

THE BODY IN RELATIONSHIP

SELF – OTHER – SOCIETY

EDITED BY COURTENAY YOUNG

PRESENTATIONS
FOR THE EABP-ISC
CONGRESS: LISBON,
SEPTEMBER 2014

A PERSON A STORY THREE LANGUAGES

A PERSON

In Latin "*Persona*" (from *per-sonare*, resonating through or by) was the wooden mask ancient Greek actors wore on the stage, in scenes in which all traits were exaggerated so that they could be more easily taken in by the spectators. The mouth was designed to reinforce the sound of the voice, made necessary by the huge size of ancient theatres.

The word "*persona*" then came to be used to express the individual represented in the play - "the character"; later it was used to refer to "an ordinary man" and, finally, to describe "man in his corporeity and as the sum of his qualities" (including, therefore, all his languages, from logical-verbal language to analogical-body language).

On reflection, along the path taken by the word "person" there has been an evolution:

- from Mask to Person,
- from Appearing to Being,
- from a Part to the Whole,
- from the Surface to Depth,
- from Verbal to Bodily.

This play on references calls me to a powerful association, which, authentically, leads me to say 'while we in the 'PSY-world' (psychologists, psychopathologists, psychiatrists, psychotherapists and psychoanalysts) continue to consider persons only as patients, we will only be dealing with their masks and... we will only be dealing with our own masks!'

A Virus: 'Try meeting the persons behind the masks in their various roles in the scenes that the theatre of life has reserved for us!'

There is a risk that we will discover a different way of feeling or of "sensing", a way of sensing that modifies the neurohumours, synapses and the relationships – a way of sensing that makes us "person".

We were speaking of "person" and "sounds" and "sensing" have come into the conversation...

"Sensing" is another extraordinary word which has, again, etymologically broadened its meaning over time. From the "sensing-hearing" of what is outside it has moved inward to the "sensing-hearing-feeling" of inside.

I would, then, suggest differentiating, in your inner sensing-feeling, between what your relationship with people as "masks" and what your relationship with people as "persons" is. Taking this further you can also differentiate between when you are a "mask" in your relationships and when you are a "person" – there is a great deal of useful information to be found...

I am not, however, speaking of value judgements – even those people who are always "masks" and never "persons" are masks simply because they do not have the option of that luxury – it would be unsustainable for them, because of fear, or structural vulnerability, because of the need for energetic economy or through their education... This should be realised and understood!

'The way of feeling that makes me a person is my tendency to be whole in the relationships I have and leads the Other to show themselves as a person in the relationship they have with me.'

I have suggested and I propose considering Analysis, despite the undecidability of its thousand facets, also as an ABC of the emotional world. Consider it as learning about the "feeling-knowing" and about being "person" which rests on the expressive intelligence of the living form 'because you cannot know without feeling... and you cannot feel without your body.'

Being a person then can make us more intelligent in the sense that 'it resonates through our corporeity.' It can permit us to read into the encounter-contact with the Other and to acquire awareness of the enriching qualities of the exchange – of the increase in reciprocity, of the humanisation of the relationship and of the negentropy, which can increase.

Person-feeling-body-intelligence-sound...

Which Sounds? ...Emanating from who? ...Emanated by who? ...Springing from where? ...Emerging how? ...Perceived when?

A STORY

I cannot do other than introduce the reading of our biological – biographical history at this point.

I would, however, like to propose a special, three-dimensional lens for observation, which is based on the incised marks of the Object Relationships of the stages and on the Other Variables which determine them along the negentropic-evolutive arrow of time.

In addition to genes, which I invite you to consider as "pure intelligence of the living form" and as receptacles of time where the incised marks of the relationships in phylogenesis are deposited, in the person's narration we should also collect:

- the How of the Scene when they came into the world, 'the Why they came into the world, and on which implicit project?'

- but, above all, the Dialogue of the Primary Object Relationship, its density, its depth, its reciprocity "from the intrauterine to weaning." This is a strictly biological dialogue, which is a prototype and a fractal for subsequent dialogues along the person's evolutive arrow of time. Additionally, it is a factor in, perhaps the main factor in, and terrain for, Resilience, which will be decisive for sustainability under future adaptive stresses...

- and then the How and the When they came into the Light (Birth), because they resonate on the possible modalities of the "birth-transitions" throughout life...
- the How of Weaning, another extraordinary incised mark, which resonates again, yet differently, on the possible modalities of Separation from the First Field Mother and on the possible How of leaving the future relational 2...
- Birth Order (first-born, second-born, youngest, only child)... and, continuing on the vertical arrow of time...
- the How of the Relationships in the Second Field family... the 3 with the Father... and the relational 4,5,6 and with the age-group...
- the Oedipal Scene, which is an extraordinary crossroads and turning-point for trait prevalences...
- the Leader of the couple... the Leader in the scene... their character Traits that will influence the terrain for our relationship with Authority...

(A Virus: "How do each of you experience Authority – more masculine or more feminine?")

- the Positions of the Parental Relationship, the nature of and variation in the Family Atmosphere and the Dominant Subsystems in it...
- the How and When of Puberty and the relationships in Third Field Social.

We hold these anamneses to be fundamental and indispensable: they represent the careful collection of memories... the careful collection of the "incised marks" from the Object Relationships, from the How of the Stage Transitions and from the Atmospheres of the Field of the Other than Us.

They form our Character (etymologically "Character" derives from and means "incised mark").

Our Combination of Traits, is stratified on the evolutive stages and marked on the bodily levels corresponding to those stages.

(Another virus: "go into your memories and try to identify the first three incised marks which determined, in each of your opinions, the person that you are... who were they imprinted by? ... when? ... and where do you feel them?...")

In Reichian Analysis the Marks Incised by the Object Relationships and by the Variables Determined by the Other than Us, along the arrow of time, permit us to ascertain the prevalent fixations in the life-story of the person, which are set in a *Heptagonal Constellation*...

"between the object relationships – the evolutive stages - the character traits – the bodily levels – the evolutive brains – the stage transitions – the field transitions"...

It is a Connexion which allows us to recover biology in psychoanalysis, to bring the body into psychoanalysis and psychoanalysis into the body.

It permits us to design every analytical-therapeutic project three-dimensionally.

Let us clarify by focussing on the points:

"*The Object Relationship* defines the How of the Relationship of a subject with their world and is the complex result of a specific organisation of their personality. It should be understood as an inter-relationship and as reciprocity (excluding – including, persecutory - welcoming). In Reichian Analysis the partial or whole object is real; it is present in the biological-biographical history and marks a prototypical how of trait, even on the bodily levels."

"*The Evolutive Stage* is a period of ontogenetic evolution in which the Self receives imprintings and incised marks from the partial object of that time. It is an interval between two stage Transitions marked by clear biological boundaries. The evolutive stages are inscribed on the background of the three successive Other than Self Fields – the Mother Field, the Family Field, the Social Field, (the fourth is the objective for the evolutive stages.)"

"*The Character Trait* is each of our stories for that stage, an imbricated set of patterns and modes of behaviour, which have been received from the relationship with the partial object of that time."

"*The Bodily Level* is the somatic source. It is the place in the body where the imprintings of the relationships with the partial stage objects are marked and it is the first receiver of the relationship with the Other than Self. It is the peripheral interface of the evolutive stage passed through and it is the concrete substrate on which the architecture of thought of the trait rests."

"*Our Encephalon* is the result of the recapitulation of phylogenetic evolution within the ontogenetic process – it is the central interface where the imprintings of the relationships with the partial stage objects, which have penetrated from the periphery, arrive and are deposited."

- The oldest formation is represented by the big base nuclei (the Reptilian Complex) and to it are attributed functions like "defence of territory, competition for rank in the group, copulation and ritualised and compulsive sequences". It reacts with aggression towards all that is not recognised and is therefore seen as being hostile... "We are in areas close to entropic zero and difference is threatening for the living system."

- The Limbic Cortex (which first appeared in ancient mammals) has functional prevalence in ontogenesis from the 3rd to 4th months of intrauterine life onwards – as we are told by the sucking reflex and the beginning of lactogenesis (prolactin being the maternity hormone *par excellence* in mammals). It adds the emotional-affective dimension with care of the young and the species, audio-vocal communication (the call of separation) and it introduces play.

It is responsible for what an individual feels or experiences, just as what an individual knows or recognises is a function of the neopallium, which developed for the three-dimensional stereoscopic vision of the upright stance.

- The Neopallium is responsible for space-time, for before and after, for cause and effect and for the higher logical and meta-communicative cognitive processes.

Most of the evolutive stages and the formation of the character, with all of the baggage of incised marks received from the object relationships, are inscribed on the segment of the arrow that is Limbic Time and that I would not hesitate to define as the "place of the World of Relationships" and the fundamental brain not only in the analytical-therapeutic setting, but also outside in the Life of Relationships.

THREE LANGUAGES

How do we communicate in the life of Relationships?

Communication is a "*conditio sine qua non*" – a condition without which there is not life. Etymologically it comes from the Latin "*cum munis*", meaning to exchange together. It is not possible not to communicate and it is not possible not to have behaviour. The simple fact that you are not speaking or not paying reciprocal attention is no exception to this affirmation.

We know from the literature that man has "two" ways of communicating – one numerical and one analogical.

The *numerical* has an aspect of content, it serves to convey information about objects and to transmit knowledge.

The *analogical* has an aspect of relationship and expresses the "how" we transmit the contents and the knowledge.

(Implicitly speaking I have introduced a content/container dyad – Reichian Analysis places a significant focus on the container, but always "in convergence" on the object, with the content).

The language of the "how" originates from a very ancient period in human evolution and is, using a very general definition, every non-verbal communication - "the look in the eyes, the facial expression, the vocalisations, their tone, their rhythm, the movements of the head and of the body, the gestures of the arms and hands," in short, the body language.

The body language orders and classifies what we say, it indeed communicates about communication, or rather it meta-communicates, directing the lines of the relationship.

In other words, all of the corporeity is in the expressive "how" of the communication – thus including the "How" in the setting and in the analytical-therapeutic reading, with highly-coherent epistemological codes and equally appropriate corporeal grammar, allows us to tap into an extraordinarily rich and intelligent language.

Our SIAR model using The Analysis of the Character, Character-Analytical Vegetotherapy and The Analysis of the Character of the Relationship is testimony to this.

What is more, it has also assisted me in the discovery of a *third language*, which is what I wish to speak to you about today – the language of traits and between traits, which is fundamental for the Relationship in the setting and in Life.

I will try to introduce it...

The incised marks from the object relationships and from the decisive variables are inscribed peripherally on the 7 bodily levels and centrally on the encephalon, always along the arrow of evolutive time.

The imbricated sum of the interactions between the incised marks and the adaptive responses of the Self generate relational modes, which are specific to the personal story of the individual, are characteristic of the evolutive stage and are recurrent state patterns – they define the traits of each of us.

We can therefore speak of prevalent traits and of combinations of traits for each of us... and, again in a wider interpretation, that each person is a combination of traits and other factors (how much, for example, does the how of stage and field transitions influence the prevalence of a trait in the combination?)

In Reichian Analysis we distinguish many characterological traits and just as many sub-types.

The language of traits is a *meta-meta* language on verbal language and on body language and includes them – knowing it allows us to decode the thoughts of the trait, the intelligence of the trait and even the terrain – the corresponding bodily levels, marked over time by the object relationships of that stage.

The language of traits presupposes the capacity of the Self to read the previous two languages simultaneously, something the Self continually does, while the Ego normally does not, since, not being used to joining up with feelings (and even less so with meta-cognition based on feeling-thought), it is attracted by the contents.

The language of traits is a language of the Self-System, while the other two are sub-systemic languages of that Self – the phylo-ontogenetic history in fact tells us of their succession over time and of their current contemporaneity.

In communications and in relationships the language of traits therefore expresses itself contemporaneously with verbal language and with body language, which represent indicators of trait.

For example, the thought, the word and the voice all tell us together about the contents, but also about the architecture of the Prevalent Trait.

As the thought, indeed, reflects the architecture of the observative position of the trait that it expresses, so, too, the words tell us about the trait, through the recurrent use of stage vocabulary and or syntax of the period and, in the same way, the how of the Voice, with its tone-sound, indicates the "where" of the bodily level from which the person is speaking in their ... resonating through.

But we are entering the world of inter-subjective Relationships and we discover then, with the very special Reichian analytical lens (resting on the greater order of magnitude of the guiding fractal of "Character Analysis") that, as well as the verbal language and body language that express the surface of interactions, the Traits profoundly "converse between themselves" in a further, third language, which is extraordinary and unknown and which is expressed by the implicit questions of the personal history.

An implicit trait question, then, punctually elicits in the Other an implicit question-response from their own set of traits.

It is on this dialogue between these unconscious minds, between these fractals and between these meta-messages of the respective Selves, that people build communications, that, if confirmed over time, can evolve into relationships, but even simply into sensations of being bearable, of alliance, of liking and of pleasure in being together.

On the contrary, it is in the incompatibility of dialogue between the implicit questions and the answers (*which always contain their own implicit questions*) of the traits of the various Selves... that dislikes, unbearableness, symmetry, the impossibility of communication, and much less of a relationship, are confirmed and registered.

The whole intermediate range of the spectrum lies between these two polar extremes.

The entropic-negentropic vectors of every Relationship are "always" silhouetted in the background, which are the outcomes of energetic dialogues, the terrain for our feeling and the foundations which govern our "unconscious choices", if you will allow me an apparent oxymoron!

The relationship is in fact a complex living system which can be born from the meeting of peoples' characterial traits. These, like filaments of DNA, arrange themselves in a double helix and on their own arrow of time.

The Relationship will have its own self-organisation, its own autopoiesis, its own developments and its own states – its own combination of character!

It is indeed the language between the traits, between their historically-marked implicit questions, which regulates the world of Communication and of Relationships.

Awareness of our own combination can help us in managing our interactions with Others' combinations... and in establishing negentropic relationships.

I think and I feel that the future, especially for those involved in the PSI world, may be passing through here...

Conclusion

Some viruses from day to day life...

How are people unbearable for us?

- Do they complain too much?
- Do they offer themselves too much?
- Do they take everything?
- Do they not permit others to speak?
- Are they too aggressive?
- Are they evasive?
- Are they too precise?
- Are they very seductive?
- Do they never ask?
- Are they too accepting?

Which implicit trait questions do these patterns imply, above and beyond the contents?

Where do we genuinely feel the incompatibility of the implicit questions of these patterns... to which trait do they belong?...on which bodily level do they resonate?...with which sound and with which trait pattern of that level do we respond... asking implicitly?

GENOVINO FERRI