

APPENDIX A--CHAPTER III

ONENESS AND TRANSCENDENT INTERPENETRATION: REGRESSION OR REAL?

As part of the developmental process, the unitary and undifferentiated matrix of experience becomes diversified into many experiential realms, one of which (internal, subjective) contains the Gestalt of self, held together by increasingly sophisticated internal linkages within the core and I-sense. These are internally linked to elements within the self and object representations, both part of a more peripheral and therapeutically changeable self. Representational reality, which contains this peripheral self representation, contains many objects (including people introjects) also held together through internal associative linkages into semipermanent Gestalten (e.g., my wife's representation and her position within my idea-mapping of external reality).

Realms in general are held together by 1). boundaries that separate and encapsulate experience and objects, and by 2). internal differentiations and connections of objects within realms and by 3). internal connections within object Gestalten that keep them together. Psychoanalysis deals with the processes by which object Gestalten become formed and then transformed into self through introjection and internalization, across the boundary separating object and self representations, or how self avoids (ego or boundary defenses) the experience of certain ideas, fantasy and emotions "properly" originating in representational areas or the unconscious. Ego defenses, as we see in the next chapter, also distort how we perceive the external world.

Connections between realms of experience are increasingly the subject matter of a number of disciplines. In most instances the connections examined are between theories of the realities represented and not between the actual experiences

themselves. Our experiential worlds are made up of senses, objects, boundaries and connections. But our ideas of the world are formed into sciences only somewhat isomorphic to our experiential realities. So science does not work at elucidating the connections between our subjective experiential realms but between elements of cognitive sciences. In these disciplines experiential connections need not be the starting point or even directly observed. But experiential connections are inferable from a set of assumptions about brain, the eye's structure, or the brain's interpretation of nerve impulses. Academic physiology, concerned with the body's effect on behavioral, mood and cognition, begins to explain academic psychology (mind, self). Mathematical theory, an elucidation of the forms of cognition itself, is used to explain information theory which, in turn is used to understand cognitive psychology and learning theory. Psychology is used to explain perceptual biases, attribute perception (mate selection and art).

Physics in one instance however, is mis-used to explain the subjectively perceived states of oceanic consciousness, symbiosis, merger and the felt sense of interconnection with the entire universe in "spiritual" states by positing an "interpenetration of all phenomena." This interpenetration is an assumed physical or connection between objects and content within different dimensional levels of physical reality (from atomic particle to Quasar) which is perceived subjectively through our body's participation in those forces and our brain's interpretation of what the body feels.

In psychoanalysis and phenomenological therapies the contents and objects of the unconsciousness and other experiential realms are related to the contents of the fantasy world, to the external world, political processes and sociology. Some physicists, philosophers and psychologists take this understanding further stating that each object within any realm has connections to objects in all the other conceptual or per-

ceptual realms. (Our transitional realms, for example, are where we creatively manipulate elements, ideas and fantasies to form new conceptual and experiential differentiations about the external world). This "transcendental" interpenetration is often related to the work of David Bohm and his enfolded notions of atomic reality, and Rupert Sheldrake with his field of causitive formation. This point of view is also quite explicit in the Buddhist Hua Yen philosophy of 500-700 A.D., and in some of the pre-Socratic philosophers.

David Bohm takes his enfoldment notion of quantum reality to apply to all dimensional levels of physical reality, not just the atomic. Physicists give imaginary particles names like "charm." Macrobiologists use terms like self-identification and self for antibody activity. A few scientists like to anthropomorphize even when they know they are doing it. The process itself has a warmth that leaves him more at ease with inanimate subject matter, but lays the foundation for committing the basic logical fallacy of assuming that what happens on the atomic and molecular levels impacts human consciousness (and vice versa) on a perceptual level, in a similar way as individual atoms or particles are influenced by each other. From this viewpoint, human consciousness or consciousness itself is enfolded in the same way as is conceptual sub-atomic physics and is enfolded with the physical reality itself also. Sheldrake uses an interpenetrating field of consciousness-like concept to explain the perseverance and spread of new ideas, discoveries and physical forms, again a mixing of physical and conceptual levels. In both instances the mistake is similar to that of assuming that Newton's classical mechanics applies both to atomic particles and to Stellar masses. Phenomenal level mechanics need not apply to sub-atomic or galactic level physics, and vice-versa. Atomic level inferred processes need not explain phenomenal level consciousness.

I think it probable that interpenetration ideas stem from an incomplete differentiation of self from world in the physicists themselves, and are not intuitive understandings of "real" but unperceived interconnections between realms. I am assuming that lingering symbioses are far more prevalent and important to the history of ideas and religion than even most psychoanalysts would believe.

Even when "real" interpenetrative links are discovered (including the obvious ones like electromagnetic and gravity, or more quirky quantum notions) there is no direct indication that the interconnections they create are perceivable by the self. These interconnections are understandable to the self, but not directly perceivable. The felt sense of unity is not, I think, explained by perceptions of external connectivity or by cognitive understanding of those connections alone. Understanding does not have the experiential quality of the felt sense.

But on a personal level, experiential realms do interpenetrate and contain each other. The objects of our affection or anger are related to our subjective fantasy and meaning representations of those external people. These representations impact and connect to our core self and are related to its need for external others and relationship. Representations and core experiences are tied to content and experience in every other realm and are mediated by the self as knower and agent. The personal self is the nexus of connections among the experiential realms and has the further potential of becoming conscious of those connections. The personal self is at the center of all consciousness, or as Sasaki Roshi would say, is the center of gravity. It is the center of all causal, intellectual and perceptual awareness and all experiential realms. Experiential realms with their own type of internal linkages are not the discourse realms of a conceptualized external reality with their separate type of linkages and connections.

It is far more plausible to assume that the experience of oneness and interpenetration stems from the personal self's position as the center of consciousness not from a perception of external linkages. All connections we are aware of, all realms or experience, all sensual fields, all thinking, imaginings and concepts happen around the self as center. The self would naturally think everything interpenetrates each other because it sees from a subjective reality of interpenetration from moment-to-moment. It is much more likely that the experience of everyday life with the self at the center of experience is the source of the enfoldment and interpenetration notions in physics, mathematics and information theory than the other way around. Our sense of internal and experiential linkages is projected into the external world and reified into systems of interpenetrative linkages of a different order. Enfoldment does point out a new vision of our old external reality as Bohm and others conjecture, but their notions flow from a "hunch" about interpenetration, flowing from everyday experiences of interpenetration within ordinary mind. Physics does not explain ordinary reality so much as the obverse.

This does not mean enfoldment physics is wrong, or that no real connections exist. It only means that we feel internal linkages within self and not-self experience and begin to look into the external world with different types of logics and sciences and find linkages and patterns there that we confuse with the inner, felt-sense of unity linkages. The felt sense of unity and transcendence arises from experiential connections within subjectivity, while other, non-perceivable connections are discovered or formed in the external world. These connections of physical theory have a consensual reality dependent on the current validity of that theory, and perhaps and intrinsic reality we can never know in itself. Inner connections mature through subjective differentiation while outer connections mature through the evolution of physical theory.

These connections are substantively different and unrelated except that both spring from the same level of sophistication of subjectivity. A five year old could not grasp classical field theory nor inner connections of a sophisticated morality or personal responsibility. One does not cause the other, both types of understanding depend on inherent cognitive and moral maturity.

Yet there does seem to be an evolution in science of the sophistication level of ideas of both internal and external realities that might suggest, according to this theory, a continuing evolution of conscious distinctions within modern men. Psychoanalytic thinking and physical theory are becoming increasingly mature indicating a generalized evolution of the complexity of thinking and intuition. Whether this results from a field of causitive formation, scientists borrowing from each other, or an inherent maturation of cognition is impossible to know.

Where does fantasy symbiosis end and synchronicity begin? The Bohm, Sheldrake and transpersonal interpretations assume a subliminal perception or magical intuition of physical level interpenetrations of weak and strong quantum and field forces or similar perceptions of internal connections within interpenetrative consciousness. These (external to the personal self) connections may exist, and we may be able to perceive them by intuition or unconscious direct apprehension through some unknown sense, but the felt sense of oneness and connection is more likely the self's recognition of its own meaning, internal linkages and nexus centrality. Bohm and the other physicists confuse the levels of of speculative physics and everyday life, often giving that confusion further spiritual interpretations. Their efforts may also be motivated by needs to make the realities of physics and astronomy more human, less abstract and fearful.

Much of what currently passes as religious theory and transpersonal speculations fall into this trap of making real

and objective a felt sense of interpenetration which is a fundamental experience of the personal self perceiving internal connections within itself and with other objects in its perceptual realities. This experience of interpenetrative connectedness itself is profoundly "spiritual" in almost all religious perspective. What varies, is the interpretation of what this experience means. Does it mean enfoldment is true, or that the Jungian Self can become aware of all consciousness through an introspective merger with the source of consciousness? Does it mean Atman is God manifesting through an individuated body and consciousness? Possibly. But in our person-oriented interpretation we will likely learn more by focusing our attention on the experience itself rather than transcendent interpretations, finding they have a more personal origin and a meaning related to the lost experience of a small child being held in its mother's arms and feeling the security of being cared for and understood.

APPENDIX B--CHAPTER III
UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS

Gedo and Goldberg (1973) coalesced the idea of invariant stages of progressive development a patient passed through in dynamic therapy in their book on the hierarchical model of psychic structure. A borderline client for example, became neurotic after a long stint in therapy and then normal. The therapeutic problems of each stage recapitulated the problems originally encountered in the developmental progression, with the neurotic manifesting Oedipal level difficulties and the borderline patient displaying identity and control problems. "Neurotic" personalities were considered more healthy and ego structured than the borderline or psychotic. Gunderson (1984), has cast doubt on the hypothesis that the invariant progressions in treatment and structure building emulate the original developmental sequence.

The therapeutic experience with Kay seems to reflect this doubt also. Kay's initial regressions involved schizoid level issues of fear of relationship, commitment and connection. Quite a few borderline and narcissitic traits were always present and some waxed stronger during therapy. Yet all issues were on the same level of personality disorders. Even after three and a half years of therapy, although a functioning adult, she never became a neurotic character going through Oedipal stages. She always manifested some Oedipal level material, but it was never a serious problem. Either she has not been in therapy long enough to manifest these problems, or they were already resolved or never present in the first place. Although there was a progression of issues in therapy, they seemed to be manifestations of prevailing ego states each of which had its own dynamics and pathologies, and each ego state could return even years after disappearing.

Rather than a progressive development of the entire self, what we may be witnessing in therapy is the binding of

co-existing schizoid, depressive, borderline and narcissitic level ego states within an increasingly cohesive ego or self. The apparent linear progression of object relations development may really mark the tying together of fragmented self aspects of discrete ego states, each with its own object relations, boundaries and realities. Progressions in therapy then deal with the internal movement dynamics of the loci of consciousness cycling through these fragmented states, acting out the object relations scenario of each level, and then binding the states together through reflexivity, merger and objectification.

As of yet we don't know where the personality fragmentation occurs. Is the splitting within the core of the self, within self and object representations, within the "fabric" of the experiential realms themselves, or between ego states that contain primitive object relations, representations and fragmentary core self identifications? Further phenomenological investigation may lead to more accurate theorizing about this phenomenon.

ORIGIN OF OBJECTIVIZATION FROM TWINNED MIND ASPECTS

The phenomenology of witnessing also raises a problem. Is it a function of an intact self or ego, or is it a basic attribute of consciousness itself? How does objectification take place assuming a dual mind origin? What causes the dichotomization of the mind into subjective self and not-self? What is the barrier between subjective and objective experience, and how is the barrier between internal and external experience formed? Why is it that experience dichotomizes rather than divides into five simultaneous aspects?

My belief is that the division of the mind into the twinned aspects of witness and merger is the causal agent or driver behind all these processes. Perhaps two similar minds perceiving the same experiential field from an objectifying

implicit structure and a subjectifying structure, can result in in a prismatic "projection" (much like two eye's seeing the same object, stereoptically create depth) and containing of phenomena into the previously mentioned experiential realms. The same objects (e.g., mother, bird, bell-sound) each perceived as an object and as subject, fragment that experience and project those fragments into various perceptual and imaginal realms. These projections would ultimately preserve a linking between the experiential fragments. A bird seen, a bird heard or felt, and that bird visualized or remembered share the same object (bird) and the same subject (self). Bird and self interpenetrate and yet are separate.

Even assuming a dual track notion of a split mind, there is no necessity that the locus of consciousness moves between the two phenomenal subjective-objective states in cycles if those two minds are identical in quality and perspective. For there to be a movement of consciousness between subjective and objective would require either that these two minds be qualitatively different, or that there be a qualitative difference of perspective in the cognition of contents by those two minds. In mechanical terms, there has to be a dynamic imbalance between the ways these two minds organize and perceive data. There has to be a "phase" difference. This could result if the dual minds are qualitatively different, with differing implicit I-ness structures associated with merger or differentiating consciousness, or if there were a time lag between the perceptions by nearly identical dual minds, and a comparison function between the perceptions of these two minds.

Another possibility is that the consciousness itself is not dual, that there is only one consciousness which fragments and differentiates into dual merger/differentiation aspects in a developmental sequence simultaneously with libidinal, self, ego and object relations development. In this case, there would be dichotomizing or polarizing processes which divide

experience, I-ness and consciousness into dual sets (realms) of experience. Each of the resulting dual realms would contain the same experience (bird or the feeling of love) which sometimes would be experienced as self, sometimes as not-self.

What does splitting mean from these two different viewpoints? If there are two different minds (the subject consisting of dual implicit structures) that are gradually brought together in development, then splitting is intrinsic to all perceptions. If there is only one phenomenal mind (subject) with splits in the object and self representations then the splitting is in the mind's content, in its experience, rather than in its basic fabric. If splitting of consciousness is in the objects only, an object relations approach to integration is warranted. Self and object representational splits are reconciled. If the splitting of consciousness is in the basic way the mind perceives, in its implicit structure, then a more Gestalt-Eastern approach is called for. By this I mean an approach that works directly with experiential boundaries, and the quality of consciousness itself.

In either of these two major cases (dual consciousness model or one consciousness differentiated by dualizing processes) I am assuming that these polarized processes are primary determinants and causal drivers of ego, cognitive and object relations development. It would be these polarized processes that stand behind Kegan's evolution of the self and remedial self-development in therapy. The better that we understand the processes of experiential polarization and boundary formation, the better we can do therapy.

With either assumption, at some evolutionary point the boundaries between the experiential realms becomes rigid and stable so that contents are fixed. Then the distinction be-

tween external world contents and inner thinking and fantasizing about those contents and other inner world experience becomes meaningful. The separation of contents is usually quite clear in adults, with only a small experiential area belonging to both (transitional reality).

In an earlier paper (Muzika, 1982) I explored the possibility that these polarizing processes structure experiential content in such a way that the self recognizes that experience as being part of one experiential realm or the other. In the terms of quantum mechanics, the content becomes structured as either a "right" or a "left" handed experience belonging properly on one or the other side of a realm boundary. The self recognizes where the experience belongs by the realm specific phenomenal and structural tag associated with it. In so far as these experience types (fantasy and its qualities, for example, as opposed to an externally perceived tree and its subjective experiential impact on the self) have phenomenal qualities that place it in a specific realm, then complexes, such as the Oedipus complex, made up of fantasy, idea, memory, and perception (transference filters), becomes fixed by those qualities, as belonging to a specific subjective realm such as representational self or the dynamic unconsciousness. Psychoanalysts have long attributed an organizing function to the ego without suggesting how it would work. This phenomenal quality tag assumption gives a theoretic mechanism by which the ego, at the instigation of the developing self, consistently organizes the experiential world into meaningful arrangements. Each realm's contents has a specific "feel" composed of sensual and other qualities.