where do you want to go?

A: With you.

J: Well then you got to play the game by my rules.

A: I promise to play almost completely by your rules.

J: No matter what. There is no turning back once we start to go. This is a commitment.

A: I never thought it would be anything different. I knew that as soon as I got close to you this would happen. I want to be with you, so I am going to go on the road with you.

J: I might require you to do some things you might not think are(pause)

A: Are ethical?

J: Aww, who cares about ethics.

A: You might require things of me that are,...

J: That are not pleasant to other people around you. See that nice young man over there? Well, here in my pocket I got this great virus. It's my pet virus.

A: Great, let's go and give it to him.

J: There is one thing...it is a deadly virus.

A: I didn't expect it would be otherwise.

Here Army is joining Jake's fantasy system in an attempt to get closer to the devil. Befriending the devil is the first step in

getting to know him. Arny's laissez faire attitude with the devil brings him into the system with Jake. Shock or hesitation in reaction to the devil's suggestions would push Arny further from the devilish part. In a sense, Arny models the devil by being just as cool and unaffected as he is. This cool and unaffected quality that Jake portrays is actually the beginning of a more profound process that he is yet to discover.

The devil and Arny then go looking for someone to infect with the virus. The devil does not want to kill his victim too quickly, but to make him suffer and wonder. At this point Arny addresses the group, saying that he is well aware of the radical nature of what they are doing. He encourages the group to be a little bit patient. Arny and Jake then find a woman in the group and decide to give her the virus.

J: Let's get the ones with the biggest hearts.

A: (to the woman they picked as the victim) Hi, you're the lady with the big heart. We have something for you.

Arny and Jake pretend to give this woman a cup of coffee with the virus hidden in it.

A: What is so important, and what is wrong with her having that big heart?

J: (pauses) I just think it will be fun to hurt it.

A: Me too, wouldn't it? (They both laugh.) I think it is fun to hurt people a little bit sometimes, just a little bit?

J: Sometimes. Maybe?

A: A little bit sometimes. Maybe we can give her a mini-coffee.

Now we are getting down to the basic nature of this devil. When

Jake says "Sometimes. Maybe?" he has reached a point of philosophical crisis. He is a warm and feeling man; throughout the work we feel his sensitivity and love for others, especially when he speaks about his mother. For Jake it is almost impossible to be even a bit hurtful. Before this point, the dialogue with this devil has been more or less organized by the perceptions of his primary process. Therefore, we have met an unapproachable devil who tries to scare us off. The primary process experiences anything which it does not comprehend as scary and unapproachable, more evil than it actually is. The primary process begins the role playing using its ideas and representations to create the figure of the devil. As we get more deeply into the role play, the primary process ideas peel away and we approach the core issue which concerns this devil. Another way to understand this is that we leave the primary process perceptual system and contact the system of the devil itself.

A: Now this is going to be the difficult thing. Sometimes it might even be a little right to hurt a little teeny bit. Not a lot, but a little bit, to take a piece of that devil.

Here the central issue is clear. Jake has reached the edge of his governing life philosophy, and is like most people in this situation. The new role, in this case, that of the devil, becomes a little shaky and we want to run back to our known world view. Arny tries to model the new behavior for Jake. They have switched roles. Arny is the devil who can be hurtful, and Jake is his apprentice.

A: I am sometimes hurtful too. I have things inside of me that could hurt her. For example, occasionally I have to say something nasty. Sometimes I can be really nasty. I can say "god damn it." (slaps his thigh) Little things like that. Then she has a few sniffs and it's done.

J: As your apprentice I guess I haven't really learned how to be a total son of a bitch.

The roles now drop and Arny challenges Jake to be slightly negative or critical. The roles are no longer necessary because we have gotten to the crux of the devilish personality, and Jake is at a big edge. Arny asks if Jake has any criticisms or negative opinions about him. Jake says no, but then adds that he just feels so much hatred and rage. The hatred and rage are the negative and devilish feelings which he needs to discover more about. Arny asks him what it is like to feel this hatred and rage.

J: Oh god it is like: I DON'T WANT TO HAVE ANYMORE FRIGGIN DISEASES!!! (Jake is furious. He looks angry and clenches his fists.) IT IS DRIVING ME OUT OF MY GOD DAMN MIND! I WANT TO LIVE! I AM NOT GOING TO DIE. I AM NOT GOING TO DIE IN MY HEART. I DON'T CARE IF MY BODY DIES. YES I DO CARE IF MY BODY DIES. I LIKE MY BODY EVEN THOUGH IF IT IS A LITTLE UGLY RIGHT NOW. I USED TO BREAK AND THROW THINGS. I USED TO TRY AND HARNESS THIS ANGER AND NOT GRAB A PERSON BECAUSE I WOULD HURT THAT PERSON AND I DON'T WANT TO HURT ANYONE.

He calms down a little, not angry now, but in tears. He is on his knees. He swings his arms and cries as he says the following:

J: Nobody wants to see anybody die. I held a man in my arms. (crying) I am careful to say this now, because it might incriminate me. But it's been on my mind and I need to say it. We helped him die. His heart wouldn't stop. He was a vegetable. He couldn't eat anymore. He couldn't open his eyes anymore and he couldn't take any more medicine. So, with the help of some professionals, I can't mention names...

A: You helped him die.

J: We got him some morphine. It is the only way, you know, to sleep. Shit, this is a secret I was never ever supposed to tell anyone, but it should be told.

A: You needn't tell secrets.

J: I want to. We injected a 100% mixture of morphine, which is illegal, (pause) and in a few minutes it was over. (crying guiltily) And I feel like I murdered my friend. And I am not a murderer. (Arny moves forward and touches him.)

A: Well, that was a merciful devil. I don't want to make it into a good devil, but he was merciful.

J: I can't ask anyone to tell me if it was the right thing to do or the wrong thing to do. He wanted us to do it.

A: Then it was the right thing to do.

J: He tried it himself and when he ended up in the hospital and I visited him there, he said, 'Damn, it didn't work.'

A: Well, I would like to say something to you about that. I would like you to take a little bit of credit for what you did. I think it was a magnificent thing. I think it was a tough thing that you did.

J: It sucked.

A: I am glad that I didn't have to do it. I am glad that you could do it. Listen, the part who did that was the devilish thing inside of you, that same energy.

J: It doesn't go away.

A: You are straightforward. I don't know for sure, but if you take that devilish energy and do more with it, it might be something like this. (Arny models the devil's energy.) This is how cool you might get with someone. You see a person who has tried to kill himself many times, and that person says 'god damn it, they won't let me do it.' Maybe you would offer them some better methods for doing it. This is still a democracy. A person has a right to die. Especially people like your friend, who wanted to die. There could be moments when dying is very right. An attitude like this, very matter of fact, would be the devil integrated.

J: They put people in jail for things like that.

A: They do. And as someone here dreamed last night, some of those people in jail might be doing things that aren't right for the culture at a given moment. That doesn't mean that relative to your totality they are the wrong things to do. The fact that you are crying and that you have such a big heart balances the whole situation. You are not a murderer.

You are a little devilish. That's a lot better.

Jake has had this poignant recollection at a crucial moment. You may recall that he was at an edge to be a little hurtful or negative. His governing life philosophy is something like the following: it is important to be loving and sensitive to people and to never be hurtful, negative or critical. This is a beautiful world view; no one could possibly dispute it, and it seems almost disrespectful to suggest another perspective. However, within his AIDS process, another side of Jake is asking for integration. At the edge of his identity he accesses a particular memory. This is a typical phenomenon; the story he remembers attempts to give him a pattern for something that is very far away from the way he thinks about himself. Naturally, this story is disturbing to him. At the time it occurred, the devil was not an integrated part of his personality; it just overcame him in an extreme moment. The story is crucial because it contains the seed for something he needs much more awareness about. The unknown territory is not only learning to be a little bit negative. It is the beginning of a totally new view.

The additional piece of awareness which is so difficult for Jake to pick up is: detachment. Arny and Jake discuss the detachment that is necessary sometimes in life; one is detached from so-called normal human feelings. If one is detached, it is possible to say 'that's how things are,' rather than remaining stuck in a particular feeling state. Detachment in Jake's story might be, in the midst of the painful scene with his friend, to be able to say, 'yes, he wanted to die, and my fate is to help him.' The

primary process uses the words 'being hurtful' to describe the state of detachment. From the standpoint of his primary identity, which includes his strong feelings towards others and the attachment to his emotional states, detachment does feel hurtful. Detachment appears hurtful because it does not possess the same kinds of feeling concerns as his primary identity does. This devilish thing which disturbs him is really the essence of detachment.

Jake now turns his attention back to his nagging question about finding a cure for AIDS. Arny tells him to ask the devil the question. When Jake does this the devil actually gives two answers simultaneously. One is a verbal message: "Check back with me in a week." The other is non-verbal: he smiles, his head bobbing up and down, and shrugs his shoulders as if he does not care at all about the question. We can see that his verbal content is still connected to his primary process ideas about what the devil would say. However, the devil is also speaking secondarily through his body signals. Arny tries to help Jake contact these somatic signals.

A: I like how you bob up and down, and shrug your shoulders. What kinds of feelings go along with those motions?

J: The feelings are: "Oh Jesus, what else could happen this week!?" (He lifts one arm in the air, looks away, and with a big exhalation lets his arm fall.)

These body signals and the words that go along with them illustrate a state of detachment. Jake is such a feeling person that it is extremely difficult for him to identify himself with

the detachment. One of the times that such detachment is necessary is when we become so stuck in one side of ourselves that we need a certain detachment in order to disidentify with that momentary state and notice other parts of ourselves as well. Detachment is an incredibly difficult thing for anyone in Jake's situation to pick up. From the standpoint of his primary identity, being detached is blasphemous.

At this point, detachment is present in the way he repeatedly looks away, seemingly uninvolved in his primary concerns, and in his ability to meta-comment: "What else could happen this week!" Although we seldom identify with it, we all know this feeling. Detachment happens spontaneously when we have come to the end of all of our efforts and intentions and there is nothing left but to shrug our shoulders, turn our palms upward and give up, not caring what happens anymore. This is not giving up and becoming hopeless, but giving up our primary intentions, and resigning ourselves to some higher power. Jake demonstrates this when he says, "Oh Jesus..." Such detachment is actually the answer to his nagging question. We find a pattern for this in Judaism in relation to suffering (Smith, 1958). One can either endlessly suffer and give up and die, or one can search for the meaning in impossible situations. The ancient Jews chose meaning (pp. 246-249).

Army integrates the devilish detachment by using Jake's primary perceptual system and organizing the secondary information in the form of a prescription, the answer his primary process has been seeking.

A: There is a cure to the illness that you have.

J: I want to know what it is.

A: Detachment.

J: Is it a pill?

A: Yup.

J: How many times a day do I have to take it?

A: Three.

J: Do I have to take it the rest of my life?

A: For the rest of your life and for the rest of eternity.

J: I am willing to give it a try.

A: Me too. Let's take it together.

J: All right.

A: I am taking my first pill right now.

J: What happens if you take two? Do they work quicker?

They both laugh and embrace, joking about taking their pills. .
The work ends and the whole room has been touched in a very special way.

Commentary

Jake's process is on the edge of cultural thinking. He is a very warm-hearted man who is being pressed to grow into a culturally unacceptable part of himself. He is much more identified with his mother, the one with the big heart. In the mercy killing he was actually able to integrate both parts of himself; he was whole, able to be not only heartfelt and feeling but devil-like and detached. Jake is one of those people who is no longer able

to uphold the cultural world view, but who is pressed from the inside to act in a very radical way. The cultural view is apparent in the fact that he is working with the devil, a collective figure for the Judeo-Christian world. The devil is the part which, in this culture, is most repressed, and least understood.

In the west, detachment appears devilish and is thus a new world view. Detachment in the far east is a more common pattern. The devil in the west looks like a classical eastern philosophy, Buddhism or detachment from ordinary feelings. Our attitudes towards life and death bring us to cultural borders. In the west, we stress the reality of this world on earth, and this life is extremely sacred. In the far east, this world is an illusion, and the body is to be transcended. Life and death are relative concepts in relation to the eternal essence of the soul. The eastern view gives one a certain detached attitude about living and dying. In the west, being detached about death is seen as irreverent.

Acausal Connections: A Collective Process

The group was very moved by Jake's work, and had a long discussion about the cultural ramifications of his process. The dream that one of the participants had about doing things that were right at the edge of cultural thinking indicates the importance of this theme for the entire group field. Mindell (1989b) has discovered that the dreams of a given field are the

dreaming background which connects the group members and structures events. Group life is not only determined by our intentions and causally-oriented connections. In this participant's dream, people were put in prison and tortured for going against the culture. During the dream the dreamer herself was upset by the imprisonment, and when she told the dream, others shared her feeling. At the beginning of this chapter the most common collective pattern identified in dealing with so-called evil has been to confine and imprison it. The dream mirrors the collective pattern and simultaneously suggests a cultural change which can be seen in the unhappiness with this current pattern. The dream indicates a collective process: a criminal or devilish aspect which the entire group and society needs to integrate. Every person has certain parts of him or herself which are on the edges of personal and collective culture. Because these parts are designated as evil by the primary world view, they are not integrated or used creatively in daily life. Instead they remain in darkness, and unconsciously become destructive and hurtful.

Another way to look at Jake's process is that he is expanding the Christian ideal of love. A profound and wide description of love might be: love is that which is able to support and see the meaning in many sides of an individual, regardless of the external culture or circumstance. This sort of love is not one-sided; it has no specific expectations, but follows nature and nourishes the many facets of human experience. In fact, one-sidedness is expressed by von Franz (1974) as evil: "...evil

entails being swept away by one-sidedness, by only *one single* pattern of behavior" (p. 147).

An Answer to the Unanswerable

Jake was struggling with an unanswerable question: in Zen Buddhism the way to enlightenment is through being posed an impossible question. The individual is given a koan, a question which cannot be answered by normal reason (Reps, Ed., 1957). The struggle to answer this question makes the individual almost mad, until he or she finally realizes that his reason cannot possibly answer. Enlightenment is this realization and the subsequent detachment. Smith (1958) writes that koans are designed to transcend the mind.

By paradox and puzzle it [the koan] will provoke, excite, baffle, and exhaust the mind until it sees that thinking is never more than thinking about, or feeling more than feeling about. Then having brought the subject to an intellectual and emotional impasse, it counts on a flash of sudden insight to bridge the gap between second and first-hand experience. The koan's contradictions increase pressure in the trainee's mind until the structures of ordinary reason collapse completely, clearing the way for sudden intuition. (p. 130)

Actually, we might understand the koan as a method to force us out of our governing life philosophies. In Jake's case, the koan was an individual method that arose naturally from his own process. As we have mentioned before, a life philosophy can only reflect back onto itself. The mind, or reason, has a similar reflective quality which the koan attempts to transcend. The new information that disturbs our life philosophies can be seen as

the koan; both the koan and disturbing information can be seen as sharing a similar function.

The koan appears illogical because reason operates within its own constructs - a structured framework of reference. But seen from another and quite opposite perspective than that of the reasoning mind trapped in its own operation, the koan has its own inexorable and transcendental 'logic' (Smith, 1958, p. 130).

We can thus see a deeper meaning in Jake's struggle with his nagging question. He cannot take a pill to find the solution. The world of rational and concrete answers is not available to him here, and this is just the point.

Childhood Dreams and Life Myths

In the discussion that followed Jake's work he shared his memory of a repeated childhood dream. Jake said that he was deathly afraid of water. In his dream he was in the water, going down, and he was intensely afraid of drowning. He then visualized himself reaching up to get air.

This is a picture of the central issue with which Jake has been struggling. The need to reach up and get air expresses the detachment he seeks. Like our chronic symptoms, childhood dreams depict essential parts of our life myths.

In working with childhood dreams, I've discovered that they point to a life pattern of the dreambody behavior. Very often, chronic illnesses appear in the childhood dreams. These major dreams pattern our lives, our problems with the world, and our body problems. (Mindell, 1985a, p. 67)

If we look at the process structure of Jake's experience of his AIDS, we can compare it to the structure of his childhood dream.

We may recall that Jake's experience of his AIDS or cancer was visual. He saw his blemishes and said they were ugly. The disturbing and unusual information occurred in the visual channel, indicating that working within this channel would yield a new experience. The same pattern occurs in his dream where the visual channel plays an important role leading him to a new world view. In the dream he must visualize himself reaching into the air; this is a life myth. His primary process as a feeling person is expressed in his fear of drowning, going down into the water, into his feelings, afraid that he will not come out. Seeing ourselves instead of feeling ourselves is a way to detach from our feeling states. Stepping out and making an internal picture encourages detachment in that it accesses another part of the personality. We are not only the one who is feeling, but also the one on the outside who is looking.

The Collective Nature of Illness

During the group's discussion an interesting point emerged about the collective nature of AIDS and illness. Mindell, who had returned from a trip to Africa just before this seminar, contributed an African understanding of disease. He had learned from the Africans he visited that disease is perceived as a possession by a collective and unintegrated spirit, and the Africans worked with the spiritual background of disease. Since rumors abound about the large number of people with AIDS on the African continent, Mindell asked some of the African people about AIDS. They claimed that there were no new diseases; rather, the

problem is the same as it has always been: a troubling spirit.

The early alchemists also believed that there was no division between matter and spirit. One of their essential goals was to free the imprisoned spirit from matter (Jung, 1968, pp. 295-297). Jung alludes to the possibilities that these ideas could have for physical and somatic processes:

It is quite clear that we have here a tendency not only to locate the mystery of psychic transformation in matter, but at the same time to use it as a *theoria* for effecting chemical changes. (p. 297)

Mindell (1982, 1985a, 1985b, 1989a) went further to develop the relationship between matter, or the body, and spirit. Process work demonstrates that in our body troubles lie the seeds of our development and that by focusing on our symptoms chemical and physical changes do occur.

Since there are always new diseases in our world it makes sense to not only work within the medical paradigm but to also expand and work with the spiritual background of disease. Process work is one method which gives this spiritual and noncausal view of illness more weight. The universal descriptions that Jake used to describe his AIDS: the devil, the ugliness, and the emphasis on being attractive all indicate a collective process with which many of us are occupied. Being more detached and going against the cultural feeling consensus is a collective spirit which is trying to come to life through his experiences. This new world view helps him with his initial presenting problem, AIDS. We often see this phenomenon in process work. Contacting a

secondary process that births a new view often transforms or brings a new perspective to the initial difficulty. This case is by no means exceptional; working with the spiritual and collective background also yields meaning for both the individual and the collective at large.

CHAPTER SIX:

UNVEILING THE CRITIC

Common Attitudes Towards Critics

Being criticized, judged, doubted, blamed, attacked, examined, discredited, distrusted, suspected, accused, condemned, and hated are frequent experiences which people endure and surprisingly enough, survive. The experience of suffering from criticism, judgment, and doubt occurs both internally and externally, in relationship. Such agony has led some to consider that these voices, ideas, and feelings might be created by a devil or evil spirit. Others who are psychologically oriented may understand such disturbances as super egos, parental complexes, inner judges, and so on. I believe that no matter how we understand or categorize this branch of human suffering, we all know its effects.

The suffering that most of us experience in these states and our desire to overcome persecution indicate that this is an area where people feel stuck, and where new models are lacking. The models we utilize are dependent upon the belief systems we have. Due to the prevalence of suffering, a common belief seems to be that the critic is powerful enough to annihilate us. Many of us stand helpless under attack, attempting to ignore critical

disturbances and proceed with our lives. Often the only means we have available to deal with the criticism is to block it out. We are thus frequently unaware of the constant inner criticism, but feel subtly depressed or put down. Another common belief is that the individual can overcome anything he or she wants. This life philosophy asserts that the will is the strongest part of the personality. Here we see a model of conquering the critic by strength, be it inner, or psychic strength, or physical force. In fact, it seems that both the belief that we are helpless and weak in the face of the critic, and the belief that the critic can be conquered, create a polarized system. On one side is a conqueror and on the other a victim. Both are locked in an eternal battle; a conqueror needs a victim and vice versa. By identifying with one side of the polarization, we remain within the system.

The polarization of victim and persecutor is the dominating structure in a system where the critic plays a leading role. There are various life philosophies which support this system and make stepping out of it difficult. Some of the more powerful ones are:

1. The belief that critics or disturbers should and can be annihilated.
2. One person, group, or part is the leader and the other parts must be overcome.
3. We strongly identify with one part of the system and believe that we are not the other.

These life philosophies support a monotheistic world view: one god or part is the ruling principle and cannot be questioned. All of the intent and force that has been applied to banishing the devil in Judeo-Christian belief is due to the threat he has posed to the fabric of a monotheistic world view. Indeed, how can such a figure have so much power in a world governed by one ultimate and good god? One has either to accept a godhead composed of both majesty and goodness and brutality and evil, or to postulate a powerful god confronted with a just-as-powerful adversary.

Monotheism is not only the belief in one god, but the philosophy that one side, part, god, person, or nation is the only correct one. The psychological structure of this belief system is tyrannical. Mindell (1987) has noted that most of us are internally tyrannized (p. 105). In other words, one part of the personality rules and others are rejected. Democracy is not only an external state for which many people strive, but an internal state where we are open to the expression of many parts of ourselves, even those which do not go along with our identities.

Models in Religion

That which is critical can be seen as either a part of the personality or an outer element or person which has been rejected by the majority. The history of our religious systems portrays the devil or heretic as the one who goes against the exclusive rule of god. The following are the models that the main religious systems of our time have employed to address critical

and doubting figures.

In many world religions the root of criticism and doubt is a devil or heretic from whom the divinity suffers as well. Judeo-Christian tradition presents the devil as a doubting thought which is said to reside in one of God's eyes (Jung, 1958, p. 375). We have already seen that this is a similar theme in Islam; Allah is influenced by the doubting thoughts of Iblis (Mercatante, 1978, p. 68). In Persian tradition Ahriman is the evil brother, represented as an agonized or negative thought (Guirand, Ed., 1959, pp. 315-316). Before the Buddha becomes enlightened under the Bodhi tree, Mara is the evil one who tempts him with self-doubt.

When the godhead is not unwittingly influenced by doubting thoughts, as in the story of Job, ignoring them is the preferred method. Another powerful model has been to create moral codes against any doubt or criticism. The Crusades, the spread of Islam by conquering, and the crucifixion of Jesus represent occasions where critics and doubters are overcome by force. In addition, in Judeo-Christian tradition, criticism of god leads to severe punishment. This is another occurrence of the pattern of overcoming a part with force. Until recently, Judaism has historically become a victim, remaining steadfast in its relationship to God and not reacting to or interacting with outer criticism. In missionary work, Christianity has shown a strong pattern of converting its critics; here the belief is that the Christian life is superior, and that those who do not conform

will be punished by God. The far east has another model: transcend the critic or doubt by not letting it attach itself to you. Doubt and criticism are illusion. Worldwide, the main message to individuals possessed by critical or doubting thoughts is: there is something wrong with you. You are possessed by an evil spirit, your life and living is wrong, you are out of tao, and you will be eternally damned.

The Process Paradigm

The patterns modeled in religion are also used by the common person in situations where he or she is criticized. Conquering, ignoring, transcending, converting, and giving up are all useful methods at one time or another. Even though the approaches vary, the basic philosophy towards the critic is the same, namely, to get rid of it as soon as possible, because it is useless and bad. Here the process paradigm makes a new contribution through its statement that what is happening is right and meaningful--even the most bizarre, painful, or destructive parts are potentially useful. This is a major philosophical difference because the goal is not to get rid of the critic, but to find out more about it on its own terms.

A world view which excludes some parts inevitably escalates the intensity with which the rejected part will push into the system. When a part is continually discriminated against, it will become more violent and desperate in its attempts to be recognized. We need only look at the world and observe how all of our attempts to eliminate critics, doubters, and disturbers are to no avail.

Repression encourages more extreme methods of expression, like violence. Thus, the philosophy of eliminating is not effective. Jung (1958), who wrote extensively on the relationship of psychology and religion, understood that this darker side of humanity cannot be eliminated, and remains a shadow of our society.

Good does not become better by being exaggerated, but worse, and a small evil becomes a big one through being disregarded and repressed. The shadow is very much a part of human nature... (p. 193)

Just as the devil or heretic has become an unintegrated and autonomous part within religion, that which is critical and doubting functions with the same unconscious autonomy, intrapsychically and in relationship and group life. The philosophy of eliminating and disregarding unintentionally assists in this autonomy. Autonomy is a symptom indicating that we have not found the way to communicate with a particular part, and it therefore acts as if it had no relationship to the rest of the personality or group. This is a crisis point. The present methodology is no longer effective and people, lacking the ability to change the situation, become hopeless. At such times, not only a new method but an entirely new philosophical standpoint is needed. Therefore, inviting the critic into the arena of life, bringing it into contact with other parts, is a revolutionary intervention. Later in this chapter we will look at some case studies in which the critic is approached with this philosophy.

The Nature of the Critic

Because the critic or doubter is unintegrated and has little conscious representation, it is not a very developed part of the personality. In fact, when one works psychologically with a critical part, some interesting facts emerge. The critic is not as powerful as it seems and actually needs help in order to bring its message across. Many of us are familiar with the internal experience of plaguing voices and thoughts which tell us that we are stupid or no good. Surprisingly, if we challenge these critical voices and demand that they explicitly tell us what is so stupid and awful, we often receive answers which are ridiculous and vague. Hoping to be noticed, the critic makes a big disturbance and lots of noise, but it often does not even know what it needs. Thus, it appears that the critic itself needs help in its expression.

In the tragic story of Job, the Hebrew God, Yahweh, is plagued by the doubting thought that his most devout servant, Job, is not faithful. Yahweh asserts that Job is faithful, but Satan, or the doubting thought, challenges him to prove it. Yahweh takes up the challenge and Job endures the most awful and devastating torture in order for Yahweh to settle his score with Satan. The point I want to bring out here is that the doubting thought had no basis in fact. While he knew that questioning Job's faith was ridiculous, Yahweh lacked the ability to get to the essence of Satan's doubt. Satan also lacked the ability to bring out the core of his dissatisfaction. We saw a similar scene with Allah and Iblis. Iblis kicks Adam, Allah's new creation, because he

thinks that Allah will make Adam more important than Iblis. Iblis' doubt convinces Allah to allow Iblis to tempt Adam in order to reveal his lack of faith. If we viewed this scene from the perspective of a family therapist, we would probably come to the conclusion that Iblis is jealous of Adam. We again see that the critic is not able to bring out the true nature of his disturbance and that God lacks the ability or desire to assist him. In her essay "God is Now Closer" (1982), Young Oon Kim expresses the kernel of this philosophical fact; "...it is painful for God to come in contact with men who are so unlike Him," (p. 323). A new model might show a godhead or individual who leaves his exalted position and assists the critical one in expressing its message.

The Role of the Critic

Although critics, disturbers, or devils lack development and are unable to bring out their messages directly, they do play an important role in life. Critics tend to emerge strongly at the edge, the boundary where the known identity ends and unknown territory begins. The critic has two common functions at the edge. One type of critic defends existing beliefs, while another type criticizes older ones in an attempt to bring in new beliefs. In the former case, the critic asserts the known identity and rejects new information or opponents. In the latter, the critic attempts to break down existing structures in order to introduce a new direction. Since religion is in part organized around shared belief systems, criticism and doubt are strongly

constellated. The devil or evil one is often represented as a doubt about the existing belief system. Historically we can see how religious figures like Jesus brought about new beliefs by indirectly criticizing older ones, and then how the Roman empire embodied the critical figure in an attempt to uphold the existing order.

Structurally, we can observe that by declaring belief we imply doubt. The assertion of belief is a statement against something which does not believe. Belief and doubt both exist, regardless of whether or not we choose to identify with the doubt. Bateson (1972) explains how this dynamic occurs from the communication standpoint.

To act or be one end of a pattern of interaction is to propose the other end. A *context* is set for a certain class of response. (p. 275)

Jung (1958) warns us about the potential danger of identifying with only our beliefs.

...where there is belief there is doubt, and the fiercer and naiver the belief the more devastating the doubt once it begins to dawn. (p. 200)

Bohm (1987) alludes to the same phenomenon when he says that the absolute nature of God inadvertently creates divisions (p. 149). We might say a critic compensates a onesided godhead, or for that matter, any absolute experience. Mindell (1985a) demonstrates how such onesided identification 'dreams up' parts of ourselves that are less known to us. Dreaming up refers to the phenomenon where other people begin to act like and embody parts of ourselves that are not sufficiently represented, but exist only

12

in our dreams, body symptoms, and double signals. We are all part of an interconnected system or field, in which the wholeness of the field must be represented in any given moment. Therefore, if a critical part is not picked up and is left only to the world of dreams, it will become manifest in the environment. In dreaming up, a person in the field, usually unconsciously, represents the missing part (pp. 65-67).

It is precisely this monotheistic attitude and tendency for us to identify with only one part of ourselves that yields a fertile ground for criticism and doubt. I am not suggesting that this should not be so. This disposition, so basic to human behavior, also allows us to learn about new parts of ourselves which are brought out in the guise of criticism. Jung (1958) emphasizes the devil and his critical nature as necessary for individuation, meaning the discovery of our individual totality.

The will to be different and contrary is characteristic of the devil, just as disobedience was the hallmark of original sin. These, as we have said, are the necessary conditions for the Creation and ought, therefore, to be included in the divine plan and - ultimately - in the divine realm. (p. 172)

We find few models in our main religious systems of a god who is open to diversity. Jung (1958) comments on this in regard to Yahweh and his all too human jealousy.

...Yahweh is no friend of critical thoughts which in any way diminish the tribute of recognition he demands. (p. 373)

Hinduism does recognize the divinity of all gods, but is just as closed to critical disturbers. Religion, therefore, tends to maintain a homeostatic system. The potential new information or

experience that diversity, doubt, or criticism might yield finds no opening. Jung (1958) makes a strong case for the devil and reminds us that in the third chapter of Genesis God gave man the power to will against God (p. 196) and concludes that "...our 'counterwill' is also an aspect of God's will" (p. 198). Jung explains its necessity:

The shadow and the opposing will are the necessary conditions for all actualization. An object that has no will of its own, capable, if need be, of opposing its creator, and with no qualities other than its creator's, such an object has no independent existence and is incapable of ethical decision. At best it is just a piece of clockwork which the Creator has to wind up to make it function. (p. 196)

Process work attempts to unravel the inherent intelligence in disturbing figures. Recognizing that they have a will of their own, quite different than what we would identify as ours, process work sees that critics are often the harbingers of new horizons or those who engage us in impossible conflicts which challenge the core of our identity. The philosophy of getting rid of the critic or devil has proven ineffective. The devil cannot be destroyed because he is eternal (Jung, 1958, p. 195). Therefore, this figure, in whatever form it takes, beckons us to discover new possibilities for approaching it.

Structure of Primary and Secondary Processes

In those times when the critic is undeveloped, unknown, and further from our awareness, the critical figure is a secondary process for the individual, and the emphasis will be on unfolding and representing the critic. When the critic is very well known

and accessible to us it is closer to our primary process and is often preventing new processes from coming into our awareness. Here the focus of the work will probably be on finding a creative solution, which often involves bypassing the criticism altogether and focusing on that which is less known. It is usually the case that this unknown process, once it is unfolded, will have the necessary creativity to transform and depotentiate the critic. Let's look at some examples.

13

The Divine Witch

Eve is a woman who complains that she has a witch on her back. Eve is upset and crying and sometimes difficult to understand. She explains to the seminar group that she recently had an experience where she literally felt that she was a witch being burned at the stake. She wants to learn more about this witch because she feels that she is always being metaphorically burned. Simultaneously, she informs those in the group who know her that they will probably want to fall asleep because they are obviously going to be bored. The therapist tries to work physically with her because her experience is that of the witch on her back. Eve says that she cannot do this in front of the people because she feels they will judge or criticize her. She continues:

E: This is all melodramatic bullshit anyway. I am a professional woman in front of all of these professional people and I am talking about witches!

If we now stop and study the structure of the various processes occurring in her beginning statements we can see that the

criticism is far more represented than the witch. She has just criticized herself, and she is able to be critical rather easily. Therefore, the critic is much closer to her primary process, or her identity. The witch is further from her awareness. She perceives it by feeling it on her back, but we have yet to experience the witch. We really know nothing about her, except that she gets burned. The witch herself is a secondary process for Eve. Therefore, discovering and representing this witch will be an important part of this work.

The therapist tries various interventions and Eve repeatedly half-way attempts to go along with them and then comments on them. She gets close to an experience and then metacommunicates about it, distracting herself from the experience. For example, the therapist puts her hands on Eve's back to help her experience the witch; Eve begins to talk about the past, becomes hopeless, and comments that she does not pay enough attention to the witch. This metacommunicating is the witch burning. Every time Eve gets close to an experience, she burns it by subtly putting it down, metacommenting on it, or talking about the past. Simply mentioning this to Eve is enlightening as she sees how she is always criticizing herself and burning the witch. Now the therapist can move on to encouraging her to experience the witch.

Since the witch makes itself known by a feeling on Eve's back, the therapist encourages her to first feel the witch. Eve sits upright, closes her eyes, and feels the witch inside herself. Next the therapist asks her to see the witch and then to make

slight movements that the witch would make. The therapist does this in order to make the experience more whole by bringing it into the other perceptual channels. Eve moves her head slightly backward, then arches backwards, her arms hanging limp and outward by her sides. Arny has joined the therapist assisting her with the bodywork. Eve remains in this internal feeling state for a few minutes. When she comes out she looks totally different and says:

E: She is at peace.

A: She is at peace. (Eve sits up now) My name is Arny. What is your name?

E: Esther.

A: It is a pleasure to meet you, Esther. Esther, what is it that set you to peace?

E: This is going to be awful to say. I can hardly say it.

A: Go ahead Esther.

E: Grace. Divine grace.

A: Well, I believe it, and I know when I see it.

The moment is filled with grace: solemn, serene and very peaceful. Eve's mood is transformed, and there is something quietly loving about her. She and Arny look at each other very calmly and intensely, and then hug. The feeling is completed, but Arny wants to do one last small thing before they sit down.

A: One little part more and we are done. (Arny takes over the critical one) What the hell is all that crap about! (sticking out his tongue at her and making faces) This is melodrama!

Simultaneously, Arny whispers to her, encouraging her to use Esther's powers on him. Eve approaches him with this mood of

grace around her and gently puts her arm on his shoulder. She looks at him in such a way that she seems to see through him. She then puts both her arms on his shoulders and caresses his face and strokes his shoulders. Arny cannot go on in his role. As a matter of fact, he is strongly affected by her and has goosebumps up and down his arms.

A: That was real power. I believe it.

E: To me that is the answer because I can't fight the criticism intellectually. I don't have an argument.

A: Yes, the way to fight is by using her powers.

In this case the critic was inhibiting Eve's spontaneous physical experiences by commenting on them and telling her they were too melodramatic. The critic was closer to her primary processes, and the experience of the witch was the one she needed to contact. The witch actually was an experience of divine grace. It is typical that the primary process formulates the experience which it knows less in terms which disturb it, like "witch." Once we get into the stream of the process, these terms no longer hold with the empirical experience. Grace was the element which transformed this critic. When the therapist can no longer maintain the critical role, the client is doing something transformative; this is the creative solution. Using this grace to give peace to herself and others during critical and intolerable times would be a way for Eve to integrate the experience. The critic wanted to maintain the old order and was intent on keeping all new information out. Grace and divine experience was the secondary process trying to come into life.

The experience of the critic is an important element which challenges her to contact this experience of grace and peace in order to then apply it even to the critic. It is almost as if the experience of divine grace was meant for the critic. Primarily Eve is a woman who feels very criticized and is internally critical of herself. Using this quality of grace when she is in such criticized states could be very helpful to her.

The Confident Critic

Tim, a university student, has been procrastinating in doing his final science project. He comes into my practice depressed and slumps into a chair. He complains that the project is already late and that he just cannot seem to do it. His professor is upset with him and is threatening to fail him.

Tim's primary process is his depression and his inability to do the project. The professor who threatens him is a secondary process. Tim does not identify with the one who is threatening and who is upset with him. As do most of us, he experiences the critical part as something other than him. Getting him into contact with the professor will probably be helpful. I ask him if he can play the professor and at first he says that he does not want to, because he hates this troublesome teacher. I empathize with him but tell him that it might be useful and that we should do it like a children's game of play acting adult behavior.

Tim takes to the suggestion and immediately sits up, looking

dignified and confident. He says:

T: You are obviously unable to do the project set forth and I will have to fail you. I don't want to, but your work is simply not up to par.

I take over Tim's role and interact with the professor.

D: Well, I want to do it, I just need more time.

T: I don't think you need more time at all. You just can't do it. You do not have the ability.

D: What do you mean I don't have the ability? I have been in the university for years now and I have passed everything.

T: It was just luck. You are just not up to it. You are lazy and undisciplined. You are not university material.

The professor is not at all depressed, but has lots of energy and speaks with great certainty. This energetic and certain quality is exactly what Tim needs.

D: Well, maybe it's true. How could I become university material? What should I do? Teach me how.

T: You have to, to... (he slaps his hand on the ground)

Tim stutters here, searching for what he wants to say. The professor is at an edge. This is a good example of a figure who comes out critically and vaguely with lots of energy but has trouble being concrete. The professor does know the way, but has reached the edge of his own awareness. This is an exciting moment where Tim is at the point of discovering how this critical figure might be of use to him. Tim, playing the professor, gives a somatic answer. He says, "You have to ..." and then he makes a slap. The verbal answer will have to match that slap in intensity. I encourage him to use his hands to find the words

that go along with his motions.

T: You have to get up at 7 a.m. and go straight to your desk! Just sit down and do it and stop thinking that you can't.

D: You mean you really think I can do it?

T: Of course you can. You're intelligent and you know what you want to do. You are just too easily defeated and you lack confidence. Now, get up and think that you are the king of the world and get it done in a week.

I slump down in my chair and complain that I'll never be able to do it. Tim lunges at me and pulls me up on my feet.

T: Now wake up! I'm not messing around now. Stand up straight, chin up, and get going! (He slaps me on the back.)

I am totally transformed now and cannot go on playing the depressed and under-confident Tim. I feel completely awake. Tim is buzzing with his new found confidence and determination, ready to begin his work.

I chose this case not because the critic brings a message that is so collectively profound, but because it is quite typical. Frequently an individual is primarily depressed and lacks contact with whatever is pressing. In Tim's story, the critical professor, an inner and outer figure, was split off from his awareness. Tim was not the agent of this figure, but was at its mercy wherever it presented itself. It had all of the power and confidence, while he had none. In the beginning the critic was just an annihilating opinion, probably attempting to annihilate his primary belief of himself as incapable and helpless. But, rather than encouraging and teaching Tim to be confident, the critic also needed help to express himself. In fact, he was not

only critical, but very supportive. In part his initial criticism is due to being kept out. Once he is let in, he is actually helpful, introducing a new confidence and determination that Tim desperately needs.

The Urgent Plea of the Critic

Mindell (1989b) has shown, especially in his work with groups, how the disturber or critical one initially comes out critically, but is actually trying to bring a message. Frequently, such critics are teachers and leaders, criticizing the existing leadership in order to bring in their own leadership abilities.¹³

I remember a course in which there was initially criticism about the structure of the course. Structural changes, however, were not the solution. Giving the critical part of the group field a voice brought out that they were really dissatisfied by the lack of personal feeling on the part of not only the teachers, but also the whole group. The critical part was trying to teach about being personal in large group situations.

Process work models a new world view by understanding that the critic is a minority figure, and helps the critic to discover its own implicit intelligence. In a world dominated by doubt and opposition, working in such a way could bring radical results to a disturbed collective.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

NEW DIRECTIONS IN RELATIONSHIPS

The Great Lesson: No Winners or Losers

The air in the seminar room is thick with tension when Gail and Lynn being to work on their relationship, which could presently be described as a state of cold war. After lots of fighting and strong emotional interaction, an icy distance remains. Apparently Gail has not been interested in her friendship with Lynn. Lynn feels hurt and angry and Gail wants to learn how to fight without getting wild and making a big mess.

A strong and repetitive signal in the field between them is hesitation. A large distance separates them and something keeps them from engaging with each other. At one point they physically fight; Gail is afraid to get into it and Lynn feels that she is holding herself back, wanting to hit but also not wanting to hurt. In the middle of the tension Lynn gets up to go to the bathroom, and then Gail says she has to go too.

A: The most impressive thing is the hesitation and that hesitation has been repeating itself in everything you do together. It is important and not something that you can just jump over. So I am going to ask you both about it, and ask you to amplify it.

Gail is the first to focus on the thing holding her back. She

holds back another group member and speaks as the one preventing her from engaging.

G: You are not going to just attack her. It is just out of the question. Even if she attacks you, you are not going to just be strong and defend yourself and attack her back for the hell of it. If it is not in you to attack her, don't do it. Walk away and think about it.

A: What should she think about when she walks away?

G: Think about your life. Think about what it is like to be alone. Think about how Lynn is your ally and how she makes you leave and go away. Leave the whole scene, the whole theatre and really think about what it is that Lynn is doing for you and how your life has changed since this fight with her.

There is a long pause and the room is quiet. Many people are moved and the tension begins to lift a little.

G: I want to say something to you, Lynn. I want to thank you and apologize to you. I feel like we are warriors in a battle and I thank you for hating me so much and wanting to kill me. I hope I can be worthy of you. I hope I can use what you have given me. I don't know if I can. I am sorry for hurting you so much. I can only be real and present when I can use what you have given me. Then you will be able to feel my apology. Then it will mean something, when I can take what you have given me and can use it.

L: What have I given you?

G: I have never felt so strong in my life. I am standing right now on my own two feet. You have given me the ability to realize that I can live alone and be an individual. Just the feeling of being strong and on my own is a big thing for me.

A: To me it also sounds like she has given you this particular figure and experience.

G: Yeah, that is what I mean when I say it makes me feel powerful. I would never be able to feel as strong as I feel now.

L: I feel like you are using me to feel this new found strength and I think it stinks. I am furious!

Both Gail and Lynn identify with their emotional and wild natures. Their primary process is fighting. That they leave the scene by going to the bathroom together and that they are not able to follow through in their physical interactions indicates that something less known is holding them back. Therefore, with the belief that the most unknown aspect of the relationship is what they both need, the work is geared towards discovering that which is least known. For Gail, this seems to be a position which is slightly outside of the battle and more involved in her own growth. In this position she finds a strong sense of strength in herself.

Lynn, the one who has been rejected, feels herself to be the weaker one in this battle. Lynn also mentions that she feels jealous of Gail's detached position.

L: I feel confused. What is happening is outside of the way I have understood relationships. I feel like I am jealous of her detachment and her ability to go with what is happening. I am still angry and hurt. It is hard for me because I have been in such a low position and I think you think you are above it all. I am also disturbed by something that happened to me during the night. I woke up feeling sick and was dreaming that my identity was changing. Then I had a forbidden thought which I can barely say now. The thought was that Gail could be right and that this whole thing could be good for me. I didn't want to think that or admit it because I feel I have been so hurt and have been the weak one for months.

Lynn then says that she feels this has something to do with being humble and that this is very hard to do with her arch enemy. She has a hard time talking, choking over her words, and needs help to express herself. The group responds with empathetic comments.

A: I understand exactly what you mean. There is nothing I dislike more than admitting that the other person is right, and I admit that openly. People who say they are humble, I can hardly believe. I always like to think I am right most of the time even though it is not true. I hate it. If you would like to become humble I would think you were a fake.

Others also join in and assert how they hate saying that their enemy could be right. Lynn feels more at ease. Arny encourages her to first express how she is right and Lynn talks about how mean and hurtful Gail has been. Arny jokes about the dream and the thought she had last night saying that they were stupid and at the same time challenges her to get into them. Lynn is at an edge and asks Arny for suggestions.

A: Well, I was looking at the dream and remembering how you were jealous of Gail's detachment, and how you were speaking about being less attached, being low or humble. These are some of the things I see.

L: (she is touched and speaks slowly and shyly) I think I have to go so low that it doesn't feel like a big thing anymore. It doesn't make me better than her or her than me. There is nothing attached to it.

Lynn physically takes a low position on the floor and looks down. Suddenly, she says that her ears are buzzing and she hears a voice from outside the circle. She moves to where she heard the voice and speaks to herself as that voice.

L: You want to know what being humble is. It has nothing to do with people. Nothing. Being humble with Gail doesn't make her better than you because this has nothing to do with being humble to her. It is being humble to what is happening between the two of you. Humility is not a thing of people. You can do it. This is a different world. It is not the world of people! There is nothing to lose and there is everything to gain. There are no losers, no weak or lowly ones. I know you and you are a very risky person; risk everything! See, you can do anything and it is not you. This has nothing to do with Gail.

A: But what about people's feelings. like hurt and anger?
What kind of a world is this?

L: This is a world of lessons. You need such impossible feelings to learn in life. You need the feelings to learn life's lessons, but at the same time they are not attached to you. This is a world of learning.

A: Who are you back there?

L: (quiet and shyly) It feels something like God.

Lynn now feels that this is the person who can approach Gail.

The tension is relieved as Lynn steps towards Gail.

L: I haven't wanted to admit that I have learned something from all of the difficulties between us because I have been so hurt and angry. But I think I am learning something. I have gotten something from all of the pain and nastiness. I can hardly believe that the world is not only a world of people and feelings, but is a world of lessons. I hope we can find a meeting place sometime. (Lynn gives her hand to Gail and they stand facing each other holding hands. People are very moved.) I feel a real bond.

G: Me too.

Relationship Philosophies

Both Gail and Lynn share a process of needing to detach from their battling and emotional affects. The spirit that has been holding them both back is more interested in learning than in the expression of any one individual's position. This case explicitly illustrates one of the most central paradigms in process work, namely, that there are no winners or losers; there is no right or wrong; no weaker or stronger position.

I am convinced that even if the weaker one loses the initial fight, being a winner or loser is only an illusion. Moreover, one 'victory' in the game of life is immediately followed by the pain of receiving

hurtful and revengeful double signals. Though novels and films portray happy endings to storybook romances, the process worker knows that beginnings and ends, winners and losers, and problems and solutions are only illusions of the primary process. (Mindell, 1987, p. 117)

It is the primary process, our known identity, which strives for justice and wants to be considered right. The nature of the primary process is that it believes itself to be the entirety of the personality. Therefore, it fights solely for itself and the continuation of its reign. Most often it is the primary process that searches for solutions which are absolute and unchanging, ones which create a world of fixed states. However, this view is illusory. Processes are always happening just outside of our primary awareness, disturbing any absolute and unchanging tendency.

One of the most common relationship philosophies which structure conflict is the belief that we are right and the other is wrong. We each defend our positions; the goals of the primary process are geared towards its continued survival. That which is secondary, meaning that which is outside of our primary position, rarely comes in. It is a humbling and heroic act to leave the primary process in the middle of a relationship battle. Many of us attempt to resolve relationship conflicts by making our case stronger and trying to convince the other person that we are right. Sometimes resolution is reached by negotiation or compromise, but these methods are usually a last resort rather than the optimal choice. They also reflect the goals of the primary process and rarely touch on the secondary process of a

relationship. Working only within the domains of the primary process leaves us feeling less whole; we are also dissatisfied with our one-sidedness and miss the unknown parts of ourselves. Bringing in the secondary process is not a negotiation or compromise, but finding the missing piece. Most couples feel relieved and more whole when they can discover this crucial element.

Process work focuses on the unintended communication between people, what Mindell (1987) calls the 'dreaming process' behind relationships (p. 2). With Gail and Lynn their repeated hesitations were the unintended signals. They were double signals, meaning that in addition to the dominating signals of the primary process, there were signals communicating something secondary. Identified with their emotions, both women had been unable to notice a more detached position which was trying to present itself in their communication. Focusing on only the intended communication of the primary process and remaining steadfast in our own convictions keeps us outside of the dynamic stream of relationship. Mindell (1987) tells us that being right is a fixed state and

At best, it is a judgement, but it is not and cannot replace the living, ongoing process occurring between people. (p. 10)

Conflict Resolution

However, since the philosophy of being right is so common and seems so natural and human, we must assume that it too has its place in the relationship arena. In fact, this causal view of

relationship life seems to be the background structure of all conflict. Mindell has shown in his work in conflict resolution that it is essential for each party to also take its own side and at some point go deeply and completely into the affect which it is having. If we do not or cannot express our onesidedness and its affect we cannot leave it. The affect then acts like a festering sore, constantly disturbing us and blocking us from change. Unless we can first strongly state our position we are neither able to sufficiently understand our opponent nor are we able to pick up the potential wisdom of our secondary processes.¹⁵ Onesidedness is also a process, and it can assist us in fully getting to know a particular part of ourselves. Only then can we drop it. This approach is quite paradoxical; being open to all of our parts also means being open to parts that need to be right and onesided. Lynn was discovering this. She said that we need to get into the very human and feeling parts of relationship in order to enter the stream of life, but any one feeling state is not our totality. Feelings are states to learn about and are great teachers about the vast array of life experiences.

Mindell has discovered that there are usually two main edges in any conflict system. The first edge is to engage in the fight, have the affect and express one's position. The second edge is to withdraw. After working in many conflict situations, he found that after a certain point people would begin to withdraw slightly. People would lean back, take a step backwards, talk to the facilitator, quickly look around the room, look down and feel something, bite their lip, become afraid, etc.. All of these

double signals which occur in the midst of a fight are trying to bring something new into the interaction. At the beginning of a conflict, we hold ourselves back, not wanting to have the conflict. Mindell has noticed that once we engage it is sometimes impossible to pull us apart. People become addicted to the affect and the fight. He hypothesizes that this is due to a culture which has little ability to express rage and conflict on an interpersonal level and thus enjoys the opportunity to finally experience it.¹⁵

Therefore, we flip into an unknown state and get stuck in the sheer pleasure of living that which has been forbidden. After going into the conflict, picking up the signals of withdrawal and unraveling their meaning is the next step. This is the point where Gail and Lynn were cycling. Engaged in active fighting for months, they needed to pick up the hesitations allowing them to bring a new direction into their relationship.

Gail and Lynn are learning that it is important to be both engaged in and detached from human feeling experience. Mindell (1987) writes that many people are searching for this particular experience in their use of a third person or therapist.

...a deep and lasting relationship is only possible with a consciousness that is directly involved in and also detached from the relationship. The third person is the symbol of a consciousness which is impersonal as well as personal, Taoistic as well as emotional, distant from, yet engaged in, the relationship. The third person represents the capacity to get beyond the one-to-one situation, to see both people as individuals and simultaneously as a unit which is in the midst of suffering because its two parts are not communicating sufficiently. (p. 10)

Since process work focuses on the entire system of a relationship, representing both parts of the relationship field with which the couple identifies and those with which they do not, it introduces a more globally-oriented philosophy of relationship work. Collectively, our governing world view has been to think of ourselves only as separate and localized units. Recently, we hear pleas from environmentalists, biologists, physicists, and futurists to think globally. However, this is still a foreign and unusual way for many of us to perceive, especially in our private and personal lives. If we take this global philosophy to heart

we must stand for the whole because only when all the parts are able to express themselves can the whole operate humanely and wisely. We need to realize that our tendency to take sides and forget the whole injures it. ... The global field does not work when only one side is supported, even though the tendency to favor only one part is real and important. ... We need to learn to support the side we believe in and simultaneously support the entire system just as much. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 103)

Such a philosophy might mean helping your opponent with her communication because only when your opponent is able to bring her side out completely can the relationship be whole. It means valuing all parts of the relationship and focusing on both primary and secondary processes. Such a world view might see conflicts as interactions with "worthy opponents."

The Worthy Opponent

Gail said she felt like a warrior and thanked Lynn for their interactions. Her language reminds us of Carlos Castaneda's

(1972) encounters with his worthy opponent. Don Juan, the Yaqui Indian shaman, is Castaneda's teacher who explains that, "The art of a benefactor is to take us to the brink" (p. 216). Thus, Don Juan finds him a "worthy opponent." Bringing someone to the brink is analogous to coming to the end of our known world and standing at the edge of a new one.

Our worst opponents challenge us to change because our primary process is no longer effective, and under most circumstances the opponent is attacking it. We are pressed to develop new parts of ourselves in order to get along with such impossible people. Don Juan instructs Carlos about his worthy opponent, 'la Catalina.'

If you survive the onslaughts of 'la Catalina' you will have to thank her someday for having forced you to change your *doing*. (p. 227)

Don Juan goes further explaining this special kind of doing:

When he [a warrior] has to act with his fellow men, a warrior follows the *doing* of strategy, and in that *doing* there are no victories or defeats. In that *doing* there are only actions. ... It entails that one is not at the mercy of people. (p. 227)

We can say here that following the doing of strategy is following not only our conscious intentions but also the process of the moment. When we follow only the dictates of the primary process, we feel at the mercy of others, stuck in one part of ourselves. We experience the world as doing something to us; fate is against us, people are troublesome, or nothing goes the way we would like it to. Our "doing" is not effective. We are not able to use our relationship troubles and make something meaningful out of them; we feel the victim of them. This weakens us; onesided and

suffering, living in a world where other people are the causes of our problems, we cling to this view and feel hopeless. In a world of lessons, of following the moment and picking up the exciting and unknown field of relationship life, we engage in the doing that Don Juan mentions. Using the turmoil into which the opponent throws us is an art which can transform us by annihilating our normal "doing". This is why Don Juan tells Castaneda that he might someday have to thank his worthy opponent. As we have seen, this is exactly what happened in Gail's case. The encounter with Lynn pressed Gail out of her normal identity as a weak woman. Here she discovered a new found strength, an attitude of warriorship. Lynn, on the other hand, learned about being humble to life's lessons. Gail helped her to detach from her affects. In Castaneda's encounters with 'la Catalina,' she, as his worthy opponent, presents a threat to his life. The worthy opponent does attempt to take our lives, intent on killing our primary process.

Wrapping it Up

This case illustrates a rare world view in regard to conflict and relationships, which both Gail and Lynn discover in their contact. In addition, it illustrates some of process work's basic philosophical paradigms in regard to relationships and conflict resolution. We can see how Gail and Lynn were suffering under the reign of a decaying world view, and that in many respects their conflict was less with each other than with a whole philosophy about their relationship. Discovering a new world

view was the solution to their long-term problems.

Working with the Field

Mindell (1989c) defines relationship as a field which is trying to discover itself. He outlines two differing paradigmatic approaches in relationship work, which are actually applicable to any psychological work. The first and most common paradigm is local causality. Behavior is explained and understood in terms of local causes; it is due to our interactions with people, our past experiences, or the events that befall us. Process work also applies causal approaches. Additionally, it perceives relationships in terms of a field theory.

From another viewpoint, the interaction between parts or people is seen as the manifestation of a general pattern involving all. According to this model, neither blame nor responsibility is assigned to any of the members. Instead, the emphasis is placed upon the governing, overall situation. This viewpoint is especially useful when dealing with situations where it is difficult or impossible to determine the sender and the receiver of a message. The importance of the individual diminishes and he becomes a manifestation of a field whose parts may no longer be distinguishable. (Mindell, 1987, pp. 16-17)

When working with the field in a relationship, parts are not localized in one body. There is no concept of inner or outer, that one person is x and the other is y. In a field concept, both x and y exist and can be occupied by any member in the field. Therefore, field thinking focuses on determining the nature of the field without attributing its specific characteristics to any one individual. Mindell (1987) explains the perceptual change that the therapist has to make when

focusing on the field.

Seeing a couple as a unit creates a perceptual change in the therapist's view of the world. If I look at a couple as a unit with connecting parts, I can expect an answer from any part when I pose a question to one member. This expectation opens up my perceptual system. In fact, when I work with a couple and ask one member a question, I frequently get the answer from another member, another channel, or even another object! Thus, in time, I find my eyes gazing at the space between people and seeing individuals as two points in a larger field. (p. 111)

Mindell (1987) posits a hologram theory for understanding the structure of a relationship field. This theory states that the world is made up of implicit wholes in which each part of the whole also possesses access to all its other parts as well as to the initial pattern or wholeness. For example, let's look at a relationship whose characteristics are coldness and sensitivity. Both individuals in the relationship will at one time or another occupy each of those parts, although one individual might habitually identify more with one characteristic. Each individual additionally has access to an entire pattern and story about coldness and sensitivity. It is this common pattern or story which acts like a myth holding the people together and creating the relationship. Therefore, rather than focusing on who is doing what, it is often useful to focus on the composition of the many parts interacting in order to bring out the larger pattern in the field. This kind of focus gives the relationship a feeling of unity, where both members feel they are involved in something like a larger myth or story. Focusing only on causal principles often gives the couple a feeling of having done something wrong, and tends to divide the couple by emphasizing

only its parts and not its wholeness.

An Example

Remember Matthew, the little boy with leukemia, who was working on his spear-like pains? Matthew actually worked together with his mother, Pat, who had been diagnosed with cancer. The first few minutes of the work are a good example of focusing on the field of a relationship.

A: Well, if you could get something done what would you decide on? (Arny has addressed both of them and waits to see who would answer.)

P: I would like to work with Matthew when he is really in pain.

A: (to Matthew) Your mother says you have a little pain sometimes. What kinds you got?

M: Aches.

A: Aches, yeah. Well there are about twelve different kinds of aches that I know about. Which kind you got?

M: Sharp pains.

Matthew and Pat are both very shy and quiet. Matthew holds the remains of a pillow which now looks like a tattered piece of cloth. Arny helps Matthew take a knot out of his pillow and tells him that children sometimes have little playful pictures about things that are sharp. He asks Matthew if he has any. Matthew says he does not. Both Arny and Matthew cannot imagine anything that is sharp. Arny then poses the question to Pat.

P: I think of knives.

A: You think of knives. Have you ever had any sharp pains?

P: Yes.

A: What kind of sharp pains do you have?

P: (laughs nervously) I am not here to talk about my sharp pains. (touching Matthew gently)

Here we can see that the entire field is having a difficult time in talking about its sharp pains. It is not just one member, but both of them. The whole field lacks relationship to those sharp pains, and therefore suffers from them.

A: We don't need to talk about her sharp pains. We don't want to talk about her sharp pains. I got off the track. I started to talk about her sharp pains, instead of mine and yours. (to Pat) Now, I am interested a little teeny bit in your sharp pains. Can you say a little about them because I think it might be helpful to Matthew. You want to try?

P: I have them in my back and they feel like spears, and they get bigger and press.

A: Well hers are like spears. (to Matthew) Do you have any idea what yours are like?

M: A tiny bit like hers.

A: I thought so. Now, you see one way to work with his sharp pains is to work with your sharp pains. Are yours a bit like hers? (Matthew nods) Then maybe we can do something together. (to Pat) Well, yours are like spears?

P: Yeah, and they get fatter inside.

A: How interesting. She's got fat spears. Can you imagine that?

M: No. Mine don't get fat.

A: What do yours do?

M: They stay as long as they were and as skinny as they are.

A: Yours stay skinny. Well, sometimes all spears aren't the same. You got fat spears and you got skinny spears. Now, who knows a story about spears? Or where did you ever hear about spears?

M: In fighting and stuff.

A: What kind of fighting?

M: Wars.

A: Did you read comic books about wars and spears?

M: No, sometimes I see spears on TV and stuff.

A: Yeah, me too. I can't quite remember the program though, but there was a war happening between two sides.

M: Yes.

A: (to Pat) Do you remember seeing a thing about spears on TV?

P: Well, I saw spears like that on Matthew's little toys.

A: Wow, I wish I had one here. What do they look like?

M: They're guys with spears in their hands.

They all engage now in the spear game, where both Matthew and Pat learn about their strength and warrior-like natures. The point I want to emphasize here is the way Mindell works with them as a field in order to access the information of their physical states. When one works with a field, information can come from anywhere in the field. Both Matthew and Pat share an experience. Even though Matthew is more identified as the one who has the most difficulty in the moment, they are both involved in a similar process. Therefore, together, they create the myth that binds them: Matthew describes his pains as sharp; Pat offers that they are spears; Matthew creates the war game; Pat says they look like Matthew's toys; and Matthew demonstrates how to hold the spear. They both contribute to the creation of this process. The emphasis is on its creation rather than on who has it or how it is caused. The field between them can primarily be described as rather shy and quiet and polite, with secondary

characteristics of power and heroic strength.

Fields and Relationship Myths

Don Juan (1972, 1974) describes his relationship with Carlos as a gesture that power has created. He means that an individual does not intentionally make relationship; there is a background spirit or creator in relationship which is more powerful than the personal will. Even when we will otherwise, we ultimately have the relationship that power creates. In process terms we can understand that the primary process or conscious will is only partially responsible for creating relationship life. The secondary process and dreaming background between people more prominently gestalts and organizes our relationships. Mindell (1987) has shown that the dreams a couple has when they first meet are long term patterns or myths which structure the entire relationship. There is a mythical background to all kinds of relationships. For example, besides being mother and son, Pat and Matthew share a myth of strength and heroism.

Jealousy and Teaching: Discovering a Myth

Mark and Joan have been married for about ten years, and during that time both of them have had other relationships. At the present time they seem happy together, and neither of them is involved with anyone else. They want to work on the jealous feelings that often emerge in their relationship; both are unhappy about how they interact about jealousy. They decide to act out the disturbing interaction. Joan feels plagued by Mark's

constant questioning and Mark feels that she never answers him.

M: (desperately) Do you like him? Are you going to have an affair with him? Are you going to sleep with him? Tell me.

J: I told you yesterday and I am not answering again.

M: Tell me again. How do you feel about him?

They continue like this and also talk about how they are behaving.

M: I'm exaggerating my desperation. When I see her flirting with someone, I want her to answer all my questions. Then she gets really impatient and I feel bad when she is impatient. And then when she is impatient I get more desperate and go on and on.

J: I get impatient 'cause he asks me the same questions over and over.

Mark accuses Joan of not being honest with him. Joan says that it is true, she does not like being honest because she does not like to hurt him.

M: Yeah, but I always feel better when you tell me and I know what is going on.

J: I don't like being honest.

M: It is in your nature. Why do you lie?

J: I got to get out of here.

A: Do you find yourself stuck in a corner, a spot you can't get out of?

J: Yeah. I find I'm embarrassed about myself because I think I should be really straight and direct and it is really hard for me.

A: Really? It sounds like you are on his side now. Why don't you come over here on his side and argue with her. Give it to Joan, there she is.

Arny encourages Joan to switch roles because at this moment she

is really on Mark's side. This is the nature of a relationship field; the individuals are constantly changing roles, but often the switch happens unconsciously. Picking up the role changes and suggesting that they do them with more awareness helps to process the conflict by giving the individuals a broader sense of themselves and the relationship. Joan takes his side and he automatically switches and takes her side.

J: You have to always tell the truth and immediately tell me everything.

M: But I don't want to tell the truth. It is too hard.

J: Well you should be straight that you are lying. Stand up for it.

M: Lying?

J: Yeah, you should be more of a liar. You are too good.

M: I don't lie.

Mark is now beginning to identify more completely with the one who has affairs and acts cool and detached.

J: I think it's actually true. You really are that way. It doesn't always have to do with relationships, but with your work. I also remember a time when you were making relationships with other people and I am now having this feeling of wanting to keep you here.

A: Yes, it is a true role switch now.

M: You are the most unjealous person.

We can see here that the roles of being jealous and being cool are roles that belong to the entire field and not just to Mark or Joan. As a matter of fact, both Mark and Joan imply that they feel better when each of the roles is accessible to both of them.

when Joan says that Mark should lie more and not act so good. she is pleading for him to take her side. Mark initially feels lonely in his jealousy and wants Joan to join him. This leads to an important point which Mindell (1987) makes in his work with relationships and groups. People feel best and most whole in relationship and group life when they can experience many parts of themselves. An individual constantly identified with one part in the relationship begins to feel stuck. Therefore, picking up the unconscious role switches and making them more apparent is helpful to the entire system.

Mark and Joan continue their dialogue, and the role switches occur even faster until no one knows who is who or what is going on anymore. Arny intervenes and suggests that they both look on while he and someone else act out the scenario. The jealous scene is re-played with both people acting flirtatious, becoming jealous, getting cool, and lying. Joan and Mark study the interaction. Arny then asks them what they saw.

M: I had a fantasy, but it is really crazy. I feel stupid saying it now. I saw these people as servants of god -- that they would have to do all of these things, like being in relationship and having affairs and they would have to teach together. You two would teach others about relationships, but I don't know how you would solve it.

A: (to Joan) You were nodding your head to what he was saying.

J: Yeah, I feel that.

A: Yeah. I want you both to pretend something. Pretend that you are instruments of god and that you are going to teach people something. I don't care much what you say or if you can do it, but I would like to try to play it just for a minute. We are the population here; teach us.

Arny now plays the population at large.

A: Thank god we came here to hear these folks talk about relationships. We have come to the end. Everyone gives up on them.

M: All the comings and going of things are a minor part of something bigger that you should be focusing on all the time. You need to focus on your love and why you are together, even if you are hating each other. You need to know that all of those everyday things that you usually take as the relationship are not the whole of it.

A: We should focus on the love?

J: Yeah, and also think that if you love someone you can't break up with them. Even if you think you will break up or think of ending it, if you love somebody the love is much stronger than anything that happens. You can go through anything, the most terrible things and you always come back to the love if it is there.

A: We all get stuck in the comings and goings and forget the bigger thing that binds us. I know a teacher when I hear one.

M: So, this is what we are going to teach: how to go through all of these things and to keep your focus on the love part.

Participant: How do you do that when you are in the middle of a mess?

J: Well, sometimes you can't when you are in the middle of a mess but you have to be open to let it back in when you feel it again and not try to keep it away and think it is gone because something awful is happening.

Participant: Can you help me with how painful it is?

M: You have to trust it even though you can't experience or feel the love.

J: (to Mark) I actually have a problem with you about that. I feel you go through these periods and stay in a mood so long.

A: (Mark is silent, looking down, so Arny speaks for him.) Well, this is why I am a teacher. It means that I am half cooked and need to learn these things.

M: I am learning. I am also thinking that sometimes you also have to hate this love thing and fight with it and interact with it.

J: I feel proud of us because we have been through the craziest relationship and have been together so long. (People

applaud and they hug.)

J: I think it is a great thing and we need to apply this to our relationship. We get in the worst fights.

A: Yes, you are the student and the teacher. Do both now. Teach yourself.

J: (to herself) You, Joan, need to believe in the love more, even if he is withdrawing and even if he is not believing with you. It is easy to believe together, but you have to believe even when there is no one to believe with.

Arny now tries to help her to really anchor that inner teacher.

A: Oh, you mean I have to have a center that is outside the human condition. There is nothing I would like more. I am following you. You are going to teach me, aren't you?

J: Yes.

A: You are always going to be there?

J: I don't know.

A: You are my teacher; I have to have you there all the time. Promise not to go away.

J: Well, it is hard for me to be around when you are hysterical.

A: Well, if you are a teacher that is when I need you the most. I don't need teachers to teach me academic things. I need teachers when I am hysterical. That is the only value in teaching -- I need you when I am hysterical. Now promise me.

J: I promise.

A: I take you as my teacher.

Now Mark wants to teach himself something.

M: You have to believe in creativity. Don't forget it. You need to be creative when you are in the middle of relationship difficulties.

A: Will you be there to remind me?

M: Yes.

J: I am excited!

M: I feel our relationship has gotten to a new point now and

we need this new thing to go on. (They embrace and sit down.)

Mark and Joan actually demonstrate their teaching through their own relationship. While watching a scene from their own relationship, they were able to simultaneously step outside of it and focus on the love or larger pattern that joins them. Here they discovered a great teacher. The myth that unites them is one of teaching and simultaneously learning about relationship life. The teacher is that part of the relationship system who is able to step out of the whole entanglement and see the larger story behind it. It is also a part which values the troubles they have and sees them as steps to greater awareness and relationship.

Secondary mythical processes bind us even if we are against them. Joan teaches us this; we cannot break up a relationship if there is a greater myth or dream that we share. This world view teaches us that relationships are not only based on Cartesian principles where individuals may remain localized units separate from a mythical dreaming process. We think we can cut ourselves off from troublesome relationships, world problems, or our environment. Process work shows that this is not the case. We might be able to leave a person by going thousands of miles away, but we do not leave the relationship process unless we have completed it. We cannot leave it. We dream about it, and we recreate the same process with other partners (Mindell, 1987, p. 92).

Joan and Mark are actually recommending a new relationship

pattern for all of us. Collectively, most of us suffer because we get stuck in one part of ourselves; we identify so strongly with the affect or difficulty we are having that we have no access to our other parts. Joan especially was looking for another; an inner teacher who would not abandon her when she was stuck in such a state, but who would help her to remain in contact with the whole of the relationship, even if Mark did not. The teacher has the ability to be both inside and outside of a relationship. We go into the relationship and at one point strongly identify with one part, and then we step out and notice that we may even be taking our partner's side. Perhaps then we might notice that we are on the outside of the interaction noticing something that is missing and has not yet been brought in. Being able to stay in contact with the deeper love or larger myth in the midst of hysteria, rage, jealousy, or terror is a big challenge for most of us. This world view is a special focus which relativizes their initial problem of jealousy.

Goals in Relationship Work

In chapter two we mentioned that the philosophy and goals of a particular school of psychology will yield an experience that remains within its scope. This is also true for relationship or family work. System's theory (Minuchin, 1974; Satir, 1967; Haley and Hoffman, 1967) was a great breakthrough in relationship and family work in which the paradigm of focusing on the individual was expanded to include the entire system. Focus was not only on the identified patient or intrapsychic material, but

on the family as one interacting system. A system is a whole composed of interacting parts. The field concept takes this idea further.

Fields take into account intrapsychic processes and see the roles in a given system as free floating forms which any member may and does fill, whether consciously or unconsciously. Fields are also impersonal, created not only by the intentions and contexts of relationship life, but also by a dreaming background which includes that which is outside of the relationship, individual, and collective identity. The nature of a field can also be compared to Jung's collective unconscious, or the tao or spirit that structures events. Therefore, field thinking directs us outside of our known world, appreciating that there is a whole range of human experience subtly manifest in the signals, dreams, symptoms, and events in a relationship. Process work introduces a new view in relationship work, following the signals and various manifestations of this field and observing its greater wisdom.

Family and couples therapy (Minuchin, 1974; Satir, 1967) introduce therapeutic goals which are all based on the therapist's opinions of how the relationships would best operate. The therapist intervenes, trying to create the kinds of relationships that he sees as healthy. These ideas of health go along with our collective beliefs. Process work begins with no assumptions about the way a relationship should be, and sees no need to create or change relationships. The process worker furthers the kinds of relationships already implicit in the

communication and intrapsychic processes, and then watches them transform according to their own intelligence. Rather than only following culturally accepted relationship ideals, process work aims towards discovering the often mysterious and sometimes culturally unacceptable background to relationship life.

Extending the Relationship World

Brian and Frank have been together as a couple for about five years. Their work together took place at a seminar which focused on relationships. At this point in the work they are in the middle of a typical problem in relationships; it is being expressed in movement. Brian holds on strongly to Frank, and Frank tries to get away. There is no content to their movement, just the embracing and the pushing away. From the outside we may have an idea about what they are doing, but process work withholds interpretation and allows them to discover what it is they are doing. Another option would be to interpret and then let their feedback lead the way. If the therapist's interpretation is not right for the couple, their signals will indicate this and direct the therapist to another path. Arny chooses the former intervention and suggests that he and another seminar participant act out the movements they were making while the two men look on.

B: When I look at you holding him there, I think that there is nothing else in the whole world for you except him.

Arny turns to the seminar participant:

A: But you are the whole world.

Participant: But it is too much for me. I have to get out.

A: But I need you. You are everything to me.

P: You are smothering me. Get away.

Arny and the participant continue in this vein, bringing the added verbal information into their movements. Brian and Frank look on, shy and astounded. Frank addresses Arny, who is playing Brian.

F: You can be the whole world for two minutes and that's it.

A: No, for eternity.

F: It is too much.

A: I'll never let you go, forever.

B: I need to switch roles because I could have the same feeling on your side.

Here we see again how a relationship cannot tolerate one person being identified with only one role. Brian finds himself empathizing with Frank's position, and Arny and the participant continue to show the scene, but switch roles. After a while they both start to laugh and Frank comments:

F: Well, I think you could use all of this energy of pushing and holding for other stuff.

A: What could we use this energy for besides pushing and holding?

F: If you would push together against something it would be great.

Surprisingly, they both agree to use all of that energy to push something together. Brian has a fantasy about being in a street

together. He grabs Frank excitedly by the arm and the two of them walk around as if they were on a city street.

F: Yeah, let's see which one of these people we would like to get!

They look around mischievously at the people who are sitting around them in a circle and secretly consult each other. Then they walk around the room arm in arm and suddenly grab one of the women sitting on the periphery. They pull her into a wild and archaic dance, spinning in a frenzy and shrieking with delight. They daringly grab each other and grind their bodies together. It is absolutely exhilarating, and when they finally stop, the woman can hardly stand it. She tells them how lonely she has been and this spurs them on again. They all leap in the air and look like apes; they are an ecstatic bunch!

A: That was fantastic, and I had a sense that things were completed.

F: Yeah, we should get more people, others now!

They look glowingly at the rest of the group and then grab Army and thank him.

Frank and Brian seem to have been stuck in a common conflict that occurs in many relationships. From the standpoint of our cultural primary process we might say they were involved with the theme of dependence and independence, neediness and self-sufficiency, or possessiveness and freedom. At one point, Brian said that Frank was the world for him and Frank said this was too much for him. The amplification of needing someone to be the

whole world is really a need for the world. There is a tremendous amount of energy in neediness; it too is a process that needs to be unfolded. From the viewpoint of the primary process it looks like it is a need for the partner. However, the need is often so strong that it is a hunger one person cannot fulfill.

In this case, both Brian and Frank have a need for the whole world. The reductionist view would dilute the experience of needing the world and would emphasize analyzing the reasons why the individual has such overwhelming needs. Such an analytically-oriented view usually concludes that the needy one should become more independent and misses the actual and real need that the individual or couple might have for the world. Another approach would suggest finding a common meeting point between the two poles. The dependent one is encouraged to do more things on his own and the independent one is encouraged to be a little more homey. Virginia Satir (1967) would say that both individuals need each other so much because they have low self esteem and thus try to find a higher self esteem in their relationship to the other. Another popular mode is to work on the childhood experiences that are assumed to be the background cause of the couple's troubles. Each of these is a valid and useful approach when dictated by the couple's process. However, the emphasis in all of these approaches is that the process is of a pathological nature. A basic cultural idea, especially for westerners, is that people should not be so needy or possessive in relationships.

Process work, with its neutral focus, reserves its judgment and attempts to discover the meaning in this pattern. Arny relies on their creativity to lead him. Looking at the pattern of holding on and pushing away, Brian and Frank had the insight that the energy they were using needed to be put to another use, something that they could do together. Reaching out to a third party was a very creative and unexpected solution, one that extended their world view of trying to get all of their needs met by one person. They saw themselves on a city street and together went looking for people. This is a myth of a couple which needs to do things together in the world. They have a task of going out into the world and making contacts with others. Doing things together in the world is a way for them to bring the world into their relationship. This is a model of relationship where one person is not enough, and living this great passion only in the coupled relationship is confining. The identified needy one will always be angry and unhappy with his partner because one person is not the whole world. A larger hunger for the earth, the whole planet, and a collective task joins this couple. The world and other people are an essential and enriching part of their relationship.

Mindell made the comment that greater world contact is one of the myths behind the threesome. After their triadic dance, Frank actually said that they should go after other people, which would bring them into contact with an even greater world. This case might lead us to speculate about the meaning of the growing number of affairs and threesomes in western culture. One

possibility is that there is a greater need for more global contact. It is not enough for many couples to live solely in their own small worlds. Often, there is a strong interest in engaging together in a task beyond the relationship, one that connects the couple with the world at large. Perhaps this is a modern day relationship myth created by a wisdom which knows that the planet cannot survive any longer as a world which thinks of itself only in terms of separate individuals, couples, and nuclear families.

Relationships and Changing World Views

Such cases show us that our relationships act as powerful catalysts motivating us to change large philosophical belief systems. Every relationship has a culture created by the primary processes of both people; processes outside of this primary culture are rejected. The cultural homeostasis is maintained by strong philosophical beliefs. In relationships, as with individuals, a crisis occurs when the culture breaks down, when the governing beliefs can no longer be upheld and that which was rejected disrupts the homeostasis. Just as an unspoken mutual consensus pulls a couple together and creates a relationship culture, this same communication consensus will later rip the culture apart and could split the couple up if it becomes too rigid. That which is outside of the culture will enter into the communication as disturbing double signals.

For example, a couple that is afraid of conflict and fighting

will create a culture of harmony and safety where voices are not raised. This will work wonderfully for a while. However, with time, as the individuals and the couple evolve, all of the conflict and emotion will begin to express itself unconsciously and disturb the harmonic homeostasis. Thus, the quiet tones will prevail, but simultaneously teeth will be clenched and fists will be held in pockets. These double signals will disturb the communication and press the couple to the edges of their culture and its governing philosophical beliefs. This is not a critique; the primary cultures that people create are essential. A primary culture can become a supportive ground for people to grow in and it can complete deep dreams and beliefs about loving and beautiful worlds that many of us have never experienced. Depending on the culture that people create, it might even give us the courage and the love to later go against it and make changes that are outside of it. However, if we are not able to adapt our culture to the changing nature of relationship life, that same potentially vital culture acts like a prison preventing new growth and excitement.

People are not really happy with old patterns, their inner culture. People are trying to change and create new culture. The horror in relationship is that there is only one vision of a culture that everyone tries to live. 17

This chapter has been an attempt to model some collectively uncommon visions and world views, which are trying to come to life within the exciting arena of relationships. These cases demonstrate ways of interacting in relationship that go beyond the therapeutic setting. They are not prescriptions or quick

remedies, but they question deeply ingrained philosophical beliefs and describe styles of living and relating that are not readily accessible to us. The individuals mentioned here are people who are forging new paths and creating new patterns of relationship.

Secondarily, but by no means less important, this chapter portrayed different kinds of relationships in order to show the great diversity and richness in all kinds of relationships. Mindell (1987) writes that an emerging myth of our modern world might be that:

...people must learn to love, wherever and however it appears, merging individuals who otherwise would be separated by religion, color, class distinction, and sexual preferences. (p. 90)

CHAPTER EIGHT:

REBELS AND RULEMAKERS:

AN INSTITUTIONAL CONFLICT

The Inherent Intelligence of Groups

In the previous chapters we have been focusing on individual and relationship work and the respective world views that have emerged. A growing area in the field of psychology, and in particular, Process-oriented Psychology, is group work.¹⁸ Recently various groups, including business groups or corporations, teaching groups, psychological groups, social work groups, and political groups, have found it necessary to learn about group dynamics and conflict resolution. Perhaps this reflects an acknowledgment of the strong conflicts and stalemated polarizations that exist in our world today and indicates a growing need to learn how to work with such conflicts on a large scale.

Process work (Mindell, 1989b) introduces a new view and philosophical standpoint in regard to groups.

The process work philosophy behind interventions is that those things we are consciously and unconsciously doing will aid us in solving problems and enriching our experience. ... The basic idea behind process work is the belief that there is an inherent intelligence in human beings which appears when all parts of their behavior are made equally accessible. Global process work is a wide spectrum attempt to

apprehend events at all levels. Such work values homeostasis and equilibrium as well as change. (p. 63)

In group process work interventions attempt to bring out more strongly and apparently what is already in the group field, but which is often frozen and incomplete. Helping that which is frozen, unknown or unconscious, or incomprehensible and mysterious to manifest and complete itself elicits the potential wholeness in groups and often brings surprising solutions. Understanding the group as a self organizing whole stimulates us to discover the processes that are occurring in a group because they will bring the solutions that everyone is looking for.

This inherent intelligence in groups is expressed in both intended and unintended information. Intended information can be seen in the goals of a group, how they identify themselves, and the content they speak about. Unintended information is not so explicit: it exists in our unconscious beliefs, and that which is outside of our identities. Information which we are not aware of and have little access to is dreamlike and presses itself onto us in ways which we can not understand or which disturb us. For example, a group identified as harmonious and peaceful will be disturbed when a new member subtly attacks the leader. A business organization might be disturbed by jealousy and greed that never come out directly. Mindell (1989b) describes how this acts like an "information float." "Information which is not picked up or which is blocked 'floats' like a fog of uncertainty between people" (p. 17).

Another way to look at this phenomenon is through a communication

model. Every piece of information or every signal is meant for a receiver and needs to be received. If no receiver picks it up, if no one wants anything to do with it, it hangs there disturbing us. This is the stuff of which dreams are made. Dreams are in part unwanted or unknown information. This float acts like a dreamfield, sending its messages into the field between people regardless of whether or not they receive them. For example, let's go back to the peaceful group and its aggressive new member. When this encounter occurs, many people remain quiet and intensely watch the interaction. Others strongly defend the leader and tell the disturber that they do not approve of his behavior. The new member does not return, but the process continues. People dream about fighting and the group breaks up into smaller groups and gossips. Some individuals even quietly side with the new member. The dreams and gossip and all the affectual energy that has been constellated becomes a part of the information float. One of the goals of psychology is to study this information float, to differentiate intended from unconscious or unintended messages, and to discover how to decipher all human messages so that they may enrich instead of confuse relationships. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 17)

Mindell describes in the first two parts of The Year One (1989b) various ways in which the inherent intelligence of human beings, groups, the world, and the universe has been understood as a whole or a living organism. He begins with ideas about systems theory which acknowledges "...that we are whole unto ourselves and that we are part of a larger whole whose existence depends

upon us" (p. 12). In physics and biology new discoveries have extended the causal roots of science to include acausal circumstances which have led to various ideas expressing that the world is a living organism. For example, Lovelock's (1979) Gaia hypothesis, Sheldrake's (1982) morphic fields, and Bohm's (1980) holomovement theory.

Paradigm Shifts: Philosophical Applications in Group Work

These new views are part of a paradigmatic shift away from mechanism, which views the world as a machine functioning in a causal and determinate way. The philosophy of Descartes, which has been the backbone of modern western philosophy and science, supports this view through its division of mind and matter.

The philosophical basis of this rigorous determinism was the fundamental division between the I and the world introduced by Descartes. (Capra, 1975, p. 45)

The Newtonian view of the universe was built on this division of mind and matter. The world according to Newton was characterized by the notions of absolute space and time, elementary solid particles, the strictly causal nature of physical phenomena, and the ideal of an objective description of nature (Capra, 1975, p. 50).

This basic philosophical attitude with which western people view the world makes us think that we are separate from the events of the world at large or a group conflict. In group work we observe this view in practice when an individual disturbs the group and we do not identify with the individual or the disturbance but

think that that person has a problem. Bohm (1987) claims that the tendency to break the world up into parts is a destructive and fragmentary way of thinking which creates distinctions between people, families, professions, nations, races, religions, and ideologies (p. 24).

Fragmentation is therefore an attitude of mind which disposes the mind to regard divisions between things as absolute and final, rather than as ways of thinking that have only a relative and limited range of usefulness and validity. It leads therefore to a general tendency to break up things in an irrelevant and inappropriate way according to how we think. And so it is evidently and inherently destructive. (p. 24)

The new paradigm stresses the basic wholeness and interdependence of the universe. Capra (1982) describes the systems viewpoint:

Systems are integrated wholes whose properties cannot be reduced to those of smaller units. Instead of concentrating on basic building blocks or basic substances, the system's approach emphasizes basic principles of organization. Examples of systems abound in nature. Every organism - from the smallest bacterium through the wide range of plants and animals to humans - is an integrated whole and thus a living system. (p. 266)

In subatomic physics discoveries about the basic wholeness and interdependence of the universe have limited the Cartesian world view.

...subatomic particles have no meaning as isolated entities, but can only be understood as interconnections between the preparation of the experiment and the subsequent measurement. Quantum theory thus reveals a basic oneness of the universe. It shows that we cannot decompose the world into independently existing smallest units. As we penetrate into matter, nature does not show us any isolated "basic building blocks," but rather appears as a complicated web of relations between the various parts of the whole. These relations always include the observer in an essential way. The human observer constitutes the final link in the chain of

observational processes, and the properties of any atomic object can be understood only in terms of the object's interaction with the observer. This means that the classical ideal of an objective description of nature is no longer valid. The Cartesian partition between the I and the world, between the observer and the observed, cannot be made when dealing with atomic matter. In atomic physics, we can never speak about nature without, at the same time, speaking about ourselves. (Capra, 1975, p. 57)

Bohm (1987) addresses the relationship between parts and wholes in his theory of the holomovement.

...there is a continual enfoldment of the whole into each region, along with the enfoldment of each region into the whole again. Although this may take many particular forms - some known and others not yet known - this movement is universal as far as we know. I'll call this universal movement of enfoldment and unfoldment 'the holomovement'. (p. 12)

Lovelock (1979) postulates in his Gaia hypothesis that the earth's biosphere, atmosphere, oceans and soil are parts of one self-regulating organism which maintains the optimum conditions for its survival. Therefore, he asserts that we are all part of one vast being, Gaia; a living intelligence that has maintained our life on earth.

Mindell (1989b) has connected these modern views with their ancient roots and describes various myths in which the earth is expressed as an anthropomorphic figure or immense god who created itself, human beings, and the environment. The mythology of the world has historically understood the world as a self-organizing body capable of an infinite intelligence.

The modern view of the world as an information network of interconnecting links, and of the planet as a thinking organism is not new, but has its roots in early myths which portray the cosmos as a living

being, a gigantic anthropos in which we all live.
(p. 20)

These ancient and modern metaphysical views serve as a theoretical groundwork in group process work and are concretely applied in the tools and interventions. One of the major contributions of group process work is that it illustrates this new paradigm shift, which is in its beginning stages of application, on a concrete human level. We can observe that the group will act as a self-organizing system, using its inherent intelligence to process its conflicts and discover itself. We will also notice how individuals are not separate and localized entities, but carry processes belonging to the entire group field. I would like to demonstrate this by bringing a case of an institutional conflict.

The Group Process

The following group process took place at an international psychological course given by the Research Society for Process-oriented Psychology in Zurich, Switzerland. Over sixty people participated in the course. On the first day, one of the administrators noticed that two people who were not participants had arrived and had been participating in the first hour of the course. When the group convened after a break, she brought her observation to the group.

Admin: I feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities as an administrator and need your help. A couple of people who were not in the course have just showed up and I feel it is the group's responsibility to decide what to do about it. I don't want it only on my shoulders and don't feel it is only an

administrative decision. I feel that if I make a decision I would be speaking for the group and therefore, need the group to help me.

This is already a very unusual way to deal with such a conflict. Normally, institutions do not give conflicts to the group to decide, but create rules to deal with such problems. Indeed, this can be looked at as a simple administrative problem. The rule was that sixty people were accepted in the course on a first-come-first-served basis. There was a waiting list of over thirty people. The course had been filled for months and the two people who had come were towards the end of the waiting list. They were aware that the course was full, yet they chose to come. The administrative rule would maintain that the course was full, they came unannounced and unpaid, and should not be allowed a place in the course.

This traditional view deals with people and circumstances as separate from a greater whole. One part, an administrator, makes the decision about another part, the people who came unannounced, without an awareness or consideration of the entire group. The interaction is then understood as an isolated incident between an administrator and those people, but not as a part of the entire group process, where all of the parts are interconnected. The Cartesian view sees the individual as separate from others and the world, and dealing with this conflict in the above manner is a form of Cartesian administration.

Another view is to understand the disturber not as a separate entity, but as an inseparable part of the group. We have already

seen that in process work disturbances are manifest on an individual level as that with which we do not identify. These secondary processes can take the form of a body symptom, relationship conflict, or anything else that disturbs our identity. Ignoring or not picking up secondary processes or disturbers contributes to the information float or fog between people. The basis of process work is holistic, incorporating that which is outside or separate, discovering its meaning for the whole organism, and thereby cleaning up the information float. In group work secondary processes often present themselves in the form of individuals who disturb the intentions and identity of the group. Such people have minority opinions, go against the group norm, and are often troublesome to other members of the group.

Most groups try to repress disturbers and therefore create rules to deal with them. Rules are important and serve the function of dealing with a problem we do not have the tools to work with, and/or sufficient understanding to appreciate. The majority rules out the minority and in a Cartesian world the whole should not suffer. However, with the new paradigm shift, the whole has to suffer because it is not only an isolated part that is rejected but a part of the system itself. Therefore, the administrator is acknowledging the importance of the system. From the system's viewpoint, the disturbers could be bringing something that the whole group needs to learn more about and the administrator is not an isolated being capable of leading or deciding for the whole group. This world view provides the

groundwork of what is to come; how the group work will structure itself and what the group will learn from the disturbance.

What is difficult to pick up in the verbal transcript is that the administrator is speaking cautiously and appears slightly irritated. In other words, she is not totally neutral. She has her own personal opinion and feelings about the situation. This is important because believing in the wisdom of the whole group also means believing in the tendency of a group to make parts and segments and to identify itself in given moments with various parts of the whole. Her affect and emotion indicate that she identifies herself with a part of the whole and in addition, she is concerned with the entire group process. Therefore, a combination of both Cartesian and holistic world views is necessary.

After the administrator introduces this conflict the group decides to find out more about it and various members of the group voice their opinions. The group is beginning to differentiate itself by creating segments and roles.

Participant: I feel hurt that these people just showed up because there was a waiting list and a friend of mine was on it. I feel badly that she couldn't come.

Others echoed similar opinions and then Mindell, the identified facilitator of this group, intervened.

A: Well, one side has been clearly represented and I will now speak for the other side. The ones who have come unannounced to the course should not feel pressed to speak because this is not a place to be scapegoated.

Here we can see that the feelings and position of the outsider

are not only identified with the people who arrived unannounced. The role or process is not localized to a particular part of the field, but is assumed to be a part of the whole group organism. Arny has noticed that one role was clearly able to express itself, but the role ostensibly occupied by the outsiders has not spoken. The idea of this intervention is that making the roles in a group explicit helps the group to work with its information float. Within the various roles and their interactions is information which demands our attention. Creating roles for various standpoints in a group helps us to learn more about the group's polarizations as well as the segments which constitute the group.

The simplest way of processing feelings is to discuss, demonstrate and act out the feelings in the different roles. Each role communicates with another role. Which role is the inadequate person speaking to? Is it the tyrant who makes others feel inadequate? Each role in a field can be understood as a reaction to another role, and polarizing these two roles clarifies the field. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 78)

Arny begins to speak as the other side and invites others in the group to take part by joining the roles to which they feel drawn. One part of the room has been set aside for the administrator position and the other for the role of the outsiders or unannounced participants. People in the room move in and out of these roles and express the feelings that they have in each of these positions. Arny begins:

A: I just had to come. Just as you had to draw a line and that was right, it was important for me to come. It was part of my inner development that I just didn't follow a collective rule.

Admin: Well we feel taken advantage of. We can't just let anyone in who shows up. We will get a reputation that anyone could just come. We have a reputation for being flexible and open. How can we turn you away?

A: Do you feel we are like terrorists?

Admin: Yes.

Outsider: It was so important for us to come. We just had to do it.

Admin: I feel hurt that you just come in and don't introduce yourselves and ask the group how they would feel about you being here. I feel that you are sneaking around. If it is really important to you I want to hear your personal feelings and ask us all how we feel about it. Would you do this? Who are you?

Up to this point in the role play, the two individuals who had come into the course had not yet spoken. After one of the participants on the administrative side had said this, the group began to talk about practical solutions like making more courses. Arny then made a second intervention. He remarked that the group had reached an edge when one part was asked a question and did not answer, and that we should really go back to this point because the group would cycle around it otherwise. Information which is not consciously picked up creates edges, because we inadvertently disidentify with the information. Thus, not responding to a question or a criticism is an edge. If the information is not picked up it adds to the information float and the group will cycle on this point. An edge is like a hot spot, and our first intention is to move off it. Therefore, we can understand why the group, turning its attention to practical matters, leaves the emotional plea of the administrator who asked the outsiders to stand for themselves. This is a common

experience and it is important to simply notice this and feed it back to the group.

The two people do not come forward immediately, and others continue in each of the roles, but with more of an emotional intensity.

Out: I know I did something bad and it is hard for me to come out and say something because I am afraid to be crucified.

Admin: Huh, I can understand that. We too feel this way. We feel that if we say that you can come or cannot attend the course we will also be crucified.

A: (intervening from the position of the outsider) And now that you point this out it must be part of my individual process to speak out in front of a group and say what is so important to me. I broke a rule and I did it for a particular reason, and I need help from certain people.

Other people come in and help and try to speak for the outsiders. Then a woman, who is very emotional, comes to the front of the room. She is not one of the unofficial participants, but people think she is because of her intense identification with them. She says:

Out: (shaky, quivering voice) I am very out of control and this is the only way I can do it. I don't know how to ask for what I need. I have to break the rules because I don't know how to do it any other way. The rules are not mine, but ones I have to fit into and I can't do it that way. I have to be in reaction.

The fact that people did not know who she was, and when she was asked if she was one of those who came without permission she hesitated but said yes, shows that she identified very strongly with the role of the outsider. I bring this to the reader's attention to show that the problem is more than an individual

process or conflict between two separate parties. Many people, like this woman, are involved, and this intensity of involvement is indicative of the collective nature of the issue.

Arny tries again to bring in the real outsiders. If they do not come in, the entire group will polarize itself against them.

A: If there are any real people, I hope we have made it safe enough for you to come in.

One of the outsiders speaks. I will call her Pat and the other unannounced participant Tom.

P: I don't feel so safe about talking to a whole group of people. I don't feel we snuck in. We came in at 8 a.m. and couldn't talk to people.

Admin; But you talked to...

P: (Her tone is sweet and she sounds like she is trying to be convincing.) It is not in an antagonistic sense, like now where we are in front of everyone trying to explain ourselves. I wouldn't mind trying to understand everyone's feelings. We tried to cooperate with the rules. We did all of the things and then we just felt so committed to this so we wanted to try it. We didn't force you. We are here and want to talk to you. We didn't get that opportunity yet and now it is in front of the group. It is real difficult for me. I wouldn't mind talking, but I want to talk to somebody first so we could have some dialogue rather than having this whole thing like this. I think that is really a strong way to put it, and then we are also nailed. I mean we aren't trying to nail you but we never got a chance to talk. (She is sitting and Tom is standing next to her.)

Admin: Well, is there anything we could do to make it easier for you?

P: Well, yeah, not have a hundred people around. (She slaps her thighs and is slightly aggressive in tone.)

T: (He speaks softly with a shaky voice and his hand on his heart area. His mood appears scared and guilty.) It is okay to be in front of a hundred people. I welcome the opportunity to allow you to make the decision, even though it is a large group and two more people might not make a difference. (His hand moves outward from his chest.) I think we would bring to the group as much as we could take from it. The reason we

came has to do with life situations and I won't bore you with the details. Next year it is impossible for us to come; we have a commitment which we have no control over. We very much want to participate in this course. We planned to come on Thursday, (earlier) and it wasn't possible. We knew there was a chance that we wouldn't be allowed to stay. But we felt it was worth it to take that chance, knowing that there was a waiting list, that people sometimes don't show and space might open up. On that basis we trusted divine guidance that if we showed up there was a reasonable chance we would get in and if it wasn't meant to be then we wouldn't.

Admin: I want to apologize to the two of you that I didn't come and ask you before if it would be okay that we brought it up in the group. Instead we made a group process about it and I put you in a position similar to the one I feel that I am in.

T: Well, that is fair.

P: Except we didn't put you in front of the group.

Admin: I put you in a position where you had no decision about what is going to happen. I understand you and feel sorry for it.

P: Yeah.

A: So we have done it both ways. They didn't give you a chance to make a decision and you didn't give them a chance to make a decision.

Admin: Yeah. I noticed that when you said that I thought to myself "how could I have possibly forgotten that?" I am sorry.

P: Well we felt the strength. We had a lot of trouble getting off the plane this morning. But we thought that this was a civilized group of people, extra civilized, extra developed. So we talked about it and decided to come. We weren't trying to nail anyone or demand anything. But I see how you felt that way, that we were attacking. We are just two people who came and said they wanted to learn.

Admin: So I think it would make it easier for me now if you could feel into our position a little bit too. That would relieve me so much if you could see that what you did was a little bit nailing, a little.

P: We did feel into your position. We did, we did. We didn't say for a minute that we didn't overstep the boundaries of the institution. We have tried to go by the rules. (She goes on defending herself.)

Here I would like to bring a few interesting points to the reader's attention. When Pat begins to speak, she does something typical of outsiders or disturbers who come into a group. She disidentifies with what she has done. She has indeed broken the rules, and in part admits it, but in the same breath claims she did everything to go by the rules. She is also upset about the issue being brought before the group. One way to look at this is to simply say that she is defensive and justifying her actions. However, it is important to discover the need behind her defensiveness. Mindell (1989b) has shown in his work that a group has a tendency to scapegoat an individual who is carrying a process to which the group has an edge. Pat's defense is an attempt not to be scapegoated. For the moment, the group's focus is on her and Tom. Interestingly, being scapegoated is a process that both Pat and Tom share with the administrators. They both fear being crucified by the group, meaning that they will be identified with a particular process which they experience as collective as well as individual.

We can also observe some of our most common collective ways of dealing with conflict. Attack and defense, justification and pleading, rational logic, and indirect blaming are some of the characteristic ways we negotiate about conflict. These methods are derived from Cartesian thinking which identifies one process with one part and Judeo-Christian tradition which attributes a value or morality to each part. Reciprocal reactions are commonplace, and it is at this point in the conflict that the administrators notice how they have reacted reciprocally.

It is fascinating that Pat keeps fighting. She has not changed as a result of the apology and the atmosphere in the group has grown rather tense. Pat used the identity of the group as a weapon when she said that she thought the group was extra-civilized and developed. Therefore, the group felt indirectly attacked. The administration, which had apologized, is drawn into a fight again and asks Pat if she could possibly feel into the other side. The administration must respond here because it has been indirectly attacked. Arny intervenes at this point by reading into the feelings that Pat might be having, helping her to complete what she is doing. Pat is only identified with part of herself, that is, the part of her that wants to come to the course and feels closed out by the institution. She is not identified with her aggression, her indirect attacks, and her rebellious actions. Fantasizing into the feelings and experiences with which an individual does not identify can be useful and relieving for both the individual and the whole group. This is another intervention which brings out the information float and makes it more apparent. Arny says:

A: (standing next to Pat and speaking for her) One of the reasons why you are moving and fidgeting so much when I speak, is because I used words that I didn't want to and they might have irritated you, because I said that you shouldn't think it was an attack. And of course that has a bad effect, you see. I didn't mean to even say it. (Pat giggles and looks a little shy.)

If we look at Pat's perseveration of the conflict as meaningful, we would come to the conclusion that there is a fight that needs to be fought. Why else would she keep on fighting? She is not

identified with a fight, and yet, she continues to fight. Who is she fighting against? If the administration has apologized to her, where is her opponent? Some administrative group is her opponent. Her inability to change from her position indicates that she has not stated her position strongly enough and thus keeps going. The role of the one who fights administrations is the rebel: this is the part that needs more definition and representation. In a way, she is not only fighting about the content of the conflict or for herself, but is fighting as a rebel who has not yet been accepted in the group field as a part. When Tom spoke with hand on his heart we could only wonder what kinds of things he was feeling. His shakiness, quiet tones, and guilt or shyness were not apparent in the kinds of things he said. He spoke very rationally and logically about the whole conflict, and the emotions remained in the background. We might guess that the feelings and purpose of the rebel were in this emotional background. Thus, we could see that the conflict goes on in an attempt to get to the core of this part and the larger need that the entire group has for its expression.

Arny's intervention, speaking as the rebel, is not picked up by Pat personally, but it clarifies for the group the reasons for their discomfort. The group comes in again at the edge. The edge here was for Pat or others to personally identify with the attacks the rebel was making. One of the most common group edges is avoiding emotional issues.

For example, someone in a large group mentions a forbidden topic or attacks someone else for being rigid. Everyone fears these emotional issues and neglects them. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 59)

The group enters here, again indicating that this is not only an individual process. Some of the members are already making many of the interactions useful for themselves. One man relates his experiences:

Participant: I have had confrontations with cops for the last ten years and now the situation has transcended into a new form. Today we have the chance to cooperate with people who have broken the rules. I broke the rules and threw stones at police while demonstrating. I broke the rules but never had the chance to come into contact with the rule makers. Now we have the chance to do this and I am glad that we have this chance to contact the other side.

His insight about how important it is to bring conflicting parts into contact and not separate them by rules and administrative policy is a big discovery. Indeed, it is one of the philosophies inherent in group process work; to bring parts into contact with one another. A deeper meaning of this which will come out of this work is that contacting the other side means contacting it on many levels or channels; meeting all sides of a group conflict in the group, relationships, internally, in subgroups, and in the world.

The focus finds its way back to Pat. There is still tension between her and some members of the group. Sometimes in group work an individual, a couple, or a subgroup can disturb the group and there comes a time when someone might need to work directly with that.

The problems of a group may appear in individuals who seem to have many problems. When a field is constantly disturbed by someone's problems, this person may represent important needs for everyone to process. This person may be known as the identified

patient, the scapegoat or a representative of the minority opinion. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 82)

Arny is experiencing Pat's feistiness and wants to bring it out. Her rebellion could be something that the whole group could profit from by learning more about it. He thinks that if she could be more direct with her attacks and more overtly rebellious the group atmosphere would be relieved. Pat is now talking, arguing her case and indirectly blaming the group.

A: I wonder if I can ask you to stand for a moment.

P: I just can't stand right now, Arny.

A: Well, if you don't stand...

P: Can you hear me? (She cuts him off and talks to the group.) Can everyone hear me?

A: I know they can, but you see, now... Hmmm, I am going to tell you to stand and you say no. You have to stand up.

P: In order to get into the course, well, I guess I will stand but I just...

A: You gotta stand up when we tell you to stand up.

P: I still don't want to.

A: You must do what we say. I experience you as being a rebel.

P: Interesting. I don't see myself as a rebel but as someone who has an idea and tries to make it happen without hurting a lot of people.

A: The ideas that you are having are not happening in such a way that they are coming across to me. You are irritating me, and we are having a fight.

P: I don't think we are having a fight.

A: You don't agree with anything I say.

P: I came to your workshop last year.

A: Is there anything that we agree on?

P: I usually agree with rules.

A: Well this isn't just rules. This is you being a rebel and me insisting on you being a rebel, and you saying you are not a rebel. And yet you are not going along with anything. And I am laughing and double signaling (saying two things) at the same time.

P: I don't think the idea started with a rebellion, but it would be fine if the system changed.

A: Well, tell us how to change it.

Here Army is trying to challenge her to really make a change in the system. All rebels want to make changes. However, they often stop after expressing their insurgence. Their rage and fury is completely justified; a part has been shut out for a long time and is upset. Really including the rebels, outsiders, or disturbers means giving them the opportunity to make changes and challenging them to do so. Pat is at a personal edge here and is unable to bring in anything concrete. Army remembers that Tom had said he thought they could bring something useful to the group, and Army is hoping that this might be it.

A: You said that you were going to come and give us something. You might possibly get in if you could give us something by changing the system that we have in such a way that it is better than the way it is right now. I want to give you the opportunity to literally change the rules in a way that everybody could profit.

P: In history there have been many exercises in change and various uprisings. This is a different kind of behavior than I would usually do. It wasn't meant to be disrespectful and I am happy to examine myself, but people... I didn't try to make a change and the pot is boiling and I didn't expect it. I wouldn't say I was trying to be rebellious but things like that seem to happen when I am around. I don't try to do that; I try not to do that. Now it just happens and I accept it.

Army has given her the opportunity to change the rules, and she is not yet able to. In doing this she would become the

rulemaker, a part of herself with which she has little contact. She would then become the administrator, helping to administrate new institutional policy in a very real and dynamic way. At this moment she is not up to it. She is moving toward this role, using her past knowledge of historic rebellions to help her along, but she has not yet arrived. This is because she does not identify with the rebellions that "seem to happen when she is around." But being a rebel and making changes is not an exclusive characteristic of one individual. The rebel and the administration are roles which need to be occupied in this group. This is a group process; many people are involved and the fact that Pat cannot go on is perfect. The rest of the group has to pick up its rebellious nature and change the system.

Becoming identified with any one role is important for us and our communities but is also onesided. Each of us has all the roles within; we are too complex to be identified with only one for long. Roles belong to the community. We need to fill them, step out, take on other roles, and finally just be ourselves. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 68)

The people who are the actual administrators of this course are excited about the challenge to change the system. Challenging one part in a field is not only a challenge to a specific individual, but to the entire field. Therefore, others feel addressed by this. Two of the administrators spontaneously switch sides and stand next to Pat and say:

Admin: I want to change something. I would like to take everyone who is on the waiting list. Everyone who wants to come to the course can come.

Admin: Everyone should come even if they have no money, if

they can commit the time. It would make my heart happy. People can come and pay what they can.

The administrators have made some big changes. They themselves have become rebellious, stepping out of their initial roles and learning about another side of themselves. However, the whole group is still not satisfied. One man says:

Participant: You are counting on our eros but you don't give any. It is a problem of eros, love and relationship. If you knew you were going to break this rule, and you did because you were making plans, I think you could have called and said that you were going to break a rule. There are people who didn't do what you did because of a feeling of relationship with us. They wouldn't want to put their friends in that position. I don't think it is a matter of rules, and now we are getting into this whole intellectual conversation about it.

A: You just brought something up that is very important. The thing that is wrong with institutions and rule makers is that they don't have enough feeling for the individual, but occasionally you have rebels who mirror that too. And therefore, you (the rebel) has to model the kind of thing that you would like us to become. Show us.

Arny has brought in a new view where an institution has feeling for its individual members. As we have seen in this transcript, the rebels are not themselves exhibiting the kind of feeling they would like to receive. This is a typical polarization; one part often accuses the other about something which it is also unable to do. A woman named Sue now steps forward and tells of her experiences which mirror the governing philosophy of institutions.

S: When Tom spoke earlier, I felt his need but a little voice inside of me came up and said "Come on Sue, you just don't have any more energy to give." During this past year I have rethought the nature of organizations, and I now see a need for an anonymous structure which automatically channels my energy in the right direction. And if that structure does not

work adequately then I cannot do what it needs to do. I now find that I have to be very clear about what my loving energy wants to give and also about the organizational structure that will support it. You can't separate them from one another.

Sue is telling us that she sometimes has a personal feeling where she has no energy to give and that she also has loving feelings which want to give. She also states that she understands the need for an anonymous institution which will channel this energy for her. In other words, a third party, something more removed from her own personal feelings and relationships, would be useful to her to help carry out her feeling needs. This is actually what creates the impersonal nature of institutions. It is much easier to not have interpersonal conflicts but to have an anonymous institution which deals with difficulties. Rules are made, perhaps with some exceptions, but the whole emotional arena of feeling and relationship remains in the hands of a person with no face or heart. Clearly, as Sue states, the need comes from the inability of most institutions to make feeling issues and relationship troubles exciting and useful. Most people find them draining; no one ever changes and the conflicts cycle. The inability of the organization to process its own material creates a need for an anonymous structure to pick up all the difficult feeling areas. Energy is consumed by struggling within the rules of a system where normally nothing changes and the sides remain in a stalemate. Both parts look the same and a rule is made to deal with the loose ends. We all have the experience of being part of a conflict which cycles, and most of us would prefer to drop it or find some easy way to handle it, like a rule. As we have seen, individuals and groups cycle around edges. Therefore,

training in noticing and working with edges could make relationship and group life more fun. As demonstrated in this work, however, we create rules against disturbers, keeping them out, and remain stuck in the world views we have when we do not have the tools to work with and appreciate the disturbances.

It is now getting close to lunchtime and Arny suggests a radical method to decide on whether Pat and Tom should be allowed to stay and participate in the course. He suggests twirling a pen. If the pen points to one side of the room they can stay, and if it points to the other side, they cannot. He asks the administration, participants, and Pat and Tom if they would agree to this. If you remember, when Tom first spoke he said that they had left the decision up to divine guidance, which would direct their fate. Suggesting the spin of the pen was therefore in accordance with Tom's initial expectations. The group had previously, before this session, completed a collective work where the outcome was consulting a neutral power in order to help make a decision. This intervention was already manifest in the group field, which is why it was picked up.

A: Would you accept it? It is not a personal thing at this point. We are leaving it up to a neutral power.

People accept it. However, there is lots of nervous tension and talk. Some people just want to let Pat and Tom in and say they would feel badly if they were turned away. Arny remarks that he would consider the "no" meaningful. He also makes an interesting statement, considering he is the unspoken, but identified, leader of the group. He says that if the decision were his he would

have simply invited Pat and Tom in, but he did not because that would be stepping on other people and that would be against the kinds of institutions he likes. Here, the leader himself is trying to create a world view where the leader does not lead, but the spirit or process of the group is the leader.

The pen is spun and it lands in a completely neutral position, on the line between the two decisions. It is spun again and lands in the exact same position. People are surprised.

A: This is so unusual and improbable. You know, being a physicist and all, I know that it is highly improbable that the thing would go in the same direction at the same degree twice in a row. I think we are forced to say that there is no solution for this in the moment and we should go have lunch.

The group dispersed for lunch and returned a couple of hours later. People were chatting about the process in the morning and wanted to continue with it in some form. Arny gave different options for how to do it and spoke a little about theory.

A: One of the reasons a group can't come to a conclusion is because as a unit it can't, but as individual parts it can, and it may first need to work on this level. Group process understanding means also that we work both as a unit and as subunits. Sometimes things are solved only in couples, or in individual work or in working alone on the topic that the group has been working on. The topic right now is rules versus freedom and the necessity of breaking those rules.

Arny then asked people what they gossiped about during the lunch break. Asking people what they have gossiped about or what they have heard in the field is an intervention to bring out material that people are too shy to say.

Gossiping about group experience outside the group, talking and trying to comprehend what occurs in a

group is one of the main spontaneous ways in which groups transform. Gossip needs time to develop! It becomes a problem only when its content is not somehow represented in the group's life. (Mindell, 1989b, p. 85)

People volunteered various pieces of conversation and it became clear that many people felt the two parts of rebel and rulemaker were not sufficiently polarized, that the rebel was not represented strongly enough. Two women said that they had separated both of the parts and acted them out together in an extreme fashion. Another piece of gossip on the more practical end of things had to do with the development of a new center; the organization was simply stressed out by its size, and was in a process of finding a vision for its growth.

One man said that the situation mirrors that of Switzerland and how the Swiss keep the foreigners out. He is American and usually identifies himself as an outsider in Switzerland. He was shocked to discover his provincial nature which wants to hold onto his land and keep the outsiders out. He made a real role switch and discovered something important about himself. Such discoveries are essential; through them he is no longer occupied with the theme of keeping Pat and Tom out, but is much more interested in his own tendency to keep people out and the foreigner or rebel who is asking to come in. As Arny stated, there are many levels to group work. During the break people worked a lot on the individual level and this furthered the process.

The group decides that the two parts are still in conflict and

invite the two women who had played the conflict during their lunch break to represent it for the group. Rebel and rulemaker strut into the center of the room. They come out fighting, shouting obscenities, with hands on hips and chins jutting forward. People on the outside watch in fascination and giggle, saying that they look like the same person. There is no difference; rebel and rulemaker are mirrors of each other. They are both in battle, one-sided, with no awareness of the other. They accuse each other of things that they both do. Who is who?

Then a strange and surprising thing occurs in the role play. The rebel notices the eyes of the rulemaker, and Arny intervenes.

A: Well, one thing you have just brought in is your awareness. You said you noticed her eyes. You are using your awareness.

Rule: We are switching roles.

A: You want to help her with the awareness role?

Rebel: I think in your eyes you are fiery, exciting and loving.

They continue observing each other and bicker a little more. The rulemaker has her hand on the rebel's shoulder as she scolds her. But the scolding is only half of the story. In her hand is another unconsciously communicated message. She follows her hand and embraces the rebel. The two parts change as they begin to bring in all of their awareness. The rebel says it feels new to hug and not fight. They look at each other and then take their place in the circle.

People remark that the role play was very realistic. Then Pat, smiling, contributes the following:

P: It was amazing, realistic.

A: It was amazingly accurate, wasn't it?

P: Yeah, I really think so.

This is the first time Pat has agreed on something, and the atmosphere is much easier.

A: I think these two women had a teaching. Teaching is also a role that all of us are responsible for. They showed me that saying "no" was important and that struggling to loosen up the rigid "no" was important. The whole interaction is paradigmatic for me of a lot of situations in life. It went beyond what we were just working on. I feel as a teacher that it is necessary to open to other people who are teaching.

A woman who had been quiet the entire time now gives a very personal description of a new world view which was the essence of this work and which was perhaps the lesson in the background for us all.

Participant: As a rebel in my own life I am shocked listening to you all and I am realizing how the other side responds to a rebel. A lot of times I have been so busy fighting the fight that I didn't realize that the stuff is being taken in and worked on and that people are going through a whole process to try and figure out some way of addressing what came up. I don't think I'll ever be able to rebel again without thinking about what is going on on the other side. (People applaud and cheer.)

Arny suggests we now work on this theme in a personal way, but before doing it he wants to tell an Iroquois myth about Firestone and Maplesprout. In the myth the great mother has twins in her uterus, Firestone and Maplesprout. They battle with each other. Firestone sees light above and wants to come out of the mother immediately. Maplesprout wants to wait and come out organically; he warns Firestone that he will kill the mother if he does it his way. Firestone ignores the warning and kills the mother by going out too quickly. Maplesprout mourns the murder.

A: Firestone is the part who can't think of the whole world while thinking of himself. This is the end of the myth, and a good description of the present state of the planet. I think that the future will bring a minority who can bring out his own side and at the same time have awareness of the whole. This would be the new minority consciousness of the future.

Participant: Well that is timely, because today in the United States it is Martin Luther King day, and many people are celebrating minority consciousness.

The group process concludes with a warm feeling. People feel they have been touched and learned a lot from the whole interaction. The group decides to work on the theme of rebels and rulemakers in dyads to make the experience even more personal.

New Views and Concluding Comments

There were specific philosophical assumptions which created the groundwork for the unfolding of this group process and the interventions that were used. I have mentioned these throughout the text but would also like to list them in conclusion.

1. Groups are made up of various roles. Individuals are more complex than these roles, and are able to identify with more than one of them. Roles belong to the group field. This is why the administrator could not make a decision without the group. Individuals identify with many roles and groups feel best when all of them are represented and anyone can identify with them. The leader or teacher is also a role which many people fill.

2. Gestalting the field by finding the parts that are present and

encouraging them to interact alleviates a frozen field and creates clearer communication.

3. The disturber or minority is an important part of the group which is trying in the best way it knows to bring its message across. Interventions are used to help elicit the message.

4. Individuals have many parts and are encouraged to represent them with the belief that what the individual experiences in a group is not only personal but collective material. The group is like one body and all of its parts are important for it to be whole.

5. The interventions that are already present are the best interventions. For example, spinning the pen was accepted because of Tom's interest in divine guidance and the group's previous process about trusting a neutral power. Asking for gossip was useful because people were already gossiping after their lunch break.

6. Groups sometimes cannot conclude because they need to work in other channels; for example, on an individual or relationship level.

7. All parts are teachers and leaders.

I would also like to list the different solutions and world views which emerged from the group itself.

1. Bringing rulemakers and rebels into contact is unusual. One man said that he had been wanting this contact in

his confrontations with police for the past ten years. Bringing the institution into contact with the individual is still a radical concept. Even groups which pride themselves on their openness often resort to institutional anonymity when personal energy is drained. In this work, energy is gained through the liveliness of processing the conflict to completion and discovering new solutions.

2. One man also brought the idea that the rebels had no feeling for the administration. In fact, the inhuman institution is often mirrored by the rebel. It is common to see little humanity in an institution and to thus act as if no person is there. Here is a challenge to all of us to show our humanity, whether we are identified with the institutions or with the ones who want to change them.

3. No solution is another kind of solution. The neutral pen gave an apparent and temporary solution, and the discoveries made during lunch moved the process along.

4. Many solutions are needed for a group to be whole. Mindell (1989b) calls this a polycephalous or many-headed solution. For example, some people were excited about practical solutions like creating a larger center to deal with so many people. Others were interested in emotional solutions, and still others might be interested in more irrational aspects of the conflict.

5. The final new view we might call: minority consciousness. This is a view where we become aware of the other and are

interested not only in our side, but in the whole as well. This is a view which sees the individual as an inseparable part of the whole and vice versa. We observed how the group reflected the Cartesian view of life which was mentioned earlier; both parts functioned independently. The new view sees our opponent as an important part of our own development and perceives all the parts as inseparable aspects of the world at large. A minority consciousness challenges all parts to bring in their positions in a way which supports the individual parts as well as the whole. This world view could aid us in making worldly changes that many of us are often hopeless about.

CHAPTER NINE:

THE GROWTH OF GOD

The Push for Divine Development

In the last chapters we have been focusing on the world views which have been revealed in the various case studies. All of these views can be seen as part of the growth of a larger entity. In Answer to Job (1954) Jung goes beyond two obvious implications of the story of Job: it is not only a reminder that humanity is weak and powerless in the face of an almighty God, nor is it only an account of the suffering and development of Job, one of God's devoted servants. Jung made the shocking and blasphemous statement that God was unconscious and shows us that we can actually understand this story as an urgent plea for the development of God. Further, just as some of us might need God in order to live on this planet and to grow and flourish, God also needs us: in fact God's development is contingent upon his relationship to humanity.

Jung reveals that Yahweh is jealous and asserts that Job has something that God lacks, namely consciousness. Because he is already almighty, the Almighty does not have the need or capacity to develop. A human being, however, faced with a powerful and unpredictable divinity, is forced into a reflective position and

thereby challenged to become conscious. Without reflection, the actions of God, fate, the world, or spirit appear ruthless and meaningless. Our humanity and ability to reflect give life to Yahweh's outbursts. We make them real, bring them into consciousness, and see how they can be useful.

Job, devastated by Yahweh's cruel test of his piety, miraculously keeps his faith and simultaneously becomes aware of the dual nature of God. By knowing God, Job is raised to a godly level, especially because he perceives a part of God that God himself does not yet know. Thus, God too is pushed to grow.

Yahweh has to remember his absolute knowledge; for if Job gains knowledge of God, then God must also learn to know himself. It just could not be that Yahweh's dual nature should become public property and remain hidden from himself alone. Whoever knows God has an effect on him. The failure of the attempt to corrupt Job has changed Yahweh's nature. (Jung, 1958, p. 391)

Jung implies here that God is not an unchanging principle but that humanity has the ability to affect God in a profound way. While people have always witnessed the great effects and change in our own relationships to the divinity, we rarely think that our personal work and relationship affects the godhead. Relationship, whether it is to God, another person, an inner figure, or a body symptom, actually has the power to transform the static quality of any being. In fact, it seems that the kernel of divine experience lies in the relationship between humankind and God, for it is the relationship itself which is creative and dynamic. Our ability to reflect and become aware, to grab the raw and mysterious kernel of nature's occurrences and

extract its essence is a creative and divine process.

I am reminded of a woman who was working on her constricted breathing at a bodywork seminar. A powerful god-like figure who was mercilessly striking her emerged. Following her body wisdom, she curled up, fists clenched, face contorted in agony, strongly amplifying the reactions she was having. When she was in this state, the god could not go on. He fell to his knees and apologized to her, saying that he would never be so brutal again. This case continues the direction of the story of Job, but here the god goes further, actually becoming aware of himself and feeling for her.

Emphasizing the mutual growth between God and humankind introduces a different kind of relationship, a new model for humanity. This pattern is the antithesis of the more common image of an exalted God who is untouched by human experience. Here we might remember Young Oon Kim's (1982) statement that God does not come down to people who are unlike him. Religious ideology which asserts that God dwells with those who obey him and abandons those who do not propagates this separation of the human and the divine. Another view might be that we are involved in a divine and vital relationship conflict, in which a possible outcome could be a more holistic pattern where humankind is joined equally with God, and both benefit from the relationship to each other. This pattern stresses our inseparable relationship to the universe itself and finds an echo in the writings of many modern thinkers as well as in ancient views from the east which stress the divine unity of all things.

Modern Connections

We have already mentioned Lovelock's (1979) "Gaia Hypothesis" which asserts that the earth is a living organism. Rupert Sheldrake (1981) has demonstrated the mysterious and interconnected tendencies of biological systems to function not only in accordance with physical laws but also as "morphogenetic fields." He has shown that behavioral developments of a given species in one part of the world will effect the evolution of the same species in another part. He attributes this to the morphogenetic field, an organizing blueprint which serves as a memory bank traveling synchronistically over large distances. His research supports Peter Russell's idea of a "global brain."

Russell (1988) traces the evolution of our universe and demonstrates that each evolutionary trend solved a crisis or responded to a period of instability, thus implying the self-organizing nature of the universe. The entire biosphere has evolved as if it were one living system with numerous interconnected subsystems. Humanity, as the most recently evolved subsystem "...is like some vast nervous system - a global brain in which each of us are the individual nerve cells" (pp. 18-19).

With the evolution of human beings there emerged self-reflective consciousness and the ability to reflect upon the world we inhabit. This opened up the possibility of evolution at the mental level, and we can find the trend towards greater organisation manifesting within us in various ways. (p. 70)

Russell envisions future evolution occurring in the realm of human

consciousness: the evolution will effect ourselves, our environment and the entire universe. He surmises that our internal evolution would challenge the most common self model of the individual as distinct and separate from the rest of the world. A new model would be one in which the individual is not only a separate entity, but is intimately united with the rest of the universe.

Mindell (1989b) refers to this self-organizing nature of the universe as a universal dreambody, and he compares its self-reflecting tendencies to the Indian description of Brahman. The Bhagavad-Gita (Zaehner, Ed., 1976) understands Brahman as the Absolute, the highest God, or "...the eternal ground from which the universe proceeds" (p. 36). Mindell explains that

the mind of the universal dreambody appears to us through our capacity to perceive, and the body of the universal dreambody appears to us through the things which we perceive. Brahman is the universal capacity in all people to see, hear, feel the body, move, relate to others and sense the world. Sensory awareness is an archetypal perceptual system characteristic of all human beings. (pp. 63-64)

Mindell concludes that our perceptual system is in effect the universal dreambody and that by becoming aware of what we are¹⁹ perceiving we further the growth of a divine being.

The evolution of a global and self-reflecting consciousness can also be compared to the evolution of God. If we go back to Jung's comments about Job, we can observe that such evolutionary ideas have occurred in the history of religion.

Job stands morally higher than Yahweh. In this respect the creature has surpassed the creator. ... Job's superiority cannot be shrugged off. Hence a situation arises in which real reflection is needed. That is

why Sophia steps in. She reinforces the much needed self-reflection and thus makes possible Yahweh's decision to become man. (1958, p. 405)

Jung's view is radical; Yahweh, jealous of the human ability to be self-reflecting, needed to become human. Thus, the incarnation of Christ (pp. 406, 409-410, 414). Although the book of Job cannot be dated exactly, it is said to have been written only a few hundred years before the birth of Christ. Jung therefore claims that the incarnation was the answer to Job; Yahweh made retribution by offering his son. In that act he became a god capable of self-reflection and brought the evolutionary process one step further. Perhaps the need for a self-reflecting god was the deeper meaning and purpose as to why Yahweh was first convinced by the doubting thoughts of Satan. Thus, we might even see the divine patterns working behind so-called evil. From this divine crisis, too, a new order of evolution has been demanded, one in which a self-reflecting god becomes the ruling principle. Jung expresses the belief that Christ could never have made such an impression if something was not already at work in the collective unconscious: the need for a self-reflecting divinity.

Mindell (1985b) notes our collective evolution within the development of religion in terms of channel awareness and implies that our access to various channel experiences broadens our ability to be self-reflecting.

Every change of religious order is a manifestation of changing channels. The Jewish god Yahweh could be heard but not visualized. Jesus could also be seen! (p. 94)

Interacting with the Global Spirit

We can conclude here that life is its own meaning; it is self referential and capable of change. As Bohm (1987) says:

Rather than to ask what is the meaning of the universe, we would have to say that the universe is its meaning. As this changes, the universe changes along with all that is in it. (p. 99)

The mystical religions, particularly Taoism, have long said that life is its own meaning. Taoism, however, is like a dream which has not quite come into being. It waits like any dream, pressing itself into our awareness, helping us to create patterns in order to bring its wisdom into our lives. As mentioned earlier, our inability to unfold the tao has been one of the hindrances to integrating the ideas and philosophy of Taoism. We have simply lacked the awareness as to how we might do this.

Process work offers various ways of interacting with the tao and assisting in its unfolding. It is our relationship and interaction with the tao, or with God, or the universe, that is transforming. This means that we do not try and create the world as we would like it, but we really see the world as an intelligent being and pick up the signals that it sends. Thus, pollution is not only a problem that should be cleaned up and tended to by local solutions, but each of us should process our waste rather than discarding it. It means that natural events like volcanoes are explosive parts of an entire system which needs focus. Our body pains and illnesses and relationship troubles are also signals communicating the messages of this

universal being. Learning about and facilitating the growth of the universal spirit means relating to it by processing its signals.

As we have seen, a world view which emphasizes our wholeness and interconnectedness has actually been around for a long time. Why have we not been able to pick it up? I believe one of the reasons is that our idea of wholeness has in fact not been quite whole, and we have thus not been able to interact with and unfold those parts which have not fit into our conception of wholeness. Even though our religions, east and west, strive towards wholeness and divine union, they are not whole because they shut out parts of the world or individual that they see as not belonging to the whole. So much emphasis is collectively placed on unification that I find we actually lack patterns to deal with our diversity and separateness. Hence, we only understand diversity as a deviation from our goals towards unification. Another pattern demonstrates that these disturbances can lead the way to a greater and encompassing totality.

For example, Russell (1988) suggests a method as to how we might reach this higher level of global consciousness. He recommends experimenting with enormous group meditations in which people all meditate on peace. He wonders if this, with enough numbers, might have a synchronistic effect on the collective (p. 205). Peace is a great idea. We would all like it. However, peace is only the goal of one part of ourselves. It is not connected to all of the apparent conflict, and it is cut off from the

spontaneous signals of the earth itself. If we believe in the self-regulating intelligence of the universe, we need to learn to pick up and interact with the signals which the universe and all of its subsystems are communicating. This would be holistic. We can refer back to the story of Job; Satan cannot be removed from the universal drama. His part is also needed; it causes a disturbance and brings the next evolutionary leap. As Mindell (1989b) writes, "The world is a massive mind dreaming away, full of jewels hidden in the garbage waiting to be recycled" (p. 32).

New Lands: Discovering Foreign Fragments

This work has illustrated how process work interacts with this universal spirit by believing in its inherent intelligence and self-regulating tendencies. I have presented various world views which have emerged through working with the signals of the universal spirit. Since many of the case examples display views of the world and philosophies of life that are foreign to our collective consensus, I wonder if they might hint at the mental evolutions predicted by many modern thinkers.

It seems that there is something like a global brain, universal dreambody, or god which generates various views of the world, pressing us out of our small worlds in order to contact a more global world view. Many of the new world views in the case material, while foreign to the individuals, could be found in other parts of the world. Other new world views could not be totally amplified by any one known view. The case material was gathered mostly from people from western and more developed

countries. It is not surprising that many of them found their discoveries echoed in cultures outside of their own. These individual discoveries could be a way that the global brain is self-reflecting, a way that the universal spirit manifests itself, or how God is becoming conscious.

If we look at the world as an anthropos we might shed a little light on these points. The idea of an anthropos, a giant divine being which was the first entity created, can be found in many creation myths. These myths describe the creation of the world by the dissemination of an anthropos figure; the hair becomes trees, the blood becomes the waters of the world, and so forth (von Franz, 1972). These myths represent a world whose parts are scattered and separate, but which are held together by a divine and common background. In order for the anthropos to become whole it must become aware of its other parts. If we look at the world as an anthropos, we notice that individuals, groups, and nations tend to identify with, and have access to, certain parts of the anthropos and are separated from others. Therefore, we could understand the cross-cultural experiences mentioned in this work as attempts of the anthropos to bring its parts into contact with each other and discover itself.

Jung (1964), in his ideas of the collective unconscious, alluded to the tendency for the anthropos to make itself whole again. He observed that people dream of experiences outside their own cultural or familial contexts. I am reminded of a recent case: a simple woman who had never traveled outside of Switzerland. She

complained that she did not know who she was, that she felt empty, and that her normal feelings were missing. She dreamed that she fled from a village and then came to an Indian family who fed her. She knew nothing about India. I told her that in India emptiness was actually the main goal of those seeking enlightenment. Reframing her experience and connecting her with the wisdom of the Indian culture changed her suffering state. She suffers because she is confined within the beliefs of one philosophical paradigm which evaluates her particular feeling state negatively: it does not fit. Her unconscious produces a new philosophical model, taking her to a part of the world where she has had no contact and helping her to appreciate this new state. Such experiences shake us out of our identities as separate and localized parts and teach us that we are part of a greater and many-faceted divine being. We can see these experiences as an anthropos or global mind at work, trying to connect its pieces and learn about its totality. Mindell (1989b) notes that we are in the midst of a revolution with our own awareness and claims that

our earth is really only on the verge of discovering its own mind, its very existence! Until now the anthropos did not know it was a whole. Our world has not had to behave as a unity. (p. 36)

The ancient message in these anthropos myths is also mirrored in the modern theories of the hologram. The idea of the hologram is taken from the photographic method of holography. In a holographic image, the entire image is represented in every piece of the hologram. In the past decade this concept has been applied in various fields which claim that the universe is

structured like a hologram (Wilbur, 1982). For example, Pribram asserts that the brain is a hologram; experience is patterned into the whole of the brain and not localized in parts. Thus, any part of the brain has access to a large range of experience (pp. 7-10). Holographic theory shows the structure of our interconnectedness and gives us a framework to understand how people can access experiences outside of their own cultures. Mindell (1989b) concludes that all of these theories, both ancient and modern "...imply the existence of a universal dreambody, a non-physical pattern, linked with events that have no known physical or causal roots" (p. 56).

The Process-Oriented Nature of the Collective Unconscious

The universal dreambody, based on anthropos and holographic theories, gives us a model for understanding our totality and our fragmentation. Cross cultural experiences demonstrate how each part may discover its other parts. Further application of this idea brings us back to the effect that such discoveries can have on the whole itself.

Jung's collective unconscious is another concept which expresses that humanity is a wise and self-generating storehouse of all human experience. It is like a historical body in which all of the information of the entire universe is encoded. Jung (1959) called the patterns, forms, and energetic qualities that create and maintain the collective unconscious archetypes. He claimed that archetypes were tendencies towards certain experiences. Too

often the archetype is thought to be a static form or a particular experience. Jung said that the archetypes themselves are in flux and are not a set and steady background. We can effect them. By working with the archetypal background of the collective unconscious, we change it.

Nowhere has this been more apparent to me than in the numerous seminars in which I have participated in during the last ten years. I have met many new people and have watched their excitement as they witnessed people struggling with difficulties similar to their own and making new discoveries. Many people have been deeply touched as they discovered ways of being and living of which they had never dreamed. I have watched people, including those who have remained quiet throughout a seminar, leave with new found courage, thinking that they might also be able to do some of the things they had thought were impossible. So often an individual has had an experience, and afterwards, everyone in the room has felt as if they too had had it. These seminar situations seem to serve as a direct way of working with the archetypal background of the collective unconscious. The way a process which ostensibly belongs to one individual can profoundly affect a given collective is perhaps one way in which the anthropos becomes aware not only of its parts, but of itself.

Recently, some of my colleagues and I were informally talking about the powerful seminars we had participated in over the years. Arny and Amy Mindell had just returned from a trip to Africa where they had met two shamans, a husband and wife team. They went into the bush and became the first white people to "be

healed." They participated in a ceremony that reminded them of seminar situations. They watched how people who initially looked like passive participants became actively involved and touched by the healing ceremony. The work with the identified individual was additionally a work for the entire community. This form of group participation and individual work touches the core of community life.

These observations have been one of the strongest motivating factors behind this work. I have seen the seminar experiences give people new patterns for world views which seem to be further away from collective awareness. By presenting some of these in written form I hope to have touched the heart and excitement of making discoveries which lie outside our individual and collective identities and hope they may serve as patterns for others who might be searching for them.

CONCLUSION

Minority Views

The night before I began the actual writing of this work I dreamed that I was standing on top of the globe. I looked down at the earth and was shocked to see that the earth was populated by mostly white men. I could see very few women, children, or dark-skinned people. I woke up from this dream with a start and realized what it was that I had been called to write about: minority world views.

Standing on top of the globe, albeit with my own bias and limitations, I have described some of our most common and global views held by the majority, in addition to introducing those of the minority. We have seen how minority world views are born by focusing on those parts of ourselves with which we do not identify and to which we give little voice. One of my goals has been to bring out these minority views in order to make them more accessible to us.

This work has demonstrated that we all suffer from our own onesidedness and internal majority opinions. Thus, we find that the most common and all-pervading view is our tendency to believe that our identity is all powerful and embodies our entirety. By allowing the minority to speak, new views emerge and new relationships to already existing patterns are created.

We have seen in great detail how process work offers a psychological system which is able to elicit minority world views by using the information that is contrary to our existing beliefs. This in itself is a revolutionary world view. By communicating with, and eliciting the meaning of the various signals and manifestations of human experience, process work is one psychology which helps us to discover new interactional patterns and world views.

This dissertation has used case material to additionally emphasize the content of experience that emerges in process work. My desire to introduce various patterns comes from my excitement about these experiences. After meditating on my fascination with the content I realized that the content of the experience is often unusual, surprising, and sometimes goes against the collective consensus. Those aspects of psychology which direct the content of experience miss certain spontaneous experiences, because some content is seen as better or more developed. In fact, the goals of some psychological work are geared towards realizing the specific ideals supported by collective belief.

Without the content goals, process work has been free to go outside the parameters of cultural thought. I have given the reader a taste of these experiences and introduced diverse world views in order to present a greater picture of our totality. Our world views and the patterns to which we have access are all valid ways of experiencing life. All of them are essential. This work does not propagate any one view or pattern, but sees

the need for them all.

The Polycephalous Nature of God

Our gods and religious systems each represent a particular and important world view. A polycephalous solution²⁰ to the apparently conflicting views sees the validity and need for all of them. They are each pieces of a universal spirit which is wanting to be known and looking for followers who will live its message. In his lecture "The Heart of the Universe," Brian Swimme mentioned that the Old Testament was the way the universe learned to reflect on itself and that the Chinese classics were²¹ the way the universe learned to feel itself. In fact, one of the conclusions of this work is that we can understand all religion, science, and human discovery as a self-reflective expression of our universe.

Individual Tasks and Collective Growth

The case studies show that presenting problems find their solution in a change of world view. When this occurs the initial problem loses its previous importance. The new world view presents an enormous challenge to both the individual and the collective. These views come to life by unraveling processes which are far from a given individual's identity. We have seen that these experiences are not only outside of the individual identity but the collective identity as well. Therefore, we can conclude that individual growth is collective growth and that these experiences are attempting to create world views for us

all. This is the creation of culture, and it is a heavy task. This work shows individuals, couples, and groups in transformation, working with universal human issues, and trying to integrate world views foreign to the majority, a task which might very well occupy them for a lifetime.

Looking Towards the Future

We have seen that our world views are mirrored or evolving in our religious systems, in our relationship to the gods, in the various creation myths, in the experiences of individuals, couples, and groups, and in modern scientific ideas. It seems that these world views are emerging in part in an attempt to assist a divine being, universal dreambody, or global brain in its own awareness and growth. My goal has been to assist in the awareness of this entity and the emerging philosophies it seems to generate. The case material can be seen as impersonal; we are not only working on our own personal development but helping this larger universal being develop parts which are outside of its awareness. Lao Tzu, the ancient Chinese sage expressed the divine and collective nature of our development in the Tao Te Ching (1963) when he wrote: "The sage has no mind of his own" (chap. XLIX).

A Final Dream

Today, my last day of writing, and I have awoken with the following dream. I am making global invitations inviting the world to an international meeting. I use colored paper and make

various collage-type cards. As I look at the many cards I have made I notice that I can discern an image or a landscape in each one, and I work with my pencils to make the image more apparent. One is of a cityscape, another is a mountain range, one is of the globe and in the last one there is a woman standing in a small boat in the water and I see that her arm is raised. I draw a torch in her hand and present her as the Statue of Liberty.

The dream seems fitting for the conclusion of this work. I do feel that this work is a global invitation to us all to participate in the creating and living of the varied world views that exist and are emerging in each of us. The Statue of Liberty seems an appropriate symbol to stand for the freedom and expression of them all.

NOTES TO THE TEXT

1. See Diamond, J., Patterns of Communication: Towards a Natural Science of Behavior, for a thorough explanation of differences, how they create information, and their communication component.
2. Mindell said this at a training seminar in Tschier, Switzerland in 1988.
3. In addition to Mindell, River's Way, see Dworkin, J., Living Alchemy, for a thorough description of alchemical thought and its applicability to Process-oriented Psychology. Also see Jung, C.G. (1968), Psychology and Alchemy. Jung was the first psychologist to show the significance of alchemical thought and compare it to psychological processes.
4. See Goodbread, J., The Dreambody Toolkit, for a good comparison of states and processes, emphasizing our collective tendencies to see ourselves and the world as static. He describes processes and states as: "Process is that which proceeds. It is measured against time, it is the opposite of states - that which is static. Processes are described by verbs, states by nouns" (p. 15).
5. See Diamond, J., Patterns of Communication: Towards a Natural Science of Behavior chap. 4, Interpretation and Amplification, for further explanation.
6. See Kaplan, A., (1986), The Hidden Dance: An Introduction to Process-oriented Movement Work, and Kaplan, A. Working with Movement in Process-oriented Psychology, for a thorough description of how process-oriented psychology works with movement.
7. In Tales of Power Don Juan explains to Castaneda that the "nagual" is all experience which is not organized by our "tonal," or in process terms, our primary process.
8. Mindell said this in classes in Zurich, Switzerland.
9. I am thankful to Arny Mindell for this example which he used in a training seminar in Tschier, Switzerland, in December 1988, to illustrate how various psychological schools work with primary and secondary awareness.
10. This seminar on "Creativity" was held in Tschier, Switzerland, in April, 1986.

12. See Goodbread, J., (1988), Dreaming Up Reality: The Politics of Countertransference in Psychotherapy and Everyday Life, for an indepth overview of the phenomenon of dreaming up.
13. I am thankful to Amy Mindell for her thorough study of this case which she presented in her course entitled: Magical Moments in Process Work, on November 11, 1987.
14. Mindell first introduced this point at a seminar on "World Processes" in Tschier, Switzerland, in April, 1987. Since then this idea has become a working hypothesis, proven true numerous times in various group situations.
15. Mindell demonstrated that taking one's own side in a conflict is one of the steps in conflict resolution. This was taught in a course called "Community Crisis and Interventions" which took place in Zurich, Switzerland at the Center for Process-oriented Psychology in May and June, 1988.
16. Mindell first introduced these ideas on escalation and de-escalation in a seminar in Colorado Springs, entitled, "New Perspectives on Conflict Resolution and Creative Leadership." The event was sponsored by The Colorado Institute for Conflict Resolution and Creative Leadership and took place October 2-9, 1987.
17. This comment was made by Mindell at a five day seminar on relationships in Hohentannen, Switzerland, March, 1987.
18. See Mindell, A., The Year One: Global Process Work, for a thorough review of group process work. See also, Dworkin, J., Group Process Work: A Stage for Individual and Group Development, for a review of group work applications in various psychological schools including group process work, and in the field of organizational development.
19. See Mindell, A., The Year One: Global Process Work, chap. 8, Wake Up Shiva, and Muktananda, S., The Play of Consciousness, for a further description of this idea and how perception is understood in Siddha Yoga. Here we find that sense experience is known as the Indian Goddess Shakti and the perceiver is the God, Shiva. There is no individual or personal perceiver; Shiva perceives Shakti.
20. Mindell, uses Virginia Hine's structure for describing networks; one of the characteristics of a network is that it is "polycephalous." Polycephalous describes the many-headed leadership positions and tendencies that a group or network has. See Mindell, A., The Year One, and Lipnack, J., and Stamps, J., The Networking Book: People Connecting with People.
21. Brian Swimme's lecture entitled "The Heart of the Universe" took place on August 14, 1986.

List of References

- Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an ecology of mind. New York: Ballantine.
- Bateson, G., & Bateson, M.C. (1987). Angels fear. London: Rider.
- Bohm D. (1980). Wholeness and the implicate order. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bohm, D. (1987). Unfolding meaning. London: Ark Paperbacks.
- Capra, F. (1975). The tao of physics. London: Wildwood House.
- Capra, F. (1982). The turning point. London: Wildwood House.
- Castaneda, C. (1972). Journey to Ixtlan. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Castaneda, C. (1974). Tales of power. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Cavendish, R., & Ling, T. (1980). Mythologie der Weltreligionen. Muenchen: Rheingauer Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Corsini, R. and Contributors (1984). Current psychotherapies. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Diamond, J. (1988). Patterns of Communication: Towards a natural science of behavior. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Dworkin, J. (1984). Living alchemy. Unpublished master's thesis, Vermont College of Norwich University, Montpelier, VT.
- Dworkin, J. (1989). Group process work: A stage for personal and global development. Unpublished dissertation, Union Institute, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Evans-Wentz, W.Y. (1984). Tibet's great yogi Milarepa. Boulder: Shambhala.
- Franz, M.L. von. (1974). Shadow and evil in fairy tales. Zurich: Spring Publications.
- Franz, M.L. von. (1972). Patterns of creativity mirrored in creation myths. Zurich: Spring Publications.
- Goodbread, J. (1987). The dreambody toolkit. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

- Goodbread, J. (1988). Dreaming up reality: The politics of countertransference in psychotherapy and everyday life. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Guirand, F. (Ed.). (1959). The new Larousse encyclopedia of mythology. New York: Hamlyn Limited.
- Haley, J. & Hoffman, L. (1967). Techniques of family therapy. New York: Basic Books.
- James, W. (1961). The varieties of religious experience. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- The Journal of Process-oriented Psychology. (Vol. 2). (1989). Zurich: The Process Press.
- Jung, C.G. The collected works of C.G. Jung. Bollingen Series XX, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Vol. 8, (1960). The structure and dynamics of the psyche.
- Vol. 9, part I, (1959). The archetypes and the collective unconscious.
- Vol. 11, (1958). Psychology and religion.
- Vol. 12, (1968). Psychology and alchemy.
- Jung, C.G. (1954). Answer to Job. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Jung, C.G. (1964). Man and his symbols. New York: Dell Books.
- Kaplan, A. (1986). The hidden dance. Unpublished master's thesis, Antioch University, Yellow Springs, Ohio.
- Kaplan, A. (1988). Working with movement in process-oriented psychology. Unpublished article.
- Kazantzakis, N. (1961). Zorba the greek. London: Faber and Faber.
- Kim, Y., in Sontag, F., and Bryant D., (Eds.). (1982). God: The contemporary discussion. New York: The Rose of Sharon Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lacey, A.R. (1986). A dictionary of philosophy (2nd. ed.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lipnack, J., & Stamps, J. (1986). The networking book: People connecting with people. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lovelock, J. (1979). Gaia: A new look at life on earth. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mercatante, A. (1978). Good and evil. New York: Harper and Row.

- Mindell, A. (1982). The dreambody. Los Angeles: Sigo Press.
- Mindell, A. (1985a). Working with the dreaming body. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mindell, A. (1985b). River's way. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mindell, A. (1987). The dreambody in relationships. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mindell, A. (1988). City shadows: Psychological interventions in psychiatry. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mindell, A. (1989a). Coma: Key to awakening. Boulder, CO.: Shambhala.
- Mindell, A. (1989b). The year one: Global process work with planetary myths and structures. London: Penguin, in press.
- Mindell, A. (1989c). Working on yourself alone with process-oriented meditation. London: Penguin, in press.
- Minuchin, S. (1974). Families and family therapy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Muktananda, S. (1974). The play of consciousness. Camp Meeker, CA.: SYDA Foundation.
- Murti, T., in Sontag, F., and Bryant, D. (Eds.). (1982). God: the contemporary discussion. New York: The Rose of Sharon Press.
- Otto, R. (1958). The idea of the holy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peck, S. (1983). People of the lie: The hope for healing human evil. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Reps, P. (Ed.). (1957). Zen flesh. Zen bones. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- Russell, P. (1988). The awakening earth: The global brain (2nd ed.). London: Arkana.
- Satir, V. (1967). Conjoint family therapy. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books.
- Sheldrake, R. (1982). A new science of life: The hypothesis of formative causation. Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher.
- Smart, N., in Sontag, F., and Bryant, D., (Eds.). (1982). God: The contemporary discussion. New York: The Rose of Sharon Press.

- Smith, H. (1958). The religions of man. New York: Harper and Row.
- Sontag, F., and Bryant, M.D., (Eds.) (1982). God" The contemporary discussion. New York: The Rose of Sharon Press.
- Tart, C. (1983). States of consciousness (2nd ed.). El Cerrito, CA.: Psychological Processes Inc.
- Tsu, Lao, (1972). the tao te ching. New York: Vintage.
- Weith, I., (Trans.). (1966). The yellow emperor's classic of internal medicine. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Welch, H. (1966). Taoism: The parting of the way. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Wilbur, K., (Ed.). (1982). The holographic paradigm and other paradoxes: Exploring the leading edge of science. Boulder: Shambhala.
- Wosien, M.G. (1966). Sacred dance: Encounter with the gods. New York: Thames and Hudson.
- Zaehner, R.C., (Ed.). (1969). The Bhagavad-Gita. London: Oxford University Press.
- Zaehner, R.C., (Ed.). (1967). The concise encyclopedia of living faiths. Boston: Beacon Press.

