

THE BODY, WHICH LOVES WHAT IT LOVES

Why the Philosophy of the Implicit Matters

Kye Nelson

*You only have to let the soft animal of your body
Love what it loves*

— Mary Oliver¹

There is a portal where the infinite-at-play enters the world, like water welling up from a spring. It is a soft, shy place. It is where your heart can be touched.

Such a touch is a quiet call, and comes in your body. Slow just a bit, and you can heed it. Heeding it is the soft shy animal of your body, loving what it loves. You are *moved*.

Sometimes being moved is a movement of the heart only. Other times, being moved draws you forward into physical movement that wells up from the deep source.

You are near this portal where the heart is touched when you hear the shy quickening of a voice at certain words. You can recognize it in a certain soft luminousness that appears sometimes in someone's face. You also can find it from inside if you look back on things you have done which glow with meaning, or when you notice what is touching your heart in this moment.

What is welling up and flowing through this shy 'I' often appears to be very small. It might show up in some particular something *you* do when you're gardening. It might show up in precisely the way *you* mother your children. It doesn't have to look earth shaking.

The shy 'I' whose heart is touched is just the actual human being you are, going about and doing whatever *you* do in your loving, *for* what you love, with whatever is available here and now. It is the shy 'I' of you in your humanity, where you *can* be touched. It is the 'I' the deep source *needs* if it is to flow through you.

The heart's movement *makes* an offering. For something to be made is for it to take a tangible form.² When something is formed by the heart's movement, what is made is infused with the loving welling-up in its making.³

A SUITABLE GIFT

In his book *A Timeless Way of Building* (1979), the architect Christopher Alexander introduced the idea of a 'quality without a name'. He said this quality—which is *felt*—is something present in all great buildings. A building with this quality seems more 'alive'.

In his most recent work, Alexander (2004) presents a set of concepts with which one can think about what is happening when one experiences a structure as being more ‘alive’. He also speaks of the state of being he inhabits, himself, when he is making something:

Sometimes, when I make something, my mind is so concentrated on it that it becomes different. It becomes a pure thing. I am not concerned with showing off, but only with making the thing itself. How can I set my mind in this egoless direction? At every step in the 10,000 steps during the making of a building, I am always, at each step, asking which of the things that I can do next is the one which will be the best gift to God...

I try to sense it. I allow my dim feeling of this ground, to unfold in my mind’s eye. I try to imagine what I would be looking at if I were looking into heaven, and then ask myself what that thing would be in this particular case (pp. 310–312).

Each time, he uses it to do something different. And yet, each time he’s using the same concept.

This concept is a special *kind* of concept, a kind I’d like to call a *magical concept* because something ‘magical’ happens when it is used.

I do something akin to what he describes—especially when I’m drawing or painting. Often I call it ‘being mole-ish’, because I feel my way very directly step by step as a mole does. I’m not looking ahead but am *immersed* in the feel of that heartfelt thing as if it were the earth around me. I’m digging forward through that and letting my ‘nose’ and the feel of the ground show me each next move.

In mole-ishness, the movements are small enough to love just exactly what they love. The mole is small and soft and blind, and is guided only by the feel and smell of the earth as its body is molded by it, in this exact moment of its movement forward. Mole-ishness is how it feels to be staying so close to your loving in each exact moment that a series of ‘sparks’ full of glowing meaning are being generated by your movements.⁴

Here’s an example of mole-ishness: Often I’ll see something that catches my eye—maybe the light playing a certain way on the wall—and something in me says, “Oh, that’s beautiful!” I’m moved by what is beautiful, and in being moved I respond to that beauty as precisely as I can.

But generally it is not so easy to grasp exactly *what* it is that’s so beautiful. So as I’m moved, I try some things. I approach what is so beautiful by making different lines on the paper. I continue to be moved to try different things until I touch ‘it’. Sometimes ‘it’ is an actual line; other times ‘it’ is in the way the lines of my different approaches work together.

Sometimes, instead of the approach to ‘it’ being in lines on the page, it comes just in looking. I look and look, and then at a certain point I say, “Oh! *That’s* what it is! *That’s* what it is doing there!” It *makes sense*. And what is it that makes sense? Well, something like the actual shape of the dot so that it glints! At these times, it is in the attempt to understand, that I’m offering my heart. When I do understand, the offering has been fully made.

When I sit down to draw, there's something I must do first before I can approach what is so beautiful. I have to remember to slow down. If I don't slow down, I get a lot of stuff on the paper that isn't right, and it is all dead.⁵

It is a slowing down somewhat like the Focusing slowing down.⁶ But it is also somewhat different. A thick, thick quiet settles on me, around my head and arms and upper back. My heart gets quieter. My muscles are more relaxed. I feel my breathing slowing down. My breaths get further apart. There's a bigger *space* between each breath and the next. Sure there's more time between breaths, but it is a *space*. Even though the breathing itself is quiet, the real quiet is *between* the breaths.

It is a hush. It gets quiet like the snow quiet, between breaths. It is delicious there, and it is a relief. It is like the period at the end of the sentence. It is a rest. It is like the big space between each word and the next when I used to read the same books over and over to my small son. With a little one around, there was no time to think my own thoughts. In those days, between the words of a book I'd read a hundred times, I found a space where I had *me* again.

When I slow down, what it is that I am seeing begins to emerge. Little by little, as I approach it, I begin to understand what is so beautiful here.

For me, drawing is offering. The feeling of 'oh, it's beautiful!' *has* to be expressed. The feeling from inside is that I can't keep it to myself. It is almost like a pressure, where it has to be offered...that's where it is a welling up. That's why I have to understand it, so that I can offer it.

The 'offering' I mean here is what loving makes. What loving *makes* is infused with that loving. I think this is at least one dimension of Alexander's 'quality without a name'.

Alexander considers modern architecture to have little of that 'quality without a name' in it—what we might call 'aliveness' or 'loving' or 'care'—and he wants to change that. He sees the root of that problem as lying in what is considered possible to think about. Accordingly, he is attempting to widen the scope of what one can think about.

Alexander's first training was as a mathematician. He is painfully aware of the disreputability of claiming that states of being of the kind discussed here are real. This makes it difficult for architects (and others) to do work which has the 'quality without a name'.

A NEW STANDING⁷

Our present official world-view is astonishingly powerful. We have gained irreplaceable things from it. Because it gives us such power, the contemporary scientific model itself has great power over us.

Ironically, science itself has known that the model was inadequate, and many scientists have sought to improve it. But the attempts to do so *have been framed in terms of the old model*. There has been no other way to proceed, because there *was* no other model

basic enough to *include* the mechanical model and still also include human experience from inside.

We need a new model. A Process Model (Gendlin, 1997) lets us think further about what is deeper and wider than today's science. The problem that had to be solved was not a scientific one, but a philosophical one. The mechanistic model is a philosophical model, not a scientific model. We have to build a new philosophical model that includes everything we've got and also lets us go on. This is what A Process Model (hereafter PM) does. PM *shifts the ground*.

I first attempted to read PM off loose-leaf sheets before we had the bound book, but found it unwieldy. Maybe that's one reason it was such a delight to turn through the pages quickly when I got my bound copy. That particular quick reading was on a plane. I have an image of myself sitting in an aisle seat, PM in hand, turning each page, reading for a minute, then turning to the next. I was flying over the work in my mental airplane, getting a feel for the terrain as a whole.

That reading of PM took just 2 or 3 hours. Watching Gendlin build up his model was a bit like watching 'God' create the world in 7 days. I came away from that reading feeling PM was like Genesis. (I still feel that way.) There is no other book I know that is not just *about* life, but *is* life happening before your eyes, growing up out of itself and creating something new in the world on every page.

On that trip through PM, one delight was the exclamation marks. 'God' would create another little bit of the world and then would get so excited about it!

I was also enchanted by the image of Isadora Duncan in Chapter VIII, the last chapter.

Isadora Duncan stands still, sometimes for a long period. She senses dance steps she could move into, but they don't feel right. What would feel right is not sure yet. She is seeking... looking for, waiting for the right feel to come, willing to let it come... It is a way of relating to, interacting with... what? Where? (Gendlin, 1997, p. 216).

Isadora herself says of her standing, "I was seeking and I finally discovered the central spring of all movements" (Duncan, 1927, p. 75).

But what *is* this 'central spring'? Gendlin continues,

It is an interaction with a right feel, a new kind of feel which will come in a new place... Her new looking, waiting for, letting... These change what comes, but it is still not right. She responds to its changed way of feeling by being differently toward it in some way... [And] the feel itself becomes more distinct, like something there, a datum, an object, something in a space that wasn't there before? (Gendlin, 1997, p. 216).

PM gives us a way to think about what I called ‘the deep source’ earlier in this paper, and the not-yet-fully-here that wells up from it, into the world. It connects *directly* with the not-yet-fully-here in sentence after sentence.

THE PROCESS OF A PROCESS MODEL

I became fascinated with tracking the ‘process’ of A Process Model. I wanted to understand how it could be that it *was* what it was talking about. The whole work is like a stepped pyramid in which each layer builds on the previous ones. *How* did it build those layers on the previous ones? I started to highlight the points where Gendlin talked about what he was doing.

I was especially drawn to the process of ‘deriving’.⁸ Deriving was the heart of the book for me because that was where the genesis actually happened. I marked every spot where Gendlin used the word ‘derive’ (and there are a *lot* of them in the book) to try to understand exactly what *he* meant by deriving. Around this time is when I also started to work closely with Gendlin on Thinking At the Edge (TAE), so there was naturally a cross-fertilization of understanding from there back into PM, and vice versa.

Gendlin’s deriving is an extension of how deriving happened in logic before him in philosophy, but his deriving uses logic in a new way. I want to show a bit of how he does it, before I go on to talk about *what* he derives which shifts the ground.

In TAE, something like deriving happens at step 12, in going back and forth with step 11. To derive as Gendlin does, you have to start with something you know from your own living, and then a fresh way of saying the odd pattern you’ve found in actual incidents.

Step 11 is where you dive down into the deep underneath of what you’re working on, repeatedly finding how one main term in its very nature already includes what one of the others means. You look for where they are *already* connected *through* what you know from your experiencing.

At step 12 you formally define each of those terms by using the others. You ‘close’ your terms and you let them work alone just with rigid logic. Working with them like this yields unexpected results—some exciting and good, while others are somehow wrong. Also you may notice that something important seems to be missing. Worst is seeing where in spite of your best intentions, you’ve fallen right back into the trap of saying what you know in terms of the ‘old’ Cartesian model!

So back you go to step 11, and after that you make another run at 12 and it *still* doesn’t work. That sends you back to 11 again. It is a back-and-forth because it takes a lot of digging at the spot you marked in the beginning, to find just how that pattern works. This digging-it-out is the process of *explication*. It may sound awful—and you’d be right, it *is* awful, because it is growing *you* into a very new way of thinking. The creaky old familiar way complains about this! It can be exhausting! But the new way of thinking is like getting to the top of a very tall hill you never climbed before, where the wind is fresh and you stand and look out over so much more than you ever saw. And on the way up you do get glimpses. It is awful, *and* it is wonderful.

When you have a structure in which each term you have used is defined by the others, and the pattern of what you cared about in the first place has been explicated by that mesh of terms, then you have created the nucleus of a theory. These terms in their relations to one another have built a little world in which what you cared about exists *in words*, in the world. You have derived it.

WHAT THE METHOD LOOKS LIKE

I want to pause from this more abstract discussion of the philosophy and its method, to show the method actually in play. I'll begin by finding a few terms I have used in this paper that arrest me as I read them now. Because these terms came from explicating one specific kind of experiencing from inside it, I can play further with them in a TAE process:

the shy 'I'
a series of sparks full of glowing meaning
coming into being
arrested where your heart is touched
a movement which moves you

Looking at these, I'm aware that even though I want to keep it, 'coming into being' has problems. It already means things publicly which I *don't* mean. The public meanings mean less and 'other' than what I mean.

I begin to look at what the phrase already means which crowds out my meaning. (This is TAE step 3.) In the 'public language' what does 'coming into being' mean? What does 'being' mean?

Being is existing. I think of 'just existing', not really *living*. That's definitely not what I mean. In Wikipedia I read this: "we only define an object's existence by its relation to other objects, and actions it undertakes."⁹ I don't merely exist as 'an object' in relation to other objects, and defined by the actions I undertake!

So what *did* I want 'coming into being' to mean? (This is a TAE step 4 question.)

To get back what I meant, I need a sentence that has my felt sense of 'coming into being' *in it*. Here is how I used it: "*In that back-and-forth conversation, something shining but not yet fully here, is coming into being...*"¹⁰

In that back-and-forth conversation, something shining but not yet fully here, is ...
...it's speaking in the conversation
...it's utterly in the conversation
...oh! It's a new utter-ance!¹¹

I sit with the term 'a new utter-ance'. I notice it works in one way but not in another. But what 'utter-ance' loses for me I can get back if I also say 'the whole conversation that's going on that it was *already in* before it 'got here'".

Each of these phrases says a part of what I mean by ‘coming into being’. Now, with all my loving for that one I say to each, “What did you *want* to mean?” (This playful loving for the phrases is part of the quality of TAE step 5.)

Coming into being: emanating out with sparkly trails like a firework going off!

A new utter-ance: all here all the way, in how it newly belongs here

Already in before it ‘got here’: just what the soup needed [i.e., I can already ‘taste’ just what it is that the soup is lacking, when I’m cooking or eating it. That’s why I pick up the salt.]

Now I let these new terms play together with the terms from the beginning of this exercise:

What is coming into being are sparks. Sparks are the utter-ances that were already in the conversation before they came, and are just what the ‘soup’ needs. The ‘soup’ doesn’t need anything that exists in it already. It needs exactly what is not yet here, but which is ‘already in it’ where it is needed.

The need is already here. Sparks are what is missing. What is missing is exactly what is ‘already in it’ where it is needed.

‘Sparks’ are alive with the ‘quality without a name’ that something has, when loving takes form in utter-ances.

‘Being’ of this kind is not mere existing, but ‘sparks’ which are utter-ances. Since we’ve shown that ‘being’ can be of this kind, we have extended the meaning of ‘being’. ‘Being’ now means at least this.

As I return to discussing the philosophy of the implicit, I suggest you bring back from reading this exercise the feeling of ‘what is missing’ which is ‘already in it’ where it is needed. If you’ve got that feeling with you, how ‘objects’ are derived below may make more sense.

HOW THE GROUND SHIFTS

Gendlin has solved the problem of how to get beyond the representational assumption in the Cartesian model, in which objects are seen as already ‘out there’, separate from ‘me’, and requiring me to make a map ‘in here’ in the mind which ‘copies’ nature more or less accurately.

The ground shifts in how an ‘object’ is *derived* in PM. We shift from *representation* to *explication*.¹² A *process* model is an *explication* model. We explicate a ‘bit’ of the life process from inside the process itself. Objects seen from *inside* life process are not representations. Objects are *being generated by* process. They are generated *in the interaction* between implying and occurring. They are never ‘first’ separate and only interacting after they separately first ‘are’.

To derive objects in such a way that life process as we know it ‘from inside’ makes sense, we need to begin *before* objects, with a consideration of body and environment, and of sequences in life process.

PM begins by laying out 4 kinds of environment (en). For our purposes here, we only need to consider two of these:

- en#1: the environment as seen by a spectator who is separate from the environment, and who separates different ‘things’ which are ‘in’ the environment from one another.
- en#2: the environment as it participates within the life process before any separation between body and environment. This puts *interaction first*.

En#1 is all that the Cartesian model ‘knows about’. This is because the Cartesian model only sees objects already formed by the spectator, totally separate from ‘me’.

Seeing objects in this way is a powerful move. We also use it ourselves in TAE, in step 12. By means of logical inferences made about observed objects, technology is able to help us do more and more ‘out there’. But it *can’t* let us see the implicit life process and how the environment participates in it. That’s why we have to go back to step 11.

In the old ‘representation’ model, it seemed as though all we have is maps in our minds. The new model—‘explication’—is both the process and the resulting objects.

PM starts with the ‘interaction first’ of en#2. Gendlin says that living process is always both its own implying and an environmental occurring. There is always a sequence in which occurring carries the implying forward. Occurring changes implying into a further next implying.

The ‘interaction first’ of en#2—together with the concepts of *implying*, *occurring*, and the *carrying forward* of a *life process*—form the base level of the ‘stepped pyramid’ of PM’s chapters. In chapter III of PM, a new way of conceiving of objects is derived from these terms. The next several paragraphs show briefly how this was done:

Much of en#2 is constant, air or water perhaps in some cases. Then these are not separate aspects (unless we separate them). But these and other aspects of en #2 may sometimes be missing (p. 12).

If *all* of the life process stops because something in the environment is missing, the creature dies. But sometimes only some of it stops and some of it can continue. Where it is stopped, something could be said to be *missing*. Without that missing part of its environment, *all* the creature’s life process can’t continue.

If the creature does not instantly die because some process is stopped, then we have an implying that was not changed [not carried forward] by an occurring. For example, the animal remains “hungry”... (p. 12).

Perhaps there is soon some new kind of food... But if not, then the implying of feeding will remain the same no matter what other events do occur [until that part of the environment returns] (p. 12).

When that part of the environment occurs again, the stopped part of the life process will continue. Now it looks like the creature recognizes that “object.”

We don't think of the environment as already consisting of objects, and especially not of spectator-defined objects. Rather, something is an object only if it is part of body-en #2, and also sometimes missing... (p. 13).

Noticing that ‘from inside’ life process, objects are only objects when absent makes it possible to derive a new kind of ‘object’: the kind that is involved in behavior and perception. Now behavior and perception can be understood in a new way. Later the cognitive kind of object is derived, and still later the felt sense, the kind of object Isadora looks for.

PM *includes* the Cartesian system, but it begins from a deeper ground and also goes on further. We can keep Descartes’ gift and also rigorously regain what the self, specifically, sees or doesn’t see. We can build new understandings in the very space of public discourse.

PM offers an alternative model. It derives the kind of objects we need for technology, and also lets us think beyond them.

LOGIC AND EXTENSION

The Cartesian world-view is rooted in *logic*.¹³ If we approach logic from the shifted ground, we can keep its strength with us.

Logic is currently seen as a ‘closed’ process, as if all one does is to rather mechanically lay out what follows from already known premises. Logic seems as if it must take place in an arid desert of empty space where nothing new could possibly grow. But in fact logic can work at that very spot in which everything new comes to be.¹⁴

For example, we can see this taking place in the arena of logic and the law:

“In the court room, the Judge reasons and extends the law...in new situations, proceeding via analogical reasoning and logical extension into new and as yet unlegislated territory” (Smith, 1998).¹⁵

Consider the nature of a law. It is a form abstracted from a set of situations. It is a *pattern* lifted out from how we have imagined ourselves acting, in a range of situations *of a particular kind* that may (or may not) have come up in the past.

A form is a generality that doesn’t actually exist in the world ‘all by itself’—it can only be rolled up to a situation and *applied* there. But the situation always ‘talks back’ to

the form; the situation is more precise than the form and the law doesn't quite fit the situation. But the judge must apply the law. So, the *meaning* of that law is *extended*. The form is now bigger than it was, and contains more possibilities for future judges to use in later deliberations.

But the judge's application of the law is not arbitrary. It must *follow* from the law, if the judge is acting with integrity. In a sense the judge is totally bound here; but in another sense, *s/he* is not. The judge's humanity can well up here, in *how* the decision follows from the law in the situations to which the law is being applied.

When it is applied well, the way it is applied feels *right*. We feel a sense of relief at *understanding* the law better, if this was an issue that we were concerned about.

But before the decision, what the judge just showed us wasn't 'there' to see. Nor was it there for the judge, before *s/he* heeded the call to find a way to make the decision that would follow from the law *and* would also make the law more 'right' for this and other situations.

STAYING CLOSE TO THE CENTRAL THING

One of my clients who is the head of a school recently brought up a concern about his staff. He said there was no lightness and grace in two recent staff meetings. This was not typical.

Part of the current problem lay with the goals the board had recently written for the school. They were goals he believed in. But as he began to delegate to staff, it was becoming clear that those goals were going to be hard to accomplish with the available people.

He's a deeply religious man. So in the context of our conversation it was natural to say, "A few days ago I read something that might give you an image to conjure with. Thinking about these goals as a whole, if you were to give God the pencil, what would He be writing here?"

There was a wonderful long, thick pause. Then he told me, "Well...*God* would say that when the staff is overloaded, then they can't support the faculty. And when the faculty isn't supported, they can't draw out the best from the children."

He had just said what the school was all about: drawing out the best from the children. This is a kind of loving. The image of God with His pencil helped him understand the central thing — the school's *kind* of loving.

His voice became quieter, deeper, and more vibrant. He began to apply the concept of 'drawing out the best from the children' to the list. Working toward some of the goals would move them further away from that, instead of being a movement which could *move* him and the school.

Now that he has articulated it, 'drawing out the best from the children' can continue to function as a magical concept for him in other situations.

MAKING A MAGICAL CONCEPT

Before I close, I'd like to offer a way to make a magical concept.

First, remember a particular time when you were able to do something you cared a lot about. Take a minute or two to savor that time...Notice what made it shine for you...With or without words, feel the *you* who did that...the one who *does* that...What *was* it anyway, that *you* were doing then...? What *is* that, which you do?

I'd also like to offer a way to see where you may already be moved *in your thinking*:

A good place to begin is where your loving is. There [may be] something which draws you to deepen your understanding of it, again and again. Where is there something like that which would be satisfying to play with [in your thinking], just for the joy of following that deepening understanding at its edge...?

When the spot is right, you can feel, "to me, this matters." And, you can feel that your experience "speaks" right here. Your whole being gets a little more open and spacious...It makes your heart smile...Here you are on home ground (Nelson, 2004).¹⁶

What might that spot be, for you?

If you played with the instructions above and you have found a spot where it matters to *you* to think further, you may notice that you are touching something very tangible and compelling. This is where something not-yet-fully-here is moving you, in your *thinking itself*. Finding such a spot, you have already begun to think from your experiencing. You are at a place where you can not fully think yet and where new concepts can come to be. If you would like to continue to think from this spot, TAE can take you further on from here.

Developing concepts with TAE allows one stay close to experiencing at each step of thought. It is a back-and-forth movement between logic and experiencing. Though it is not written into the TAE steps to do so, you can also make the further move of staying close to what your loving would like to offer as well, at every 'zigzag' back to experiencing. In this way, your thinking can generate a series of 'sparks'. Loving and thinking are no longer separate. If you also work to make your concepts as extensible as you can (step 13 can help here if you are deliberately use it for this) the loving being offered by means of your concepts could potentially touch more situations, and more kinds of situations.

ENDNOTES

1. Oliver, 1992-c2005, p. 110, "Wild Geese".
2. My use of 'tangible' here emphasizes something that can be *touched*. Though the feeling of touching something might be assumed to be a physical sensation related to one of 'the 5 senses', there are more ways of sensing than just these. A felt sense, for instance, is clearly tangible.

A concept could also be considered to be tangible, in that it is ‘touched’ by the mind contemplating it for a time. A concept is something that takes form, and just as with other forms, it can be infused with the loving which made it. But of course this can be so only if it was actually made by the movement of loving. Not all made things are made with love.

3. There is little room at present in the world of paid work for the ‘soft animal’, much less for what it loves. As a result, there is less and less of that quality which things made with love have, in the world created *through* paid work.

Part of the problem is in *how* we go about valuing what work creates. This is partly procedural (we base our valuations on ‘metrics’ instead of basing them on experiencing, or metrics informed by experiencing) and partly cultural (in our culture we tend to devalue ‘caretaking’ and other work of the heart, compared to other kinds of work).

Attending to experiencing can seem as though it is mere ‘navel gazing’ from the perspective of the ‘get it done ASAP’ work world. It is not necessarily intuitively obvious that things which are annoying at best and actually counterproductive at worst—such as the current over-reliance on automated telephone systems—come about at least partly because of a lack of capacity to attend to experiencing while at work.

The inability to recognize that allowing enough time to attend to experiencing might have *practical* value is endemic in our culture. Even when enough time to attend to experiencing is recognized as having a valuable contribution to make in work settings, well-developed skills in attending to experiencing are often lacking. Or, even if such skills are developed, an understanding of how to apply the skills within the context of the workday is often lacking.

Consequently, the experience of work is often arid, and also generates an aridity that reaches *beyond* the workday, into the world we have to live in ‘after hours’. No one actually wants this aridity. It is high time that we tease apart the strands of the problem of what is generating this aridity that no one wants, and begin to address it.

The recession, global warming, and so on, loom large in our awareness at this historical moment. But taking up the problem of aridity does not imply ignoring these other problems. Instead, it means approaching them differently. It is clear that in some degree, solutions to the serious problems of our time *require* that we offer our care. Of course care is already being offered widely—but there is a further step we could make. We could *think with* what the heart knows. Only then, would we be thinking with our full power.

4. To create something infused with loving doesn’t happen in an instant—there must be a way to stay close to loving, if it is to continue to be what moves you in each step of your work.
5. Part of the reason that the world of work is so experiencing-impooverished, is that time pressure and urgency don’t leave room to slow down and attend to experiencing. As a culture we are addicted to hurry, and think it necessary. And yet, it is generally more efficient to take a little more time and work under less pressure.

It’s already generally understood that the body-mind is healthier when we work under less pressure. But I’d like to draw attention to a further point: when we have time to attend to experiencing as well as ‘the numbers’ in our work, what we are doing takes account of more factors. We are more exactly responsive to the situation, and we have more clarity.

6. 'Focusing' could be roughly defined as sustained attention to some dimension of experiencing before words about it, such that what is implicit in that bit of experiencing 'opens' fruitfully. You can see www.focusing.org for further explanation, a description of the Focusing process, and applications of it, if the term is unfamiliar to you.
7. In common parlance, standing can mean one's rank, reputation, or position in society or in a field. A person of standing has a high reputation and is held in high esteem. A friendship of long standing is one that has endured. Something with standing is fixed, sometimes indefinitely—as in a standing invitation. When something is standing, it's not been cut down. Something standing is not moving; it's rooted in its position as a tree is rooted.

In law, standing refers to the right to act. It also means an uprightness, a full erectness: it is a position of dignity. Standing can also be an act of respect, as in a standing ovation. Standing can be an acceptance of something that is other than oneself as having intrinsic value, as in the new standing that indigenous peoples are beginning to have in the world.

All this mesh of meaning can apply not only to individuals, but also to experiences and ways of being. And, an experience or way of being can have *phenomenological* standing (anyone who knows how to 'go there' can *find* it in their experience) without also having a *culturally legitimized* place. To say that something is culturally legitimized is to say that it is *sanctioned* within the 'official' *world view* of a people.
8. When you understand something you might say, 'oh yes, I see!' But then it may take you a little while to say what you understand, rather than just repeating what the other person said. But once you can say what you understand, you can very often explain other things that neither of you had been able to explain before. Now you might naturally put an exclamation point at the end of the next sentence you write—or you might wildly gesticulate, if you're talking aloud. This is the experience of deriving, in a nutshell.
9. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Being> accessed Aug 28, 2008.
10. Here is one example of where I slowed to attend to the felt sense in the process of this TAE play—there are many others which may become apparent if you read for them.
11. This is an example of the kind of play that TAE encourages. An 'old' word without any qualifiers or other modification, falls back into the old meanings very easily. When I use the word I just coined, 'utter-ance', I mean something new: both that it is an utterance as in a conversation, and also that it is made 'utterly', i.e., the whole being is expressed in it. My hyphen added to the word utterance signals that there is something new being meant here. Coining a word like I did here is not actually typical of TAE, though. More usually, what one does is to add a modifier to a word which precisifies that word: for instance, 'fresh language' or 'felt sense'.
12. The term 'explication' is widely used to refer to the close reading of a written text, in which one is 'reading between the lines' and making explicit or clear what was only implicit before in the text. It can also mean the process of replacing an inexact concept with a more exact one. The term is also used to refer to a thought process which unfolds any implicit meaning and makes it explicit.

In PM, Gendlin is “explicating the explication process” (p. 7). With the new concepts that are generated by this explication, the whole life process can be thought about as an opening and unfolding, so that what was only implicit before is now explicit. The thought process of explication can be seen as a special case of the life process of explication.

Explication is never representation. An explication has “more or different parts than what occurred when what is now explicated “was” implicit” (p. 154). “An explication is not the same as what was implicit. Implying is never to be equated with some structure” (p. 235).

13. Logic is the process of following a line of thought by means of which one can draw a valid conclusion from specific premises. In logic, one makes use of generalizations: *forms* or patterns, of which some specific content is an *instance*. One makes abstractions and discovers their implications.
14. Once a pattern has been abstracted, one sees implications not only generally, but also in specific situations where the pattern is applicable. By means of the pattern, one sees something more in each such situation than one would see without it.
15. Extension here means to enlarge the scope where a pattern can be applied: to expand its meaning, to make it more comprehensive so that it now ‘covers more ground’ than it did.

For instance, Christopher Alexander is concerned with making *physical* things—buildings, paintings, tiles, carpets, etc. There is a broader scope for his concepts about making, though. Concepts *themselves* might also be made in such a manner that they had the quality without a name. This extension is relevant to all manner of work done in the ‘information age’. The earlier footnote about how I am using the word ‘tangible’ in this paper, is another example of extension.

Extension can be useful in practical daily life as well. For instance, there are certain moves I make again and again in writing. Recently I saw that I could apply one such kind of move much more widely in my life. Now I have access to the particular kind of power that move gives me, in more kinds of situations.

An application of a concept can be so different from how it was used before, that there is a kind of ‘state change’ in the concept itself.

16. This process of finding a spot where you are thinking not only from experiencing, but specifically from something in your experiencing where you care to be thinking, can be thought of as “step 0” of TAE. Once such a spot is found, the quoted article creates a bridge for the reader from that spot into the rest of the TAE process.

I’ve said more elsewhere about staying close to what touches the heart in other dimensions of life besides thinking. Aspects of this are laid out in the ‘heeding’, ‘tending your heart’ and ‘finding your place’ methodologies, the ‘wisdom scale’, and in some of my other writings.

REFERENCES

Alexander, C. (2004). *The luminous ground: An essay on the art of building and the nature of the universe*. Berkeley, California: Center for Environmental Structure.

- Alexander, C. (1979). *The timeless way of building*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duncan, I. (1927). *My life*. New York: Boni and Liveright.
- Gendlin, E. (1997). *A process model*. Spring Valley, New York: The Focusing Institute.
- Nelson, K. (2004). Starting from a strong place. *Folio*. 19, 27-31. [excerpt from Nelson, K. (2001-2003). Thinking fundamentally. A more recent version of the complete article is available at www.antheosophia.org/documents/TFrev.PDF]
- Oliver, M. (1992-c2005). *New and selected poems*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Smith, C. (1998). Seminar presentation to the Indiana Bar Association, “Creativity and the Practice of Law”, July 1998. Kominsky Stadium, South Bend, Indiana.

Kye Nelson helps her clients live and work more wisely and from the heart. A Focusing Institute Certifying Coordinator and a close associate of Eugene Gendlin, she has taught worldwide. Contact info: kye@live-wisely.net 210/829-8343 (US). Websites: live-wisely.net (consultation) nu.umin.us (writings), and antheosophia.org (TAE, and certification programs).

