

PART II: THE SUBJECTIVE ASPECT

All that we have discussed is objective knowledge or speculation about the self. But what does this mean from the inside? What is the subjective experience of self from inside the self-representation, from within I-ness? We all have self experience, but how much of it is conscious without reflection? Moreover, what does this experience mean in terms of what exists as self? What am I really? If I have some experience of myself, or for that matter of enlightenment or a perception of a tree, does that perception amount to truth or reality? What are the epistemological and ontological consequences of experience, especially experience of the self?

To get a good grasp on the range of this question we must look at an even deeper question. We need to understand the nature of the reality we perceive. What is real, or what is?

There are many people who claim to have seen God, and many more who claim to have perceived an alternative reality to the one most of us live in. Castaneda's Sorcerer's reality is one such alternative reality. But does the perception of that supposedly deeper reality make it so? The perception means nothing without the interpretation of what that perception means. I may perceive some strange land in a vision and because of my religious training and upbringing interpret that land to be the Western Paradise or heaven. This vision may seem far more real than my normal world--and many mystics and spiritual practitioners make a claim that their altered state of consciousness revealed reality is far more real than their everyday reality. But does that appearance of being more real mean, in fact, that it is more real in an ontological sense? Is my vision of heaven, which has a subjective reality, a confirmation that heaven exists in some objective manner perhaps even more real than ordinary reality? Does an altered state

and the object of that altered state, no matter how real it appears, lend a greater reality to it than to ordinary mind reality?

A person taking psychedelics may perceive an altered reality but we don't consider it to be more real than either our own or their usual reality. Ordinary reality is usually considered the benchmark of reality, while spiritual and drug induced realities are special cases of consciousness per se, and not usually indicative of a different permanent structures of being (subjectivities) or of pointing to different realities. This is a case of a special kind of knowing, a temporarily altered subjectivity; generally we don't take this altered knowing to indicate either a permanent alteration in being or that another reality exists. At the worst we take it to be a sign of serious mental disorder or a hallucinatory drug reaction. At best we take it to mean the mystic has experienced another subjective reality that appears to be objective. Because he has experienced it, we also may experience that appearance of reality.

Heaven may exist in some fashion. But it does not exist like the city of Cleveland exists. Nor does the fact that seven mystics have each "seen" heaven make its existence a fact. The fact that it is perceived by some, does not mean its existence is a fact in the way other public objects are facts. Many people have a psychological need to have another, more perfect and good world. For them the mystic's report of another physical reality, or of another way to perceive the same physical reality may be all the proof needed to excite a search for inner peace and to bolster their insecure belief in a better world.

With this in mind, the answers to the question, "What am I?," become more intertwined with philosophical and metapsychological perspectives. Mystics may reveal "knowledge" about the self. But that knowledge is suspect because of the idiosyncrasy of the experience of self. The self knowledge

they perceive is of their selves, not of selves in general. As a not-public phenomena, the self falls into a different category of existence from objects in the public realm, such as a tree. The self has a more shadowy existence, even though in many ways and to many people it is much more real than a tree. Public objects are accepted to be more real than self, even though today many people accept as public objects, entities which have never been public at all.

Some physicists, philosophers and lay people consider the world of atomic physics and quantum mechanics to be more real than their Toyotas. But they can't see a quark or a positron. Yet that reality is considered to be more substantial than their own ordinary world. They have "reified" a hypothetical reality because the theoretic and experimental consequences of that reification has resulted in major scientific breakthroughs. These assumed realms may exist as physical reality in some way. But I can't know this directly, with my senses. I "know" they exist by inference. They exist as ideas, as "realms of discourse" within the minds of scientists and philosophers. It is in these discourse realms (which are very different from experiential realms) that nuclear bombs and megabyte chips are created, not in the real, unknowable atomic world--if it exists.

There are then different realms of "external" reality. One is a realm of objects and laws revealed by the senses and by our minds. A second inferred world of hypothetical reality and hypothetical objects of physics exists which has a different level of reality. This world has an explanatory potentiality as a realm of discourse, and a "real" but unperceivable existence. Lastly, there are the other realities experienced in altered states of consciousness. So what is real?

With regard to the self we have these same problems of the real. There is the self revealed by mystics; the self of psychoanalysis (scientists) which is largely an inferred sub-

jective world; the self revealed through my own introspection, and also the self discovered in psychotherapy. So which of those selves am I really? The choices are a mystically revealed self, an objective theoretical self of a universal psychoanalytic client, or the multiple aspects of my own self discovered in meditative introspection and as a client in psychotherapy. For me I choose the last approach and accept that self, in its these aspects of person, and of the dual aspects of impersonal cognizer and impersonal identifier, as the final measure. I can most cogently know me through the direct experience of myself and the direct experience of what is not myself. Theories, models and Gurus can help me to more discriminately perceive myself. But all these models, theories and revealed truth lack the vigor and convincing authenticity of direct, subjective apprehension of the self and the self in relation.

The introspectively revealed self has distinct dual aspects with regard to the personal self. In deep witnessing there is no personal self that is witnessing. Witnessing is a function of objectivity (but not objective in the sense of being public) and an attribute of consciousness itself, not of the personal self. Also, the self that is witnessed becomes dispersed into its components--atomized. This selfness is contrasted to the self revealed in psychotherapy, which is personal, integral and interpersonal (I-ness with an integrated self representation and object related feelings).

Although elements and qualities of the personal self may be held for introspective contemplation in meditation, that analysis has no personal elements anywhere. The personal self as object of witnessing disappears. There is no self as witness (except as an inferred but not seen "little person" inside us), and the witnessing itself is an impersonal function.

In meditation we can perceive, feel, smell, hear, and taste just as in ordinary consciousness. We can also reflexively watch those same processes of perceiving them-

selves which involve a self perceiving an object. In meditation we can become (Samadhi) the object of our perception, be it a tree or an image (fantasy). But the elements revealed in this meditation as ordinarily practiced are not the personal elements associated with the psychotherapeutic emphasis on interpersonal relations. The relations among and between contemplated elements of our self, and the witnessing of these processes, and any connections or linkages created are not personal. They have the qualities of a mechanism, of disjointed or coordinated elements of a machine. In meditation the contemplated self becomes a loosely integrated machine with no personal self anywhere.

The reasons for this phenomenon are complex. According to developmental psychology the personal self comes into existence through interpersonal relations and sustains itself through those relations. Therapy is such a creative relationship--it fosters the growth of the self. But meditative introspection is a reflexive relation where portions of the self objectify and relate to other portions of the self, including the self representations and ego fragments. The self does not relate to an object, either as representation (internal image) or to another person. Interpersonal aspects of the self are deactivated, at least during the meditation, and can disappear entirely if the meditator doesn't have a strong self-sense. He microanalyzes his personal self out of an integrated existence, at least as an entity that relates to the outside world.

A part of the process by which the personal self is maintained is through a reflexivity of consciousness. In a self-other relation, consciousness is split between an inward and an outward directedness. This splitting also occurs between other experiential realms such as self and not-self, and consciousness-unconsciousness. But meditation induces an altered state of consciousness, at least for a significant portion of a meditator's career. One attribute of this medita-

tive state, depending on the type of meditation practiced of course, is a disappearance of the splitting of consciousness and the barrier separating the two experiential realms. With that barrier's disappearance, the self re-merges into the matrix from which it came.

For all these reasons, Buddhists, like the philosopher Hume, can find no personal self through introspection. The method of meditation joined with a metaphysics that rejects the personal self, bonded attachments and ambition-desire, prohibits discovery of that self. What they do find depends on the school of Buddhism and their belief systems and also on the type of meditation practiced. What I call microanalysis is associated with the Vipassana meditation technique of the Burmese Theravadan school. Zen with its Shikantaza and the Tibetan Khargya school with the Mahamudra practices would find the self disappearing into not-self external world experience of a bell's sound. The self could also disappear into a pain in the back muscles felt in meditation. Stolorow (1984) makes a similar point about Husserl's phenomenological approach. Husserl's phenomena are also abstract and impersonal.

Only Thoughts, emotions, images, fantasies, body sensations, desires and movement can be found, but no self (personal or transcendent). Self supposedly disappears through introspection only to reappear after meditation, perhaps somewhat changed, perhaps not.

Vipassana meditation is based on the theory that the normal, acting-and-feeling-in-the-world-self, personal self, is seen to be unreal when reflectively investigated in meditation. It becomes a mere conglomeration of parts that when observed microanalytically, has no essential self nature or self feeling (I-ness). Even more, that conglomeration is an effect of antecedent conditions and will be the cause of similar subjective states in the future. The present self is not a continuation of the past self, nor will the present self last into the future. The only subjectivity is now, in the

moment. The self has no continuity, as an entity, in time. The only continuity is of the causal process of a succession of subjective states which appears to be an I to the untrained person.

The experience of self and the experience of what content is self, or is not self, depends on whether I am in ordinary consciousness or in a meditation altered state. That is, the self, not-self and transitional spaces are all variable. In my experience, what appears real or appears to be myself is very different in meditation and outside meditation. Also, what is experienced as outside or inside of myself (whether the percept or feeling is object or subject) varies depending on where I am in the present meditation period, how much experience I have had in that type meditation and in meditation in general.

Each meditation period and meditation type alters that self perception and the area of phenomena included in self. Also, the more years a meditator practices, hopefully the more like ordinary consciousness his meditation will become. Generally only beginners think meditation is a coming into a more and more a special state until he attains some exalted consciousness or enlightenment. The more experienced the meditator, the more his mind tends to be like ordinary consciousness in meditation. However, just the process of sitting in meditation and watching one's mind, body and the sounds and sights of the external world entering that watched mind does tend to induce an altered state of consciousness--a special state. It takes a long time to reconcile the insights and experiences of that state with the world outside of meditation.

I recognize that when I pursue certain sorts of knowledge and meditation practices, that what I perceive as self changes. The boundaries of self-ness change. The content included in my sense of self changes. What I had considered self disappears and there may be a reappearing of a newly

reordered sensual world, this time without a central organizing agency or executive function or the feeling of having a center.

There can be a reorganization of the perceptual world and the subjectivities that comprise the world. Inside and outside distinctions may disappear or realign in new ways. I can become a new world of perception, or body sensations, external world sky and the ringing of a distant gong. My self is a momentarily passing jet or singing bird. I can become everything because I am no thing, no self. My formerly objective world has become the subject, the self. Then I return to normal mind where I am a person with a name, East is East, and ice is cold--the world of self, object, intent, goals and value.

A typical example of realignment was of a Zen student I knew who practiced two forms of meditation eight hours a day for about five months until one day, while leaning against a tree, he felt his hand melt into the tree. The contact boundary became a merger boundary instead of a separating skin.

What is the proper interpretation and the meaning of the reality found in these altered states? Is the world there more real than that revealed by ordinary mind? Many mystics may make that claim. Yet we always return to ordinary mind and an ordinary reality. It is easy to understand though why so many people seek a more basically "friendly" reality as an escape from the suffering of their lives in ordinary reality. But certainly this desire for something more is no proof it exists. My experience has been that this hope and belief usually prevents any real psychotherapy work from being accomplished. The idealization of guru, Buddha or the hope for a Nirkalpa Samadhi preserves an idealizing link for an overwhelmed self. As long as that link is preserved, the client does not see the depth of suffering in his life. He keeps his eyes turned towards the ideal. Without the awareness of his own suffering, his consciousness stays in fantasy and cognition rather than in feelings.

But what if we can do a microanalysis analysis on components of the self that is not destructive? What if we can be reflexively aware of sub-components of the self without simultaneously destroying the splitting of consciousness of the self-not-self boundary? If this is possible, we can use these altered states to link components of the conscious self with lost or poorly articulated self experience thus rebuilding overly permeable boundaries, adding structures to the self, reorganizing defensive and cognitive functions--all through "tacking" and attaching processes that weld new components together after first analytically articulating and dispersing them. This is the position of the phenomenological approach I am suggesting. Using meditation to link together impersonal elements into a new type I self-experience. Because the elements are impersonal, introspection is initially much safer for many people who fear introspection for what it might reveal.

The reorganization of self structures is possible because in the altered states of witnessing and Samadhi we return to those same states of consciousness that our original differentiations and structure building occurred as infants. If the personal self arose out of the dialectic between the two aspects of consciousness, returning to those states experientially offers a second chance to investigate those self phenomena and to restructure them.

AN INTRODUCTION TO MICROANALYSIS

Keeping all these questions and speculations in mind, I would now like to introduce the reader to an example of the kind of experiential investigation I am advocating as an adjunct to psychodynamic therapy. I call the technique "microanalysis." Simply, it consists of quieting the mind and achieving a kind of internal focusing of consciousness. We can then turn the attention of this focused mind on all of our experience, internal and external, self and not-self. From

this focused position we begin to notice everything about a particular experience that we had missed before. We continue to watch until our perception and understanding of the experience becomes more sophisticated and discriminating. The quality of the experience usually changes by being the object of focused attention. Hindus and some Buddhists would say a deeper reality is being revealed. This may or may not be true.

But a different reality is revealed. For speculative purposes, its reality value may be more or less than the experience before attention was focused on it, but at least it is an alternative perspective that may lead to valuable insights, or even to a way of therapy very different from present approaches.

Microanalysis has various levels or degrees of focus and tuning. The levels used below are quite close to that of the personal self and everyday mind. Since this process is necessarily subjective and personal, everything below is stated in first person, exactly as the investigation would have been done. You may wish to try this for yourself as you read below, or afterwards in meditation or in the hypnogogic state immediately preceding or following sleep.

I would like to start by investigating the various modes or ways I experience emotions. The self was perceived in four types of ways as before with two sub-categories of type 3 self experience. With emotions we can limit this to three ways of perceiving them to simplify reaching conclusions. I perceive emotions:

1. As a person experiencing (having) emotions of varying intensity from 0 to 100% and with varying degrees of identification with or acceptance of that feeling:

A. I may experience anger in the form of a "little" anger at being turned down for a promotion I wanted and

"deserved," and this anger is perhaps 20% of the intensity of an anger I felt in a blind rage I can remember having been in four years ago, or that I can imagine I might be able to have. In this case, my self has a feeling (anger) of varying intensity.

B. As an intimation that there is a repressed emotion inside me, but it is not coming out. It may feel like a great torrent of anger, guilt, envy, or bottomless fear or love that is being held in check. It is as if this emotion were a fuzzy cloud of frozen feeling lying below the tactile sensations of muscle tensions which has buried this affect. This is an experience of poorly defended against feeling.

2. As a Witness:

A. As a person witnessing emotions. The emotions are there inside my body, with a deepness, richness, color, flavor, tension and an "electricity" and this emotion is happening to me, but I am merely a witness with no inclination to do anything about that feeling. Besides, the emotion experienced this way is very interesting and entertaining with all its nuances and interconnections between feeling, body and thinking readily available. But emotion has no compellingness experienced this way. It is peaceful. This state is known as the observing ego in psychotherapy.

B. Personless witnessing of emotions, where there are just observed emotions and no self watching (bare awareness). This is the Witness state of Eastern religions.

3. As a merger:

On the opposite end of the continuum from witness, but as a state that often arises from the witnessing state's watchfulness, is a moment when the separation of self from feeling disappears and I become that emotion, I become rage, love or envy.² There no longer is a self independent of the emotion. The emotion and I are one. But there is no longer a separate I, just an emotion and it is my essence; it is my self. Witness disappears into merging. There is a substantive and qualitative quantum jump in mind states. I call this mode III state "Samadhi Mind," or just Samadhi.

Carl Rogers (Rogers, 1950) talks about a stage in psychotherapy where a person becomes so immersed in watching and talking about his feelings, that the subjective experience is that he becomes his feelings.

Above I have listed three modes of experiencing emotion. Any element of phenomenal experience can also be perceived in these ways, from fantasy, to memory to body sensation. Mode I (ordinary mind) is the most common way and almost always possesses some element of alienation (witness) from the emotion. The emotion is happening to me. The above mentioned example of an experience 20% of maximum anger, has that feeling arise in my body with such and such sensations, and it may be caused by some internal event (memory, fantasy, thinking) or some external event. But the feeling of self, independent from emotion, never disappears. I am angry, but I am also me. I am upset. I am, and I am upset. The feeling is partially sub-

2. From my own and other's experience, it is a lot easier to let this state occur if the emotion is love rather than hate or rage or envy, although I can imagine other people more comfortable experiencing anger as self rather than experiencing anger as a frequent feeling felt by self.

ject, partially object; it is partially a thing or event received as separate from the observer. In this case both the perceiver (me) and the perceived (anger) may be experienced as self. In some rare cases I may totally become the emotion and the doing associated with such an emotion such as getting carried away with rage or passion and becoming violent. But in this state the self is not present in consciousness and there is a doing or activity which is different from mode III's utterly passive becoming. Consciousness has no inward directedness at all. Reflexivity is missing.

Combined with this first mode of experiencing is the object related potential for action. I am angry and I can: 1. verbalize the anger, 2. act angry and upset, 3. start an argument with the person who "caused" my anger, 4. suppress the anger, 5. run five miles or throw myself into work, 6. and on an unconscious level, repress the feeling or displace it onto another. I can do something to decrease the tension. I can also use the anger to motivate some creative activity. I can change the world or I can uncreate the cause of my anger. I can change my boss's mind and have him give me that promotion, or I can indirectly change his mind by getting someone else to intervene. Or, I can sublimate that emotional energy into a new line of action, writing, or managing that will result in a whole new career.

I can also try an entirely different and less active tact. I can stop doing whatever I was doing when the emotion first arises. I can witness the emotion, some of its physiological effects, the texture of the anger, what mood, thinking and imaging changes it induces, and just hold it before me as an object. By just holding it there, it will change. It will transform into physiological energy, into a new feeling, or into an utterly clear awareness of what must then be done as an action. I can continue to watch ever more closely until sometimes, everything stops and even I disappear--into the emotion. I become the anger. I become

love. No longer am I a body, a mind, or a self. I am anger. But in being angry, totally, I no longer have a body and cannot act. Body and mind have dropped away and only anger is; and in this Is-ness, there is immediate and total acceptance of it and an incorporation into the self. The self absorbs and is absorbed by the affect and becomes transformed thereby into a new self. Object has become subject. I call this doing Samadhi on the emotions as entities. This merger experience is very important to the ultimate transformation of the self both in normal development and reparatively in psychotherapy.

The Vipassana (a Burmese Buddhist meditation) meditation uses a similar technique. Emotions are first broken down into their many somatic components (microanalysis of the percept into interrelated components). Meditation and concentration are necessary to break the feeling into these components. Now, two things might happen. The first is we "see" those elements that compose feelings and thus "see" (visual orientation of a watcher) that the way we usually perceive emotion (as immersed in the body sensations which we identify as us) is illusion and unreal. Microanalysis has revealed a "deeper" reality. Or, two, we can now do Samadhi on the sub-components of the feeling with an integration and identification with those components and not with the Gestalt of the feeling itself. What is integrated is the somatic elements and fragmented images, thinking, memories, aches and anxiety, not a feeling that a person is having. I may even be integrating my body armor sensations into myself. But I am not integrating the emotions with their object orientation into myself. Nor am I objectifying that object related feeling, I am objectifying its impersonal components. In a sense I've become more autistic through this practice by losing that orientation towards other people that emotion usually has. I have taken a step backward in object relations development towards an insulated emotionality. I have not transcended emotionality. I

have somewhat robbed emotion of its meaning of relatedness to another.

WORTZIAN MICROANALYSIS

Wortz (Wortz 1982), a Buddhist-Gestalt therapist has his clients examine (microanalyze) their body sensations associated with the particular undesired emotion being felt at that moment in order to learn the subjectively perceived physiological components of that emotion with the intent of eventually placing these physical tension patterns and manifestations of the emotion under voluntary control. Rather than dealing with the meaning and history of that feeling in therapy, he has them find the momentary manifestation in their flesh with the intent to end it. For example, by examining anger, we may find we do anger by: 1. Imagining a hurtful outcome, or remembering some past injustice or fearful situation, which then, 2. initiates some internal physical changes, which the perceiver finds painful.

One example of this type analysis I've watched him do and have witnessed in myself, might be to find a startle reaction to an external world anger provoking situation, which might consist of stopping breathing, tensing the trapezoid muscles, closing the anus, slightly arching the back and tensing the latissimus dorsi muscle groups. The overall result may be a very painful state of anger, physiologically induced from a memory, imaging, or thinking sequence following some external, real world situational trigger.

Wortz says the particular patterns of the sensate experience of any particular emotion is extremely variant and idiosyncratic. The subjective experience of emotion as body sensation is very different between people, leading at times, to great misunderstanding since each perceives the same feeling in very different ways. Communication about each other's feelings may be quite frustrating since I might enjoy the angry state but my wife might fear the pain of that state. My

talking about anger may lead to it arising in her and her subsequent avoidance of talking about it.

Dr. Wortz's technique consists of atomizing the emotions into components, and then objectifying those components and finding out how to manipulate those components in order to end the feeling and the need to do something about the feeling. This is the basic Vipassana practice brought into a therapeutic situation with the intent of introducing some separation between the self and the emotion so that the emotion doesn't control the person's behavior or mood.

But objectification of components of feeling (as well as the subjectification possible through Samadhi) is not the same as the therapeutic process of first subjectifying and then objectifying the feeling as a whole--as a Gestalt, with its person directed element, and with its embeddedness in other feelings, memories and transferences. Anger is usually at someone or something. It is person oriented. It is also often part of a large number of feelings, self and object images organized together into a transference that becomes activated when in an intimate relationship.

Atomizing the emotion, which then I no longer feel, into components that I do feel, means the emotion has lost much of its meaning of relatedness. The objectification has not taken place with the whole feeling and its meaning. No regression to an earlier self state has occurred. No transference has been mobilized. No self structure has been built with respect to emotions as a whole. There is no maturation here (at least from this technique; although it may still be occurring silently, arising from the relationship to the therapist), with an increased ability to be a feeling, relating person. There is only an increase of an ability to not feel an emotion. We have a new, sophisticated defense against feelings and psychological and physical pain. This technique could be very useful for temporarily dealing with great pain, but it is most likely to develop into an end.

Wortz seems to be proposing a method by which we can edit experience (to not experience the suffering aspects of emotion, as in the Buddhist tradition he has adopted), by selectively objectifying experiential components and bringing the entirety of the experience under voluntary control through a manipulation of those components. Self becomes chooser and master of his feelings.

When I was a monk, I was struck by the Buddhist emphasis on ending pain and suffering. The religion is founded on the fourfold truth about how suffering arises and can be ended. But I think they make a great mistake by finding their truth in a microanalysis of phenomena, or in other altered states with the realities of those states, and taking that truth back to ordinary mind. In deep Vipassana meditation, we may discover the "illusion" of emotions and pain, but an hour later we may be desperately trying to cling to that "truth" as an escape from the real world pain of our lives. The truth of one reality may be a defense in another.

Yet the same microanalysis when done to aid the development of the ordinary mind we always return to is a different matter. Rather than trying to see through the illusion of ordinary mind and self, we can use analysis to examine and articulate elements of that self, and then Samadhi to reconstruct that self to put those elements together in a new way.

The origin of affects is still an unclear area in academic psychology. Are emotions more than the sum of their components and are they viscerally, cognitively or memory based?. By emotional components I mean the somatic, fantasy, thinking and sensual elements that comprise the feeling upon microanalysis and the whole of which is embedded in the much larger sensual-somatic-imaginal field of our being. Often I find a particular emotion, newly discovered, lying behind the somatic components. With new these feelings, I have to ignore the body sensations in order to experience it.

Associated with the habitual body armoring are habitual "defensive", emotions. These have to be ignored also. This is a subtle distinction sometimes, separating a new feeling from grosser and closer to the surface (of consciousness) body sensations and the emotions associated with that typical body armoring.

It is as if there are layers of sensation, with my normal experience or tension blocking these new, therapy discovered feelings. The old habitual somatic feeling as well as the habitual emotionality is discovered to be an experience of my own body armoring against feeling the newly emerged feeling. The old feelings are embedded in my muscles as armor. I don't experience the new feeling (buried up to now under) as a pattern of muscle tension, stifled breath or other body sensation, but rather as a long lost friend--a forgotten part of myself--waiting to be added to myself. Concentration on the body sensations would be concentrating on distracting armoring and I would miss the freshness of the sadness, mourning or anger below. This new feeling, and I am speaking as a phenomenologist, has more the quality of spirit or energy than of the body.

Concentrating on the body tension aspects teaches us how to undo our "suffering" in terms of decomposing it into its component parts. After a tremendous amount of practice, the unwanted emotion no longer arises. We have trained our consciousness to stop registering suffering by moving attention from the external "causative" situation origins of this conflict, to the inner experience of the feeling. We move from an outward action and relating orientation to an inward being orientation. In that inward being orientation we intervene in suffering by getting into the witness state rather than the subjective self state. We thus de-energize external activity (de-activate manic defenses) and motility, and we make the somatic elements of feeling volitional. The learned volitional control (and there is here a great emphasis on and un-

derlying need of control over feelings; a need that they become tame objects of consciousness) allows us: 1. to stop experiencing the pain of an emotional state, 2. with the choice of being able to end it, it becomes more tolerable. We have an out, we don't only have to suffer it. With this potential for control there is a great sense of relief.

My reaction is that the emphasis on control or editing of experience and an energizing of the witness, we may soon energize ourselves out of our normal mind with its goals, vitality and pain, into a continuous observer. We can transcend suffering at the cost of vitality, normality and emotional closeness and sensitivity. Emotions become objects only, they lose that precious connection with our selfness. With the emphasis on control over pain, and by energizing the impersonal witness, we severely limit the way we experience emotion and reality. Events and experience can no longer just happen to us. We actively edit and screen our experience much like the unconscious ego defenses.

We also decrease our personal relatedness by taking full responsibility for our feelings and our inner world becomes a battleground for control over painful feelings. Others lose importance as persons to relate to and who are also the source of feeling reactions in us. We can become so concerned for our personal responsibility in the feeling of emotions that we neglect the importance of the other to us emotionally. If I am the source and controller of all my feelings, then I am the conductor, orchestra and the audience. I don't need anyone else.

Very importantly though, this technique does teach the beginnings of inner reflexivity, which is absolutely necessary for healing. But if the reflexivity has the components of emotion as its objects instead of whole feelings or the whole self or the whole other, again it decreases our relatedness to whole others feeling object related feelings. It induces a practiced, defensive fragmentation of self and objects.

On the other hand, replacing unconscious defenses by conscious defenses may be a valuable trade off. For example, a rage reaction as an unconscious defense against overwhelming fear may be replaced by a calm, meditative witnessing. This change to conscious defenses, without guilt (because the defense is authorized and legitimized by the guru or teachings) has substantially improved the marital relationship of one client who learned to drop rage reactions in this relationship in favor of a calm retreat, analysis and subsequent "insight." However, the degree of involvement in that relationship was unchanged. The relation, though more peaceful, was not any closer; but it did feel better.

I want to suggest the alternative use of microanalysis mentioned above. That way is to look behind both the gross body sensations of armoring and also the strongly manifest reactive (and defensive) emotions into the quiet place there where new, small and perhaps poorly formed feelings have their home, and there to welcome the feelings found. After finding these feelings by "looking" behind or "feeling" behind the habitual outer layers of emotion and sensation, we must welcome them into the self. Incorporation of lost affect is done through a conscious Samadhi, a conscious merger. On an ordinary mind level it is done through acceptance, and the acceptance comes through familiarity.

If I can get to that feeling behind the body sensations, the body tension patterns change and attenuate. If I can become that feeling behind the gross sensations, then those gross defenses disappears. Sometimes, even my body disappears and I become the feeling and nothing more. With me, those hidden feelings were often of sorrow, depression, or of feeling small, helpless and vulnerable. After a long while of observing and then becoming those feelings rather than the sensations of body around those feelings, I grew comfortable with them and added them to me. This me had a new strength of having new feelings added to myself, rather than being

defended against these feelings. I was more complete and I was now acting in the world with a different subjectivity. My self had learned to incorporate a formerly hidden affect, image or attitude and to use it for its own purposes as a more complete and flexible self. For me, these new sensations, which I call the new emotions, are far more refined and subtle than the gross processes of body tension patterns, breath stoppages and associated images, and exploring them opens a new area of my being--a previously unconscious or preconscious area.

It took many months of practicing discriminative witnessing on my body sensations and the connected emotions before I was able to make the distinctions between body-defensive, emotional-defensive and the new-emotion layers. The safety of the witness state allowed me to do it at all rather than to be intimidated by the fear of the emerging unconsciousness. Instead, I felt great joy and excitement. I subjectified the emotional objects, incorporating them through integrative fantasy and through merger thereby permanently changing my subjectivity.

Some readers may have difficulty following particular elements of this phenomenological investigation because they haven't practiced meditation and have no personal experience of these self or microanalytic states. Ordinary mind consciousness breaks down into these quite distinct states for most people, but only after some practice. It is difficult to communicate clearly the quality, content and significance of these states to those people for whom they are only hypothetical.

Other people, even experienced meditators, may experience emotions vis-a-vis the self quite differently, with different defenses, repressions and other barriers to experiencing emotion and the fullness of self. They may recognize nothing of themselves in what has been said to now. For example, a hysteric would be able to merge with feelings far more easily

than I was, and an obsessive-compulsive is normally in one kind of witness state or another. The latter would have tremendous difficulty merging with feelings because that state would represent a loss of control which his defenses protect him from experiencing. The hysteric would likewise have a difficult time maintaining a mode II witnessing of feelings, either merging with them, or being a person overwhelmed by them

In the fourth chapter, I'd like to explore the very different Wortzian-Vipassana viewpoint and a derived therapeutic model that coexists with the above viewpoint. I think both models are true, very different and sometimes contradictory. To resolve that contradiction requires an ability to resolve ambivalence in general. You must learn to hold onto two antithetical views simultaneously, or at least pass between the two views in rapid succession. The contradictions in these two models are then seen to be apparent only. There are many levels of modeling, perceiving, understanding and controlling the same content, and contradictions arise from comparing differing schemes on the same level when they really apply to different levels. We can equally and validly shift between realities from microanalytic, to common sense, from personal self, to mechanistic structure, but only if we can tolerate the anxiety of apparent contradictions.

Accepting Vipassana insights at face value has another payoff. If we assume that the microanalytic states are common reality broken down into components, then we can use these states to investigate the most basic elements of self, and of self and object representations. We can also examine the linkages and processes that take place among these objects. If meditative introspection really does examine a microanalytic reality, we can watch the processes of projection, splitting, introjection and other self-ego mechanisms first hand. Even more, perhaps we can teach the rudiments of such introspection to our clients to help them repair damaged or never formed linkages in the self.