

ASSERTIVENESS AND SOLIDARITY IN A LANDSCAPE OF FEAR

—————
Rob Foxcroft
—————

I have been struggling for some days with a question:

“Is there any way to balance the ethical life against the natural life?”¹

What I am asking (what I would like you to be asking with me) is this:

“If by ‘ethics’ we mean some version of the view, that ‘the needs of each person ought to weigh equally in the scale, against the needs of every other person’; then how can I live an ethical life without being utterly crushed by the intolerable demand which duty makes of me?”

Please pause here... asking this question of yourself... and about your own life... sensing into its meaning... allowing some sense of perplexity to arise, about the issue as a whole...

Is it ok to buy myself a Mozart CD, given that the same money would feed a starving family? Is it ok to buy new shoes, in the knowledge that they may have been made by child labour? Is it ok to take an hour for myself, when I could be writing to a prisoner of conscience? Is it ok to relax in the safety and comfort of my family life, walling out my awareness that many people are gazing uneasily over a landscape of fear?

These, I think, are real questions. To answer them in one way seems to lead to a life which would be unendurably burdened, which even a saint might fail to sustain. To answer them in the other way seems callous and provincial. Given the density of suffering in the world, it would seem almost unforgivable, if I were to say:

“I know there are refugee camps just over that hill. I believe that the governments all around are using these people as a pawn in fierce and terrifying power games. Clearly, my own government is implicated in the camps being there. But I’m going for a nice holiday. I’m going to see my friends, eat lovely food, swim in the lake. Oh, they’re starving, you say? They live in fear, in the immediate presence of hunger and squalor, the imminent threat of death? Ah well, that’s sad. But really, what can I do? I don’t see why I should get involved”.

Is that how we are thinking? If so, how do we manage it? How do we manage (if we do) to wall out the pain and fear of others, sufficiently to get on with our lives? And ought we do that? And if so, to what extent? Or are these perhaps the wrong questions? Is the

dilemma radically skewed in some way? — The issues which arise here are extremely tangled. I don't expect to say anything new, or even very clear — for this territory is a graveyard of hopes. I am just wanting to tease out some preliminary features of the dilemma in which our natural ethical awakening places us.

In the first part of this tentative sketch, therefore, I must show that people do sometimes experience a sudden or gradual ethical awakening. I will ask what that is like; and give some idea of what it is, about this awakening, which is problematical.

Afterwards, I shall try to show why (in a certain sense) the natural must be privileged over the ethical; and that this need not be disastrous (or even very ugly), as one might at first expect. I shall say something rather general about “natural emergent human values”; and something very specific about the creative process in human beings — about the nature of thought^{2,3}. I shall end by connecting all this to the idea of “*living in a landscape of fear*”. I will suggest that there is reason for hope, and a profound truth in the ancient saying, that “*Perfect love casts out fear*” — indeed, that even hesitant and very imperfect love has a power to build bridges and to heal wounds, to bring peace inside and outside ourselves.

(1) MANY PEOPLE DO EXPERIENCE A SUDDEN OR GRADUAL ETHICAL AWAKENING.

Human beings are extremely various, show marked personality even in infancy, and follow highly idiosyncratic paths of development. But I think it is broadly true that when we are little, we are in some ways wrapped up in ourselves — in our own world, our own needs, our wants and dreams and longings. Even so, it is clear that infants do feel the pain or distress or anxiety of others, and are troubled by it. So (to my mind) the story which we have sometimes been told — that children are all self-centredness, and have to be trained to become social beings — that story is plainly nonsense.

I should prefer to say, that there is a way in which young children *ought* to be self-absorbed, that something is maybe not quite right, not quite secure, not quite happy, in a young child who is too sensitive to the needs of others — that the roots of fearfulness are probably growing in that child; also, that we need to get out of the way, as young children begin to assert their feelings and needs, pushing themselves forward in independent (and often inconvenient) action. It is also clear that young children form very strong attachments, that they love deeply and abidingly; and finally, that children have a natural and passionate sense of fairness.

With respect to my title terms — it is partly these natural capacities (to feel with another person, to come alongside them, to be an equal, to be loyal, and to care passionately that your friends are treated fairly) which I gather together under the crucial portmanteau term: *solidarity*.

There seem to be grounds already for revising our first idea of a sharp conflict between the natural and the ethical life. There is something in our nature, which makes it likely that we will come to respond, to the fear and suffering of others, more and more as if it were our

own; and there is an innate sense of justice, which may come to approximate more and more to an impartial ideal. In that case, it seems that our natural desires may tend to converge, little by little, with the logic of impartiality. We feel for others, as well as grasping the austere logic of duty. Natural feeling and ethical conviction are running alongside one another now, rather than coming head to head. And this completes the concept, for which I am using the term: *solidarity*. I want this term to embrace not only our natural empathy, but also the logic of impartiality — when I use this term, I intend it to mean a mature fusion of these two aspects.

There is also something else in us: a deep inner necessity, which obliges us to *assert* ourselves, to be stubborn or thrawn, to proclaim our independence and the autonomy of our will and judgment. Without that *assertive* streak in us, what use would there be to anybody in our having a merely passive sense of *solidarity*? So here is my second title term: *assertiveness*. I hope to show decisively and unmistakably that *without assertiveness, the ethical life is in ruins*.

Thus the central argument I am making is this: that the drastic opposition between the natural and the ethical views of life tends partly to dissolve, once we are re-construing the whole territory in terms of *solidarity* and *assertiveness*. It may dissolve, however, at the cost of being more open to the pain and the outrage of compassion.

It seems natural to imagine that a small child may feel an overwhelming sense of weakness and inferiority, relative to the big people who are all around. Finding that “*I am weak and little*”, the child perhaps adopts one or other of the following metascripts for living: either, fearfully, “*Help me! Come here! If I go on being helpless, maybe I can get you to go on taking care of me*”; or, obstinately, “*I’ll show you! One day, I’ll be as big and strong as you guys. Go away! I can do it all of myself*”. Once a child has adopted one of these scripts, the script of anxiety or the script of freedom, it seems that the script tends to stick. It is not so easy, maybe, to shift from a passive to an active style of being in the world; or from an over-independent to a co-operative style of living⁴.

Thus children are from the start social beings. Personality unfolds within a social context, a social experience. There is a natural social development, which emerges from inside the growing child. This development can only be carried forward in interaction with the world of other people. There is a blueprint, if you like; and the blueprint expects the world (the social world, the human community) to be of such a kind, that what it foreshadows can become actual⁵.

As we are growing up, most of us get in a tangle. We lose contact with the subtlety and resourcefulness of our natural imagination. We are trapped by rules and prejudices, which can hardly be called “our own”, since they seem to have become glued onto the surface, or blotted over us, rather than to have emerged through a natural process of situational learning. When adults around us mistrust our natural development, are fearful and untrusting towards the future adults whom we shall one day become, we may well become confused, hesitant and anxious. We are all tangled up in rules and stuff. We lose contact with both our natural *assertiveness*, and our natural empathy. Our natural ethical sensitivity is twisted, blocked or painted over. Yet our true nature is not so much absent, as obscured⁶.

And I think that in some people, these powers creep back into view quietly, little by little, as different situations call forth different responses. A child is entranced by a hamster, sad when it dies. A young man discovers a certain competence in himself, which wins respect in the world. A girl falls in love. A baby is born. A grandparent is taken ill. There is famine overseas. For many people, compassion and social interest seep in; to use another image, they radiate slowly outwards, in ever-increasing circles.

In other lives, there is some shock. Some dramatic event takes place, which breaks through the shell, the accumulation of callous habituation. A boy goes to be a soldier, all gung-ho, his body full of dreams of being a real man, having a gun, fighting and being tough, and coming back a hero and a real hard man; but what he sees makes him say,

*“My dreams, my dreams, are all shattered in a ghastly reality.
Earth and sky are not for those in prison”.⁷*

For he comes home broken, in a way, gravely fractured and shaken, caught behind the bars of his horror, his frozen terror, his human outrage. At the same time, it may sometimes happen (I do not imagine that it always happens!) that he has been forced up against a possible view of life that is less schematic, more ambiguous, and more compassionate. Having passed through the fire, he may never again be able to forget others: the plight of the widow and the orphan, the poor and the oppressed, is always with him — and so his life may become radically oriented towards compassion, towards the hope of social change.

(2) WHAT ETHICAL AWAKENING IS LIKE.

Many centuries ago, it may be somewhere in the Fertile Crescent, in the country now variously called Palestine or Israel, somebody had an idea which has inspired countless people ever since, in every part of the world. Perhaps it was a windy, dusty morning. He was tramping down the steep road from Jerusalem to Jericho, heading down the tricky curves, keeping a wary eye out for bandits behind the rocks. Perhaps there was a person lying by the roadside, who had just been knifed and robbed. He wondered, *“Am I next?”* Or maybe not. Perhaps the men of the tribe were away, when an enemy came into her camp, who was in the last weakness of thirst and starvation. She was frightened, very frightened, for her body and her honour.

But at any rate, there comes a moment in your life when you forget to ask fearfully — *“If I stop to help this person, what will happen to me?”* Instead, you are taken aback, as you hear yourself asking — *“If I do not help this person, what will become of them?”*⁸

Maybe the person in trouble is out of sight or far away? It makes no difference. The idea that came to our prophet is this:

*Wherever there is fear or suffering, it is the concern of us all.
Whoever you are, and wherever you are,
your trouble is my business.*

(3) WHAT IT IS ABOUT THIS AWAKENING, WHICH IS PROBLEMATICAL.

The world is rank with suffering — with poverty and exile; injustice, cruelty, tyranny and oppression; ignorance, misunderstanding and prejudice; resentment, hatred and conflict; with simple vulnerability, whether through youth, frailty or old age. We are truly living in a landscape of fear — fear of drought and famine, fear of change, fear of shame and dishonour, fear of self, fear of one's own community, fear of strangers, fear of the violent, fear of the rich, and fear of the powerful. If we were to let all that in, opening ourselves to the full desperation of many people's lives, would we go mad?

To make our lives bearable, we shut out even our own fear and suffering. To make our lives comfortable, we try to forget the pain of others. In dread, lest we be utterly engulfed, we close the doors of our empathy. We divide the world into insiders and outsiders. We harden our hearts against the outsider. We harden our hearts against our own feelings, becoming brittle, critical, and defensive.

But human beings are naturally empathic. We cannot be wholly happy, whilst *anybody* is in pain. To frame our social experience in terms of “insiders” and “outsiders”, we must make compartments. But will compartments not always leak, sooner or later?

For two hundred years, we have been exposed to a callous and optimistic ideology of freedom, which declares that if everybody looks after their own separate interests, we will end up with the best of possible worlds⁹. Still, as we contemplate the ubiquity of fear, the prevalence of war and conflict, the desperate state of the common environment, the countless ways in which we are all in the same precarious boat — is it not possible that each person's happiness may only be achievable, when we face our terror of one another, and learn to pull together? Is it not time to seek a new synthesis, a new ideology?

(4) WHY THE NATURAL MUST BE PRIVILEGED OVER THE ETHICAL.

So there we are. We are faced with the absolute necessity of following along with human nature, the certain ill-effects of trying to override it. We know that, right from the beginning, bad things happen, when we try to force a child to “*Think of others*”. Yet it hardly seems prescient, simply to say, “*Every man for himself*”. And we have already seen that, even if we wished to say that, we just can't do it. Like it or not, our compartments will leak. Thus, *we can't bear solidarity, and we can't avoid it.*

That is our dilemma. But we have already seen some of the way forward.

(5) PRIVILEGING THE NATURAL OVER THE ETHICAL NEED NOT BE DISASTROUS.

*“Start where you are.
Use what you have.
Do what you can.”*¹⁰

Many years ago, Gene Gendlin wrote that “*Ethics has been replaced by psychology*”¹¹. He was speaking prematurely. Philosophers (not all, but many) went through a phase at that time of radical scepticism about the whole project of ethics. Now, having learned from the sceptics, we can agree that “*Ethics must come to terms with psychology*”. Any system of ethics is doomed to failure, if it ignores human nature. People may well bracket their own feelings and needs, in order to follow some moral code — but we would now say emphatically that they *should not do that*.

There is no choice, but to “*Start where you are*”. Where we are is in the middle of our natural lives — our jobs, friends, interests, loyalties, our immediate hopes and fears. It is only from here that we can adopt the maxim, “*Use what you have*”. What do we have? In addition to that natural life-world, in which each of us is situated, what do we have, which we can bring to the ethical life?

Fundamentally, there are two things:

1. our sense of *solidarity*
2. our natural *assertiveness*.

Within these we must specify:

3. our natural power of empathy
4. our natural sense of fairness
5. the network of our passionate loyalties and attachments
6. our developed sense of the predicament of others.

Finally, there are two things I haven’t talked about yet:

7. the power to think objectively
8. our awareness of human limitation.

About (7). There is our power to look behind appearances, and to see underlying structures. Commonly there is no hope of change, until we grasp the pattern, the causal network. It is vital for us to think clearly: to balance “the view from here” against “the view from nowhere”. We *must* be — and we steadfastly refuse to be *only* — where we are, in the middle of a local and narrow view. We are here — and also, we must struggle to achieve a wider, more objective, more impartial view¹².

“*Here I am, still travelling, trying to broaden my mind, for I’ve seen too much of the damage narrow-mindedness can make of things, and when I return home, I will devote what energies I have to repairing the damage.*”¹³

We keep looking for ways in which our judgments may be biased. We have to be strongly “fallibilistic”: that is, “we take it for granted that few or none of our statements are immune to correction” — but we need not concede very much (if anything) to relativism or philosophical pragmatism, nor give up the project of objectivity.

Finally (8), (and a little ruefully) we have our awareness that we can’t do everything. The wise policy is to “*Do what you can*”. I continually hear myself saying to my students,

“*Nobody is expecting you to do what you can’t*”. In that spirit of modesty we set out, from inside the pattern of our natural lives, to reach out to others. In particular, we want to be sure that, when we think we are helping, we are not simply feeding our own needs and vanities¹⁴; and when we think we have reached our limits, that we are not merely callous and half-committed. So we try to clarify our intentions.

We are not answerable for all the complexities of the world, by which our work may miscarry or fall into ruin. We are answerable for making an effort to know ourselves. Our responsibility is not for outcomes; it is to do the best we can in the circumstances as a whole. And perhaps you feel helpless? Act anyway. Join with others. *Do what you can*. It is never right, to abandon hope.

(6) NATURAL EMERGENT HUMAN VALUES.

It has been found over and over again, for example in contemplative practices, in psychotherapy, in Nonviolent Communication, and in Focusing partnerships, that as people come to know themselves and their own fears, and come into contact with the needs and feelings of others, certain common values tend to emerge.

I will mention four of these:

1. We learn that it is destructive to despair, or to lead others to live in fear of failure or of being shamed (but see value 3). We come to practise a strategic optimism¹⁵.

We have known sinking into the valley of the shadow, the cold dampness of the underworld. There are places here from which no Eurydice can escape, unless Orpheus should come with his lute and fire in his heart, burning a path to freedom. Even then, there can be no looking back.

2. We learn to approach all living beings in a spirit of tenderness — to be open to life; to be responsive to the carrying forward of living processes¹⁶.

We have tried imposing *oughts* and *shoulds*, and frankly, the results have been pretty ruinous. Something else happens, when we ask, “*Where is the life here?*” — waiting quietly for some living creature to move or call.

3. We learn that justice matters. It is not enough to be kind. To be fair to everybody seems such an easy thing at first; until we are brought up against hard cases, concerning which it is tempting to be shallow and evasive.

Wherever there is secrecy, falls the shadow of torture and abuse. Nothing has more effect, in terms of human rights, than for people to become aware that their deeds will be

known, that people are remembered for their actions. In this case (see value 1), it can be both constructive and necessary for people to live in fear of being shamed!¹⁷

4. Finally, we learn to be aware of context, to treat every situation as a unique pattern. We slowly learn not to treat people as examples of general types (“*She’s a Jew*” — “*He’s a Muslim*”), but as living, breathing human beings, each one of whom has an intricacy of experiencing, which needs to be heard, and can only carry forward in its own unique way.

Susan Stebbing comments, “*What I am most concerned to do is to call attention to the complexity of the ethical situation. Whether he likes it or not, Nero is within the wider situation. The question which confronts him is whether in this definite situation it is better to stop fiddling and put out the fire.*”¹⁸

(7) FULLY EMBODIED THINKING — THE CREATIVE PROCESS IN HUMAN BEINGS.

So what is this unique carrying forward (values 2 & 4, above), which is so crucial to our awareness of context?

Focusing, or “fully embodied thinking” (as I prefer to call it), is about the emerging of new patterns from the creative unknown. This process has of course been known for countless centuries¹⁹. It has been claimed, however, that there used to be no social forms, which would hold a space for Focusing to go on in²⁰. I am myself uncertain, whether this claim is plausible — but I am quite sure that in the present social context the need for Focusing is peculiarly urgent.

Why? Well, during transitional periods in human culture, beliefs and values may for the time being be extremely volatile. Think of Late Antiquity²¹, or China in the period of the One Hundred Schools²². Today, we are living through one of these transitions. Few if any of us dwell in communities, in which traditional beliefs and values can be simply taken as read. For this reason, it is both possible and necessary today to live in new ways. In order to live in new ways, we need to be in touch with the essentially embodied nature of human thinking. At this time, there is no good way to get by without fully embodied thinking.

From observation of a great many people during moments of transition from “surface thinking” into fully embodied thinking, Gene Gendlin and his friends and colleagues have generated various sets of *Focusing teaching-steps*. Using these steps, we can revive this natural process in people, in whom it has become blocked by fear, trauma or ideology²³.

Here is a very simple version of the teaching-steps²⁴, which I am using just now –

1. a blockage in the soul

You have a problem in your life. The forward movement is stopped.

You are feeling some sort of blockage in your soul.

2. a little pool of silence

You stop what you are doing. You let your thoughts and feelings settle down. You need to be calm enough to feel very low-level emotional states. Soon you are aware of a clear space within you, some degree of stillness or openness.

You have come into a little pool of silence.

3. making each guest welcome

You sense for a feeling of the problem, noticing what it feels like *as a whole*, noticing the quality of *the whole thing*. This feeling may well be extremely subtle, even elusive. There may be many feelings, images, sensations. Each has a story to tell, and will tell that story, once it feels ready.

Each is like a guest, whom you make welcome.

4. the likeness of the guest

You set out to look for a word, phrase, image, sound or gesture, which captures the quality of the felt perplexity. You refine that saying, until something in your body eases a little. You begin to be able to say what the feeling is like.

You begin to have a sense of who the guest is, of what she is like.

5. the gift, which the guest has brought you

You are inviting the stuck pattern to loosen, to free up in some way as yet unknown. You are sensing for some carrying forward, waiting for a creative step to bubble up, accompanied by some kind of felt movement. You are waiting for an opening — and will know it when it comes: for with it comes surprise, release or relief — a sigh or laughter, heart-easing or tears.

Your guest tells her story, and offers you some gift which she has brought you.

6. giving thanks for the gift

You welcome such a life-step, when it comes. You are taking time to allow the new to be integrated, so that the system does not fall back into the old stuckness, when you say “Goodbye” to the loosened, open space.

You are thanking each guest for the gift which she has brought.

(8) LIVING IN A LANDSCAPE OF FEAR.

So here we are, in a world more and more saturated in feelings of fear and hostility, of hatred and suspicion, of prejudice and isolation, of violence and impulsivity.

Can fully embodied thinking, which seems so simple, be a vehicle of transformation? Will it enable us to explore our fears and tangles, so that new creative life-steps come, and life flows forward once more? Inside ourselves, can this process mediate the claims of the natural and the ethical life? And in the wider world, can this process bridge the chasms of fear and mutual incomprehension, which (together with gross inequalities of power) are making our world such a dangerous place?

I judge from my own experiences and observations, that the answer to all of these questions is a resounding “Yes!”

Yes, certainly. Let us think of focusing-and-listening as a single process of human encounter. This single process, then, is the royal road to a synthesis of *assertiveness* and *solidarity*, which tends to resolve that abrupt conflict between the demands of the natural and the ethical life, the qualities of which I have been trying to evoke in these pages.

And for these reasons:

1. that to be gently and quietly attentive to the meanings held in our bodies is the deepest way in which we show love and compassion *for ourselves*; and also
2. that *when we listen to others* with empathy and sympathetic kindness; when they are able to sense into their meanings, their experiencing, their fears and suspicions, their feelings and needs; then not only may their own lives be carried forward (which is already a precious gift) — and the lives of those around them... but also these people, by the contagiousness of our listening, may experience the capacity of sincere and sensitive listening to cast out fear and terror; to dissolve prejudice and loathing; to replace separation and isolation with a sense of *solidarity* and common humanity; they will tend to let go of the vicious tendency to see a person as a mere example of some rigid category; as we are listening to them, they may well experience a renewal of the natural urge to *assertive* and independent action, a lively sense of themselves as agents in the world; they may arrive, sooner or later, at that phase of ethical awakening, of which we have spoken; they may find at last, that the denuded *landscape of fear* has “suffered a sea-change”, that they are now living in a numinous world, *a landscape of compassion*... and above all, they may experience the capacity of human encounter to embody love in all its fullness.

I began by calling this territory “a graveyard of hopes”. Yet it seems there is hope. Though these thoughts are merely preliminary, they suggest that a synthesis of the natural and the ethical may be found. *Assertiveness* and *solidarity* are interdependent.

We can walk an ethical path, feeling neither burdened nor callous, but luminous and joyful. Our path takes us into the heart of the landscape of fear, and our walking tends to transform it.

*Rob Foxcroft may be found at rob@robfoxcroft.com
Website: www.robfoxcroft.com*

- 1 This very sharply utilitarian opposition owes a great deal to Jeremy Bentham, of course, but takes its form here largely from the discussion in Thomas Nagel, "*The view from nowhere*", chapter 10. Nagel writes of a trio: "living right/living well/living rationally" — in place of my two pairs: "assertiveness/solidarity" and "natural/ethical". As you read on, you may like to be aware that these contrasts all owe a debt, not so much to the writings as to the life-story of John Stuart Mill (see J S Mill, "*Autobiography*").
- 2 The phrase and the concept of "*natural emergent human values*" is from Carl Rogers — see Carl Rogers and Barry Stevens, "*Person to person*". Carl Rogers has in several places set out his evidence.
- 3 John Dewey describes this process in his book, "*How we think*". E T Gendlin (universally and affectionately known simply as "Gene") calls it "Focusing". A worldwide Focusing movement has grown up, in whose development he has played a central role, though a great many colleagues and co-researchers have also contributed. It is possibly arguable that Gene Gendlin's role has been over-central, and may have led to a dwindling of that healthy dissent, without which no movement remains alive and creative.
- 4 Alfred Adler — a basic theme, treated in many writings.
- 5 This image, though not unique to Gene Gendlin, is one of which he has made frequent and persuasive use.
- 6 The writing of Carl Rogers on "conditions of worth" is relevant here. See "*On becoming a person*" (etc).
- 7 Michael Tippett — oratorio, "*A child of our time*".
- 8 Martin Luther King tells the story of the Good Samaritan in rather this way, in his posthumously assembled "*Autobiography*"
- 9 This is the core of the argument in Adam Smith's book — "*The wealth of nations*" — and is widely regarded today as the residual (or only now possible) ideology.
- 10 Arthur Ashe — tennis player.
- 11 Gene Gendlin is the author of many books and articles. Here I am referring in particular to — "*Experiencing and the creation of meaning*" (1962) — chapter 7.
- 12 For "the view from here" and "the view from nowhere", see Thomas Nagel — "*The last word*" and "*The view from nowhere*".
- 13 Malcolm X — in Arabia, at the end of his life.
- 14 But see Martin Luther King — sermon, "*The drum major instinct*".
[<http://www.stanford.edu/group/King/publications/sermons/680204.000_Drum_Major_Instinct.html>]
- 15 The phrase is adopted by Hilary Putnam, in describing the attitude of John Dewey — see his "*Ethics without ontology*". The theme is one which Gene Gendlin often takes up, insisting that "*Pessimism is an insult to life*".
- 16 Gene Gendlin — "*A Process Model*," chapter 8.
- 17 The work of Amnesty International, and the publications of Human Rights Watch, provide abundant evidence of this.
- 18 Susan Stebbing — "*Ideals and illusions*" (1943), p 86ff, abridged.
- 19 For recent examples of immense interest, see (1) Virginia Woolf — "*A room of one's own*", p6 and elsewhere; (2) Gottlob Frege — "*Nachgelassene Schriften*", 1914/1969, pages 225-226, abridged; translated in Michael Beaney, "*The Frege Reader*", p315; and (3) John Dewey, "*How we think*" (1933), pages 12-13, a book which has had immeasurable influence on the development of Focusing (see Gene Gendlin, "*Experiencing and the creation of meaning*" (1962) — pages 60n, and elsewhere).

- 20 Gene Gendlin — “*Focusing*” (1978), and in other writings and talks.
- 21 See Peter Brown — “The world of Late Antiquity” (1971).
- 22 See Angus Graham — “*Disputers of the tao*” (Open Court, 1995).
- 23 The crucial role played in the development of Focusing, and of the Focusing movement, by the Chicago group, Changes International (and by Kristin Glaser in particular), has not yet been adequately described in any published text.
- 24 The image of the guest has been introduced to Focusing by Pat Omidian and Nina Joy Lawrence. It is taken from Jallaladdin Rumi — Sufi poem, “*The guest-house*”, from the “*Mathnawi*”.