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ABSTRACT

Purpose of Study:

The following study is a phenemonological exploration into ways of looking. The work aims at elucidating the experiences of seeing the world from two distinct vantage points: that of the stare and that of the smile. It seeks to clarify differing ways of seeing and being seen.

Procedure:

The stare and the smile are portrayed through phenomenological description and literary imagery, a dialogue between the smile and the stare, and an expository presentation of the patient-therapist relationship.

Findings:

The natural scientific attitude is found to confine its gaze primarily to the mode of the stare. This type of stare sharply contracts the periphery of the field of vision, thereby limiting definition of that which is viewed. This natural scientific stare also isolates the perceived from the world of relationships. The schizophrenic stare is seen to fragment both the object and the viewer. Time stops because this stare allows no closure. The smile, on the other hand, is found to include in its look a periphery which assists in making relationships possible. The smile joins the world and helps to form a center from which dwelling and hospitality can emerge. Consideration of the stare and the smile allows a different kind of meaning to emerge out of the patient-therapist relationship.
Conclusion:

The stare and the smile as fundamental modes of seeing and being seen call forth a phenomenological rethematisation, a new ordering of our world. This emphasis of the look makes possible a radical reordering of what-is-smile and what-is-stare with psychiatric patients, psychotherapeutic practices, and the human sciences. Exploration of the two modes of seeing and being seen, the stare and the smile, makes possible wider perspectives and new meaning in the world of human exchange. The distinction of two ways of seeing, which formerly remained undifferentiated, enables us to clarify how we are situated in the world.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The following study of seeing and being seen focuses attention on the smile and the stare. The smile and the stare are modes that both exemplify and create different theoretical ways of seeing. These perspectives reveal unique worlds which form constellations which, although unique, are rarely differentiated. They are fundamental vantage points from which an order radiates. Dialectical confusion can reign when people converse together, each embedded in different and unacknowledged perspectives. A route toward meeting in dialectical discourse may be enhanced by attention to the smile and the stare. Dialectical discourse is clarified and enriched by making explicit the stance from which one speaks or looks. It is as if expression is perpetually enhanced by clarification as to how one is situated in the world. This study is prompted by the need to regard the changes which emerge from seeing the world from different vantage points: that of the stare and that of the smile.

The form of this paper falls into six sections. First, phenomenological description, as a method, is
discussed. This gives attention to the many ways of look­ing at the world.

In the many different ways of looking at our world of lived experience we find prominent at this time a nat­ural scientific view. There are many ways of looking, and this is but one. We find that the natural scientific way of looking at the world is basically a type of stare. Its manner of looking reveals a rather stark, though detailed, world. Despite what we learn, this method can obscure some fundamental connections; one of those being the connection between a skeletal and a rational view of man. The details that are found in this method often lack the over­arching view which returns and clarifies man in his family; man in his relationship to others.

The second section deals with aspects of the stare. Schizophrenic, frozen, and fragmenting stares are viewed in relation to closure and the necessity of this closure for the experience of temporality. Here, also, the stare in relation to power, order, and countenance is viewed. In this second section stares that do not see are described.

In the third section we meet Allen and his stare. Allen is a psychiatric patient in a community mental health facility. The study of Allen emphasizes the participation of the observer. It holds to bringing one's own existence to bear upon that which one wishes to reveal or unfold. Explicit in this study is the wish by both the patient and therapist to be seen: an attempt at meeting.
The fourth section is a dialogue between a smile and a stare. This attempts to show that the smile and the stare see different worlds. The interactions in this dialogue show how a world can reveal itself as authentic or non-authentic from these different positions. In this attempt at dialogue a struggle emerges for that which is deemed shared knowledge.

The fifth section will describe the smile, especially as it reveals itself in the dialogue with the stare. Qualities of rhythmic movement and embodiment as aspects of the smile are described. We see a temporality in the smile that allows the past its movement into the future.

The sixth section will show how the smile and stare appear in psychotherapy. Here the therapist is seen as taking, in part, the position of the smile and attempting to reveal a world which shows a responsive, evocative face. Here the patient is portrayed as being in the limited vision of the stare. The therapist, then, is working toward broadening the patient's horizon. In a fruitful exchange involving meaningful sharing, the revelation of different worlds emerges for both participants.

Description

When we watch a play or a game or read a novel, we do not stand above it as subject contemplating an object: we are caught up in the inner movement of the thing that is unfolding; we are seized.¹

Many approaches and perspectives may be assumed in seeking knowledge. There is a rather abstract, logical or
technical approach that looks for a meaning. This approach can look at objects as autonomous, a-historical, and without a living context. The analysis proceeds as though that which is being regarded exists independently of our experience of it. It isolates an object and attempts to eliminate the effect of the observer. This analysis works on the assumption of a subject/object model. The attention toward the object reigns vertically from above upon the viewed. The view seems to come from one unquestioned position: that of a hidden observer. The self in the seeing is neglected.

Jean-Paul Sartre discusses the manifestation of self through seeing:

> For example, in a perspective scheme the eye is the point toward which all the objective lines converge. Thus the perceptive field refers to a center objectively defined by that reference and located in the very field which is oriented around it. Only we do not see this center. Thus the order of the objects in the world perpetually refers to us the image of an object which on principle can not be an object for us since it is what we have to be. The structure of the world demands that we can not see without being visible.\(^2\)

This is an attentive way of seeing which includes the viewer. Quite often in the natural sciences the position of the observer as actual participant is ignored. This prevents an event from being fully understood. This leads to a struggle to control the observed where conceptual mastery is sought. It is less an activity in which the observer is open to what emerges, than a manipulation to
meet categories. This view, which we regard as "staring down" or "shouting down" forces illusive categories upon a recalcitrant world. The observed here is twisted to fit the categories. A meeting of seeing and being seen gives way to verticality and the hidden observer.

Such an observer can not make room or peace for, can not listen to, can never be fascinated by the phenomenon which he observes. He is estranged from it. He overpowers a dialogue with the phenomenon. He transforms the phenomenon into quantitied units, independent of their relational world.

Thus, his inquiry is unlikely to show more than a skeletal view of what is observed. The questioner becomes prominent even in his attempt to hide. This method of questioning can lead, and follows, its own route.

To see an object in this manner is more a portrait in cloaked conquest than an invitation to dialogue. This hiding can be seen as the degeneration of expression in theorizing:

Expressiveness is a self-manifestation which gives access to the world. The decline of the theoretic journey is associated precisely with the invisibility of the theorist. Theorizing slowly degenerates into a seeing which offers nothing to view. The ideal figure of theoretical effort becomes the "unseen seer." The theorist becomes the great invisible, hidden in his towers of learning, protected by esoteric jargon, covered by white coats, and sheltered by elitist pretension. The frank open glance of the viewer who is visible slowly degenerates into a squint directed through peepholes. The highpoint of the primordial theoretic journey makes clear that the most fundamental asking is an offering that the most profound desire to see
is manifested in availability, and the clearest invitations to be is openness.3

Holding all variables stable and trying not to confound the data with the observer's bias creates a kind of funnel vision. The operational definition is the mean of defining an abstract quality like hunger, or an internal event such as a dream, by framing the definition in terms of the operations used to measure or observe it. Hunger, for example, might be defined operationally as "x number of hours without food." This way of approaching objects eliminates them as living concepts, at the very least, in the empirical universe. As Merleau-Ponty remarks:

Operational thought claims for itself, in the name of psychology, that domain of contact with oneself and with the world which Desartes reserved for a blind but irreducible experience. It is fundamentally hostile to philosophy as thought in contact.4

In discussing the relationship between phenomenology and the natural scientific attitude, as well as that between descriptive analysis and operational thought, it is necessary to clarify briefly some fundamental differences.

Phenomenology does not restrict its investigations to a world "in-itself." It speaks of an expressive world of endless references and inter-connections, a world where all objects are potentially open to all other possible aspects.

Operational thought belongs within the sphere of the wholly "objective" and defines the object of its analysis in terms of functional relations between variables,
not between objects and man (i.e., scientific rigor demands that consciousness be excluded in order that another reality may be discovered).

To illustrate the difference between phenomenology and the natural scientific attitude, we may look at hospitality. A relational world involves hospitality. An abstract, logical, or technical view of the world may be a corruption of this hospitality. To respond to a curiosity with rigid categories extinguishes the spectacle, that which calls forth and invites fascination. The "other," the spontaneous guest, that is different from the host's categories is here excluded.

Hospitalities falter here as no receptive face presents itself; what is left is "a mere outline of a face inhabited by a willful initiative, a stare." A willful attempt at scientific investigation with rigid definitions holds itself and its object rigid; it stares.

Otherness, which arrives as surprise, is refused with categories. Hospitality falters here as no receptive face presents itself; what is left is "a mere outline of a face inhabited by a willful initiative, a stare." (A willful attempt at scientific investigation with rigid definitions holds itself and its object rigid; it stares.)

Description, a shaking loose of this stare in attention to expressive surfaces and interconnections, may be seen as a project of phenomenology. Later we will see
phenomenology in another fundamental vantage point of seeing and being seen, the smile which offers itself.

**Madness and Method**

The face of passion in many respects constitutes the fundamental project of psychoanalytic thought in the same manner that the expressive face, that is, the face emerging within the clear dialectic of a seeing and being seen constitutes a fundamental project of phenomenological thought. Freud is as obsessed with the face drawn inward and away by suffering or passion as Merleau-Ponty is haunted by the selfportrait of the painter, that is, by the glance which penetrates itself without yet ceasing to offer itself to the other, and without relinquishing the spectacle.7

How may we understand the phenomen of madness? When one looks at madness it can be seen as chaotic. It takes as many forms as the people who possess it. Going to the asylum one expects the unexpected. Of course there are patterns. The terms paranoia, depression, and manic-depressive point to similarities. One frequent similarity in madness is a disturbance in the eyes, the seeing. It's expected, on entering this world, to see stark stares. Hollow eyes appear. One can feel either seen "through" (a sense of permeability or being penetrated) or not seen at all.

It is expected to see a patient staring at the ground, ceiling, or wall. A cementing to a spectacle occurs and then, perhaps, an afromal wrenching from it. This disruption of a world of the eyes includes staring for hours at what seem insignificant and, on the other hand, hardly seeing what seems significant (e.g., an old friend
who enters the ward to visit). What is significant is turned on end, and things generally seen as minute details become magnified. Everything seems to come into question, a strange democracy or homogenization of the significant comes into being. The experience evokes Nietzsche's words about an inconvenient trait:

An inconvenient trait—to find everything profound that is an inconvenient trait. It makes one strain one's eyes all the time, and in the end one finds more than one might have wished.8

The stare offers no expressive surface: it does not express that which it experiences. It remains blank. As a disruption in seeing is a common part of madness, as exploration into kinds of seeing provides a fruitful way of searching for meaning in madness.

A stare in madness can magnify details which must be brought back into the significance of the lived world, back into the fabric of interrelatedness. Unless it brings its observed detail back into the relational world, it remains only a fragmented face.

To look is to explore. Seeing a tree brings knowledge of ourselves: within our viewing emerges our own situation. If the tree looks tall then the viewer knows that he is smaller. Seeing reveals space, size, distance: reveals the body. Viewing another constitutes an exchange, a mutual offering, it proceeds through a rhythmic positioning of oneself vis-a-vis another. Involved in this process must be the establishment of distance.
A view of oneself, different visions, perspectives, knowledge of how one appears to another, can be experienced as an exchange of gifts. This visibility, positioning of personal distance, is contingent on a significantly unified world view. Being "here" or "there" is an inclusion in space and time, in the fabric of the world. Left "out of it" often are the mad who may balance a world of detail in the funnel of a stare. They are "disturbed" as a relational world is confined to details.

Faithfully relating what one sees is a kind of respect. A respect which is an effort not to disturb is expressed by Professor Dr. J. H. van den Berg:

He is a phenomenologist; that is, he respects what is put on record, the incidents just as they are occurring. So he has to respect the observations of the incidents, the seeing of the incident's objects. He disturbs the objects by closer inspections, so he refrains from inspecting them. Which does not mean that, in the future, he will see superficially. On the contrary, he is of the opinion that by not submitting things to a closer inspection he will be able to see them more clearly and more accurately.

A closer inspection (in the sense meant here) reduces things to those that can be observed without emotion. Daily observations do not occur, or occur only seldom, without emotion. Therefore, those who look closely see other matters. He who desires to know what, in a given situation, is happening psychologically, does well to put himself in that situation.9

In putting ourselves in a situation we are seen. The phenomenological method is not a desire to see without being seen: that is the stare.
FOOTNOTES


5 Bernd Jager, "Toward the Phenomenology of Passion" in Existential Phenomenology, ed. by Mark King (Baltimore: Williams & Wikins, 1976).

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.


CHAPTER II

ASPECTS OF THE STARE

The stare creates a paradoxical point of view. It is used to glue a world together while it fragments the viewed world. It stops, yet holds a quality of racing about detail. While the stare seems to hold its object and itself rigid, yet therein a lived, shared world seems to flow out. The stare seems an intensified attempt to see, yet it often blinds.

The stare is defined as: "to look with a fixed gaze; to be insistently or obtrusively conspicuous; to bring a person, etc., into a specific condition, action by staring."¹ There is a powerful quality in the stare that can force the other into a specific position and create a mutual stiffening of itself and its object. A state of being insistently or obtrusively conspicuous may be experienced as a desperate route toward clear definition. A polarized extreme enactment of distance and closeness also occurs. As details appear near, a relational world falls away. The forcing into a specific position which is part of the stare can be experienced as intrusion. The world that intrudes refuses to be conceptualized. It remains resistant to all designation. Too many rapid perspectives
on a single object leaves an unfruitful feeling of incom-
pletion. Transition of attention to another object freezes
and yields, ultimately, a view of fragmentation. With this
fragmentation the self may seem to obliterate. Sarte
describes this:

At what cost do I raise my eyes? Did I raise them?
Rather did I not obliterate myself for an instant
in order to be reborn in the following instant with
my head thrown back and my eyes raised upward.²

Staring Schizophrenia and Fragmentation

The schizophrenic often stares. In schizophrenic
vision, vision fragments. Perspectives multiply and fall to
join together into a coherent view. There appears to be no
closure: finishing and starting cannot exist within this
mode of vision. If we use the analogy of language we could
speak of a failure to stick to the subject matter, a fail-
ure to keep a topic clearly in mind. One gets the impres-
sion of labels slipping off the objects to which previously
they had clung. Staring could be understood as an attempt
to hold together a wildly dispersing world, to bring unity
and stability to fragmenting objects. Staring can function
as a kind of glue applied to a broken world. But it does
not work. A creative view demands a certain freedom, a bit
of play, some room to move from one thing to another. We
have to speak and to see across this space, this bit of
play. Meaning is what traverses this space. A surface of
things emerges from this space to address us, to have mean-
ing, to be present. A frozen world resists movement and
meaning. Both the frozen world of the stare and the fragmenting world of schizophrenia arrest vision. In neither world is true closure possible. In closure we experience objects as self-sufficient. Closure makes it possible to leave an object behind, to be done with it. Also, upon closure, one object gives us access to the next; one object releases us to view the other. Closure allows a passing, creates a past and, thereby, opens a future. In the fragmenting view of schizophrenia the past does not come to pass, it divides itself endlessly. Here the glance is the captive of one spectacle which proliferates endlessly from within. Neither fragmenting vision nor frozen vision offer space or give true access.

Frozen vision paralyzes us. It takes from us the movement necessary to see the other side of things and beings. The world is revealed as flat and inaccessible.

Fragmenting vision dissolves a world and, hence, dissolves our perspective. Proliferation of the perspectives with fragmenting vision creates a fullness which excludes! It smothers the space where a meaning can occur, where a live life can be lived.

Order and Power in the Stare

In the following quote Sartre describes the stare as a desperate attempt to establish an order, stop a rapid metamorphosis. Through staring a person can attempt to clarify a multiplicity of visions:
As long as I could stare at things nothing would happen: I looked at them as much as I could, pavements, houses, gas lights; my eyes went rapidly from one to the other, to catch them unawares, stop them in the midst of their metamorphosis. They didn't look too natural, but I told myself forcibly: This is a gaslight, this is a drinking fountain and I tried to reduce them to their everyday aspect by the power of my gaze.\(^3\)

In this effort to reduce things to their everyday aspect there is an attempt to order; limit what is happening. In the seeing, there is an act of distancing. The characters in *Nausea* see a world that intrudes rather than responds. This is similar to the world of the paranoid where one is "stared down" or pursued. An uncomfortable vision of self in relation to others has trouble finding a position in the world. It bursts out in grandiosity and flounders from a clearer identity. In *Nausea* Sartre conceived of the relationship between people to be an issue of connections and conflicts. He suggests that the primary reality of relationship is the "look" or the "gaze." He is saying that one does not come into being until another looks at him, but this interpretation holds more specifically with the stare than the look. The stare can be defined as "to affect in some specific way by a stare; as, to stare one out of countenance."\(^4\) An archaic form of countenance is "face."\(^5\) In Sartre's works, objects at times do see a face or dissolve their surfaces while they are being perceived.

To be looked at may be experienced as an invasion (being stared down); as a cutting into another's form, an
infringement of personal space. This kind of looking makes the relationship between people an intense conflict.

Eyes and the basic issue of trespassing are presented together here with the ritual of the evil eye. The eye is seen as a powerful legislator of personal space. Ari Kiev describes some of the rituals around the evil eye:

To avoid the evil eye, people refrain from boasting of the good fortunes and practice various magical or counter-phobic maneuvers, e.g., stretching the right hand towards the glance of the envious and saying "khamssa" five times, covering objects with blue paint, and wearing charms. Compliments are negated by magical phrases. "Evil eye" has something to do with the invasion of private space, and the projections of hostility toward the impositions of forced dependency; as such, it is treated by maneuvers that enable the victim to reestablish the appropriate distance from any person who has overstepped these personal boundaries.

There is an emphasis of the power involved in looking in Sartre. It is a statement that one is not the total foundation of one's own being. To look at another is immediately to create him as the Other. This is to subjugate or reduce him to the status of a dependent object. Thus, his freedom is diminished, for at that moment he begins to exist only via the power of another's gaze. He is at the mercy of a freedom that does not originate with himself and, therefore, is not his own.

Thus, one's human reality becomes dependent on another's gaze. In this way Sartre takes the relations between people to be fraught with struggle and uneasiness. The look, for Sartre, puts to rest any hope for solitude,
because one is either looking at and threatening another's freedom or being looked at and threatened. The vacillation from one condition to the other becomes a state of instability. Here, one is effected by the powerful ordering of another's gaze; one is found in the other.

**Staring and Countenance**

One rich source of imagery describing a world of stares, bursting surfaces, penetrations, permeabilities, and transparencies is Sartre's *Nausea*. Its words express the migrations of a concrete form to a symbolic sense. A chair flows into a claw. From one perspective it is an artistic expression of the terror of a psychiatric patient saying, "It's a terrible thing for a girl to be a wall." Sartre's artistic use of language gives meaning to an experience which might lay fallow in madness. *Nausea* contains many portraits of ways of seeing, and being seen, and especially the stare.

In *Nausea* objects loose and change their forms rapidly. For example: "The eyes, nose, and mouth disappear: nothing human is left." Things are transformed and magnified, such as: "His fine, roving eyes shine like globes of fire and his sparse hair forms a steaming halo on his skull." The objects continually dissolve and transform into an obtrusive multiplicity. In this world a phenomenon is not one thing, it is innumerable other things. Such a world portrayed in imagery is similar to the world
of the schizophrenic who might say: "That's the rain. I could be the rain." 10

Sartre often uses images of eyes to paint a vision of an intruding, erupting world that pays no homage to the differences of one thing from another, of one person from another, or of persons from things. Phrases such as: "The little old man next to me is surely Coffier: one of the women of the group, the brunette, is devouring him with her eyes," 11 evoke images of confused separation. This woman might be experienced as too close, as devouring. At the same time she is far away, as she presents little that might be seen as dialectical possibility. The multiplicity of these phrases of confused separation enhances the effect of separateness:

He would take off his spectacles, as if to show himself naked in his man's flesh, and stare at me with eloquent eyes, with a weary, insistent look which seemed to undress me, and drag out my human essence... 12

Many descriptions of eyes are used in Nausea. "He stares at the little man ferociously. A direct look that puts everything in its place." 13 With these eyes initiative is one sided. The eyes portray the blurring and trespassing of entities and the struggle to establish a balance between initiatives and penetrations, or to differentiate one thing from another.

In this realm of eyes in Nausea the world is viewed as an aerythmic vision of stark barreness and volatile, overflowing, bursting surfaces. Defining the stare may
include to stare one out of countenance. To be out of countenance robs one of a face, a privital self through a clear vision of the other. In this state of being stared out of countenance, objects seem to burst, they flow away. The self and the objects of the world do not remain contained in limits that make vision possible. In Old French we find "countenance" from "contenir: to contain." A world that resists containment lacks a quality of closure on objects, self-sufficiency continually flows out.

This world does not permit a chair to remain as such, but releases the multiple facets that usually are considered "chairness" into distant identities in themselves. The images are often those of multiple aspects leaping toward one:

Every existing thing is born without reason, prolongs itself out of weariness and dies by chance. I leaned back and closed my eyes. By the images forewarned, immediately leaped up and filled my closed eyes with existences; existence is a fullness which man can never abandon.

The red of a simple chair does not stay the red of the chair, but can, seemingly, become the red of other disparate objects. Here, both in looking at the objects in the world and in being seen there is a rupture away from lived space. Even as the act of staring is an attempt to satisfy a world in splinters, the object of the stare is, itself, a narrow fragment of a larger view of the world. There is a staring which does not see:
Undoubtedly, if I close my eyes or stare vaguely at the ceiling I can re-create the scene: a tree in the distance, a short dingy figure runs towards me. But I am inventing all this to make out a case. That Moroccan was big and weather-beaten: certain details, somewhat curtailed, live in my memory. But I don't SEE anything and more: I can search in the past in vain, I can only find these scraps of images and I am not sure what they represent, whether they are memories or just fiction.  

Here in the stare we find the modern version of the biblical, eyes have they, but they see not.
FOOTNOTES


3 Ibid., p. 78


5 Ibid., p. 936.


8 Sartre, Nausea, p. 17.

9 Ibid.

10 Laing, The Divided Self, p. 198

11 Sartre, Nausea, p. 44

12 Ibid., p. 113.

13 Ibid., p. 66.


15 Sartre, Nausea, p. 133.

16 Ibid., p. 32.
CHAPTER III

ALLEN: WHO'S WHO?

Self-consciousness has before it another self-consciousness; it has come outside itself. This has a double significance. First it has lost its own self, since it finds itself as an other being; secondly, it has thereby sublated that other, for it does not regard the other as essentially real, but sees its own self in the other.

The Energy Rip Off

The staff at the local county mental health facility speaks often about the "energy rip off." A feeling of abuse and depletion often emerges as a prominent, yet amorphous, quality of the work. The "energy rip off" is important to regard, especially as it is experienced as something that seems to come from no definite realm. It is not easily clarified by words. One can only say about it: "I can feel my energy flowing out, my self blurred; I feel beaten at the process of separating my thought from another's." And so it rests, amorphous, and the feeling of the continuous drain remains.

In this state of depletion all work can turn into a search for categories from which this feeling does or does not come. The deliberations and dilemma focus on finding the root of depletion. And again, this very process of a
confused search for course pushes one further down the road to a feeling of raped exhaustion.

The source of the depletion can find its roots in many areas. It seems best to start at what might be the beginning: a therapist faced with a patient. In the case of Allen (name changed), it is more of being faced with a navel, as he is dancing shirtless in front of a mirror while I am sitting near him.

Even in the first magical moment of meeting, the categories Allen and I carry to the situation are charged. Is one to bring the other clarity? In the area of madness where there is so much confusion, often one gets to the point where, in relation to the people called "mad," there is an extreme ambiguity as to where the thought is coming from: him or me? When the experience of "self and other" comes to be so extremely blurred, the people working in the file seem forced into a corner of confusion, such that the categories of staff versus patient serve the purpose of establishing a kind of order. This treatment is an effort to change someone through labels, rather than simply being present to them. This labelling shows: "DIS-EASE, the experience of being not at ease, leads to the discovery of the 'diseases.'"²

Well, here we are in the day room in front of the mirror. Allen would be called schizophrenic by many. Allen is talking to the radio as if it were constantly making appropriate responses to him. Here on the ward that
conversation might easily connect him with the label schizophrenic and it might also evoke much wonder from the world at large. But what is happening: he is carrying on this elaborate conversation with the radio and dancing with the mirror. The person in the chair is thinking, "Hum, Allen seems to have one eye firmly fixed on me, and if I would imagine some of his musing it would be, 'my, my, here we have an intern, what fun, I'll show her a crazy that she'll never forget.'" What disparity.

He appears out of touch because he reacts to a personal conversation with the radio. At the same time he is so in touch with who is sitting in the chair in the room with him. He seems there, but not there. If I would say, "hello," he would as easily say, "good-by" or "green." The rules are different. The respect for the place, space, time, symbols, or language differentiations between I-Other (where the trespassing lines lie)—all are gone. Doubt floods in from every area. When thinking of the room I want to say we seem to be in an orange room. The doubt flows through me.

One runs the gamut of emotions: delight, wonder, jealousy, anger, fear, humiliation, frustrations, defiance, embarrassment, puzzlement, determinations, resignation, depletion. It's just one moment preceded by and followed by a few hundred other moments which give a similar run through the emotions.
The chair in the dayroom does not seem to hold a history of being very well lived in; like the glance that is repelled by the metal on the chair does not bring with it the thoughts of an object that has been permitted to hold someone or give support or relief. The chair releases its transient possessors. It is locked up, as are all the people and the objects in the ward: it remains more a symbol of what cannot be used. Chairs are nice, solid, and safe. This chair, however, probably hasn't spent most of its life as a chair. How many times has it been a black shiny monster with silver fangs? And, how many moments has it lived as a tool, a defense of fangs against the gleam of a thorazine needle. It becomes an intruder; not comfy, spongy ordinariness. The chair can absorb more space than it lends, tighten the knot in the throat, just as the glance at the place on the door where rests the shiny white circle that when one says, "lock," sometimes rests in the door and sometimes presses too close up against the walls, floors, ceilings, and people.

Allen swaggeres over to the chair that I'm in and pats the armrest. Somewhere in that moment the chair lives as my thigh. Panic fills me as I feel the humiliation of being forced, relegated to a bizarre melding. I am not even permitted to inhabit comfortable space. "Allen, you con man, you thief, you rob me of the lines my body dwells in. The chair is not me, I am not the chair." In this moment a world desolves. In the world of the sixteen year
girl body is played back in space:

A girl of about sixteen enters the room in which her elder brother is talking to a few friends. When his friends see who is coming in, they stop talking and look at her. For the first time in her life, the girl notices that she is being seen through male eyes. She blushes. What does her blushing mean? Generally speaking, there is a difference between the way in which a man and a woman look at another person. Whereas female eyes can rest on the surface of objects and people, a masculine glance is inclined to go through the objects; it penetrates, unmasks, changes, more than does the feminine glance. The girl notices that she is being looked at with this kind of glance. Her brother's friends are looking at her in an unmasking way; they are looking through her clothes. Their eyes are trying to undress. As a result, the girl is robbed of her body; to a modest degree, her body turns into a body of her brother's friends. But this estrangement of her own body is not all. Also, for the first time in her life, she finds that she desires to possess this different, newly shaped body. She becomes a woman entirely. Later, in a less surprising moment of her own choice, she wants to BE this body, and to prove it, her body--those parts are seen--is filled with blood. She blushes, becomes visible, more visible than she was before the masculine glances. Her blood goes out to meet their glances. But at the same time, her blushing is a barrier behind which she is hiding. She hides behind a layer of blood. Her blush refuses. Her blushing is the result both of estrangement from her body AND of new intimacy with her body. The other persons' glances make her body far off and nearby.3

Here there is a self-consciousness that sees itself via the other. But between Allen and I a racing occurs. This is more extreme than that sixteen year old of Different Existence, as a crumbling exists which does not seem to release my body back to where it is experienced in any world.

I search for the clam to flow through me, but something is racing, racing, racing. My eyes dark from object
to object—chair to ceiling to walls to stains—but they all seem released from their boundaries. But I have to put them back, put them back as they put me back in their alignment with their label and name. As I seem to live Allen's feeling, and he mine, the room is transformed—nothing pays homage to a limit, a form. The peeling orange paint resists the wall and all is flow and flux, as this orange wall just as easily lends itself to a curling monster's scar as to a stroke of orange electric lightning.

The impulse is to overreact or to grab a rigid category (man, woman, staff, patient) in an attempt to stop the racing, the rapid disintegration of form; there is a desperation in it. As the armrest of the chair seems to give a pulse, panic impells me toward category. Someone is not playing by the rules here. What is happening here? The common vistas are abandoned. The place where we are to meet in a common, universal vision is gone. We are together in space in the room, but the experience is abandonment. Where is the seeing of the same thing, even if differently? All is dividing, transient wandering. Orange wanders from the wall—the chair gives itself up to everything.

**Fugue**

Allen speaks as a captain on a voyage which doesn't address its origins or its destination. No beginning or end comes to pass. As Allen is addressing what might be a vision before him, he changes his tone abruptly and says to
the image, "Just hang in their baby; just take it slow."
Here I'm handed shock and support in one moment. I feel momentarily seen. How is it to be so "out of it" and so "in tune" in one moment; the pervasive, unearthly feelings of someone connecting via another, more elusive channel.

As I hear the last ring of the world "slow," there is an appeal toward sharing. And I want to say, "Hey, Allen, meet me here where you can see me." This fades away as severed abandonment appears; things feel a little more like a bit of "show" as Allen continues on his monologue.

In the space between us flow the colors, the sounds, the odors; they are permitted free reign; little stance via common sign posts can be grasped. The area between two people which can create some similarity of vision (a chair can be a chair, not a person) where the rhythm between the rigid and amorphous can play to find their balance in an essential order: all that closure is gone. It is not only a matter of "a place for everything and everything in its place." It is the struggle between the bombardment of multiple racing images and the impulse to stop them at any cost. Then, too, there is the seduction of "going with" them in feeling the richness of fantasy as it presents all objects as exotic.

Abandonment, rage, and fear can be made reciprocal. There is a way of perceiving things in a vertical form which can falsely break through the type of horror that Allen seems to place the other in. It creates another kind
of horror. Thus, he can be placed in the underworld, i.e., just a patient. In this division his world releases its hold; less authority is given to the place that he designates as meeting-ground. He is in another world. With stratification more separation is invested into the situations. It replaces the distance between what he sees and what another sees. A label, "patient," fills the gap between the differences in world views. The day room chair resumes its familiar peace. The chairs become the possession of the staff. The chairs are owned by the common view of them and he is called, "possessed," as all objects are taken from him.

The objects reveal his inability to (see) possess them; an inability in the realm of ownership, dwelling, as he seems to see objects migrate. This migration changes beyond that which forms a supportive ground. With his diminution being "patient" comes a kind of relief to staff from giving authority to his vision of forms in formlessness and objects left nameless. As his forms wander and migrate from their designated categories, he too becomes detached; disjoined from signposts. He becomes, in part, the wanderer, as in Hillman's image:

For indeed wandering is a psychopathic trait. The mocking discordant shadow who must see through because he is also a Knight Errant, passionate and idealistic, is indeed a figure of psychopathy. It is he within who is driven out of stable connections, who cannot settle, cannot conform, because he is driven to unsettle all forms. But this fugue in the soul need not be condemned to play the anti-social criminal, since precisely his mordant
insights are those that can awaken the callow unpsychological innocent—who also lives within us—to discern among ideas, discover new perspectives, and survive.⁴

But it can be this shock of being immersed in this migration that can split one. Temptation to take two routes emerges. One goes toward a life of discovery of new perspectives and fascination. The other direction is away from the lost, dissolving, abandoned, death of delinations. There is the struggle simultaneously to follow Allen and retreat. There is seduction by the rainbow of colors of the new emerging magic horizon: a magic chair, a chair that's never been seen before. Beside this also resides the terror of living so close to the edge of the death of form. A chair that is not resting in its designated place can twist the knot full in one's throat as it speaks of its power to permeate. It can threaten to steal one's lived space as the thigh of the chair lives its bizarre melding. And the warden and patient race toward the seduction of enriched vision and yet away in the terror of "no space," "no territory" and the warden, staff groans, "Another day, another getting sucked in, another energy rip off."

In this very exhaustion it is rare that a kind of learning isn't felt. Confusion reigns in the feeling that one has been very close, and yet very far, from something. The birth of vision and death of form seem to rest so very close in one moment. The exhausting journey toward and
away, makes its racing repetition in every object; delight
and repulsion meld in a space insufficient for their con-
finement.

The refuting of limits and boundaries might be
seen, in one light, as the journey of the errant way:

The errant way leads to the less known for sure,
to less knowledge as established, as accumulated
into security. It even dissolves the known into
doubt, into the freedom of uncertainty. Is not
knowledge suppose to free one? Knowledge makes us
able to leave it behind, able to take off down
the road of pitfalls in full foolishness, risking
even greater windmills, still farther out, an old
knight, more and more bold, an old rogue more and
more peculiar, aging into the freedom of our
pathology.5

There is the drama enacted in the arena of sterile
white metal, putred spotted carpet, graffiti smurred orange
walls. But in this tragic enactment the characters, the
verse and image, the symbols and emotions, do not hold sta-
ble to support the distance necessary to look into the face
of that which terrifies.
FOOTNOTES


5Ibid., p. 164.
CHAPTER IV

DIALOGUE OF THE SMILE AND STARE

I stare prodigiously but nobody remarks it, for everybody stares here; staring is à la mode—there is a stare of attention and intérêt, a stare of curiosity, a stare of expectation, a stare of surprise.

One way to clarify different world views is to see what happens when they converse together. In the following dialogue the smile has more movement. The stare reveals a disembodied look.

SMILE: Hello

STARE: ...

SMILE: I'm happy to see you.

STARE: Can't say the same.

SMILE: Well, at least I'm polite, if sometimes only superficially.

STARE: I'm not really here. Besides, I'm concerned with something else, beyond, below the surface, maybe nothing.

SMILE: I recognize you.

STARE: Don't bother me. I'm busy being rigid.

SMILE: I'm here. You are here.

STARE: No I'm not and neither are you.

SMILE: I'm disarming, like a handshake. I say there is no danger.
STARE: How can you be so sure?

SMILE: Let's play.

STARE: I'll control things! Watch me be the mother! Ever seen what I can do with a child about to make an insulting remark?

SMILE: I can win over people, bring out their best.

STARE: But can you disembodied people as a stare that turns one to stone? I exist with Medusa.

SMILE: I can animate bodies.

STARE: I can embarrass you. They say I'm sexual. Here's just one example: the sense of embarrassment one experiences at being stared at and which keeps one from staring hard at others, finds its explanation in the sexual significance of the parts of the face.

SMILE: One of the many things that's said of you. Looking at you robs one of a world, sexual and all. With my sense of embodiment I can be spontaneous and play with unity and separation. I'm with children playing peek-a-boo when things disappear and, then, reappear. Glee and I appear together.

STARE: I can be extreme poles of separation and unity. I can separate and be very distant from people or dialogue, but seem to merge with the object of my gaze. "Stone: he longed to be that stone and melt into it, to fill himself. But it could not help him: it was outside and forever."2

SMILE: When I appear there is a shared world between people. Objects unfold in comfortable multiple facets. Light plays off objects. A large periphery, a less funnelled vision embraced me. I experience things emerging as welcome company, not impositions. You refuse to decentralize. My face opens to give place.

STARE: When I appear a contracted, funnelled focused vision can occur. I may shed light on one object. All else, the periphery, contracts. The world shrinks to the stark tube I delineate. Little else can enter across the narrow steel string from me to my object. A piercing, forced grasping can be felt; all else is cut away.

SMILE: I'd like to tickle you.
STARE: Don't touch me!

SMILE: You know sometimes you are a blind stare. Now, myself, often I see. When perceiving I allow a style of contact (conduct) to play across my body. Besides, a rather non-bodily, semi-participant, disembodied psyche--like yourself--would not be able to see the other. "It is this transfer of my intentions to my own, my alienation of the other and his alienations of me, that makes possible the perception of others." 3

STARE: You're blurring my concentration. Anything from the periphery can be a little suspect, you know. You're enough to startle me at times. That start seems so bodily when interrupting the beam of my eyes. Why do you seem to shake things loose sometimes?

SMILE: You're making me claustrophobic. Want to hear a good joke?

STARE: As I was saying, I may be a more original type of perception. Wouldn't you say that the seeing of others starts from a state where the child is unaware of himself and the other as different beings? A child, not an adult, has license to stare.

SMILE: How often is the child called impolite for taking my form? Let's be happy.

STARE: Well, I have been known to exist in the happy day dream.

SMILE: Looking into my eyes one sees the color of the iris.

STARE: I reflect things, but you've been known to avoid things, especially when you don't know.

SMILE: The same to you. But at times you've been known to be too direct. How would you like a little surprise?

STARE: No. You've been known to spend a lot of time with self-satisfaction.

SMILE: How about you and narcissm? I exist with others.

STARE: You bounce around too much.
SMILE: Sometimes you rob me of that contentedness. When you gaze upon me, my world transforms. Let's give up your retentiveness and roll in the grass.

STARE: I shall remain over here and you over there. Feel free to leave.

SMILE: But your stuck on me? When I look out the view includes a large warm periphery. Objects easily unfold many faces. I flow and dance about things.

STARE: Dance out the door. I'm busy.

SMILE: When I run across you I stick, yet you tell me to go. So you've got me coming and going. What control you have: to shrink the periphery and legislate me to the limited world of your blinding white tube. Let's dance through a rainbow.

STARE: Thank you, but I have a headache.

SMILE: You are a headache! When you strike me, my body lights up and loses its shady embeddedness. Awkwardness emerges as I try to balance in your world, and my body loses its pose toward things in my world. Objects that embrace me and make me potential take flight when you are busy putting me in, what you think is, my place. You make me awkward flesh. Let's enliven it.

STARE: You could embrace the door knob. Your mingling is a bit promiscuous.

SMILE: Me? Promiscuous? What could be more obscene than attempting vision without eye movement, trying to see without being seen?

STARE: What a prude! You're not without taking license yourself, you know. Haven't you heard only a painter can look at everything without appraising what he sees? You may like color, but by yourself. A Picasso you're not.

SMILE: I was there at times.

STARE: As I was. Are you sneeking into "intellectual" life?

SMILE: ...But we need each other. (Starts singing: "Some of these days you'll miss me, honey" into the sunset.)
FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER V

DWELLING AND THE SMILE

In the facing, the recognizing and inclining towards each other the guests and host each grant each other the space wherein fully to be themselves. In the space of hospitality is the space of the embrace; it does not constrain but gives and makes place. Hospitality is a mutually creative act in which host and guest ask each other to fully inhabit the earth from within the space of their embrace. Each is asked to manifest himself, to be whoever he is! Psychotherapy essentially is the cultivation of hospitable space, a seeking the other as well as a manifestation of the self.¹

Hospitality and the Smile

Hospitality is an invitation into a dwelling. We speak of a gracious and hospitable smile. We smile in greeting; we invite others into the dwellings that reveal ourselves. We are offering, we are giving a presence of self at these times. A smile in greeting is an invitation to see, we show a face. A kind of solidifying occurs with this smile: "the act of getting up to meet a friend at the threshold is a substantiating movement."²

In the preceding chapter, "Dialogue of the Smile and Stare," the smile beckons to the stare. The smile exhibits a quest for the presence of that which attracts its attention. The smile does not enact the part of a
self-sufficient, autonomous element, but invites another to join in dialogue. It is an expressive face:

The expressive face offers itself. The face cannot be self-sufficient, it does not possess itself what it makes available for the other; it remains forever ignorant of exactly how it looks. The expressive face is half, of which he who observes it from the other. Between the two halves lies a shared world.³

In a shared world a ground is laid; this is not a world in which a whole is formed by additives, fragments. Here, with the presence of expression, is a dynamic configuration of exchange. This exchange necessitates an other to give an access to the shared world.

This access refers to a circuit of reverberations and exchanges between the other's glance and the spectacle and the spectacle appears illuminated by the glance of the other.⁴

A comfortable smile draws us to its object. This is not the empty smile of the manic patient which lacks a true direction, whose incessant movement excludes a place for the inclusion of the other. This manic grimace can not support hospitality; it is not a discernable response, a response to something or someone.

The smile refers us to something other than itself; it is unlike the stare which becomes "dead-eyed," and is itself an end. In the stare, eyes become more prominent than vision. When vision predominates a world emerges and hospitality becomes possible. Sensory organs usually disappear. They lose themselves completely in their
respective objects; seeing becomes a panorama, hearing becomes a melody.

The stare stops us, leaves us with hollow eyes. The smile continues and carries us to others. There is a quality of movement, a bit of play. This play is an enlivenment, it embodies as it places one in the world. Here eyes look out upon that which attracts them. The vision mingles with a play of surfaces. The body does not become a problematic and frozen mass. In this quest for presence things do not so easily remain stationary matter.

**Neighbouring**

Here again we see a relationship between the smile and stare that is similar to the relationship between the phenomenological and the natural scientific attitude. While the natural scientific attitude works well with confines and defines matters, phenomenology looks to surfaces and presence. Phenomenology has been described as a quest for presence:

This spirit seeks to transform the human science into a disciplined communal quest for presence, for the full manifestation of whatever surrounds, undergrids or overarches the human world. Under its influence science can become a drawing near or **neigh-bouring**, or dwelling nearby whatever attracts our attention. Science will then once again stand alongside the arts, alongside poetry and philosophy and even the crafts as a certain manner of unfolding objects, situations, persons. Science will become then a certain manner of drawing near to nature, to others, to the self, to the horizons and ground of existence.
Confining definitions have no place in this world of neighbouring. They harm and transform the object to force it into categories. Mutual presence allows things to emerge; "Just as we all know people in whose company it is pleasant to take a walk because the objects come to no harm."6 A neighborhood implies a secure space, free from harm. To expand the rigid definitions of natural science into the "disciplined communal quest for presence" the accepting influence of the smile is needed. The smile in its hospitality invites neighboring, and dwelling together.

A smile radiates from and invites to a foundation which can support the metamorphosis of hospitality. In hospitality all objects turn to face the guest. Hospitality depends on dwelling, for without dwelling, without unproblematic support, we cannot fully attend to the other. Our vision is impaired. The insecure dweller is busy maintaining his own ground. Closed off are distant realms, they become severely limited. Fruitful question of our relations to the other are brought to a stop. Loss of grounds leads the glance to our feet. Vision withdraws from a wider perspective. Without ground, without faithful support it becomes impossible to smile. With dwelling, with ground, a smile binds a world together. It makes everything available from a center. A smile offers a world and guarantees support.
FOOTNOTES
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CHAPTER VI

THE LOOK IN PSYCHOTHERAPY

When I now examine these two spheres: my friend's eyes, I notice first that between them and the arm chair there are countless possible paths. That means that my friend is not looking... But now the two spheres are turning in their orbit; now the eyes are becoming a look. Suddenly a path is cut through the room, an unwavering path, the shortest and straightest one possible.1

The Smile and Stare in Psychotherapy

Therapy can be seen as a response to pain, a response to that which closes our eyes. Communication with others breaks when we are in pain. Pain loosens us from a play of surfaces which offer themselves. This face of pain stares inward, downward, and backward; away from the other. In tragedy this face turns and looks more fully into its fate and reaches toward expression. The tragic face, while in pain, maintains expression; its stance before the other. The tragic is described by John M. Anderson: "In the tragic sense of life or in a tragedy, by contrast, it is man who holds out attention as he brings himself to stand before the other."2

Therapy may be seen as calling the stare of pathos, a mute pain, into the tragic form, toward expression. Therapy descends into the chaos, the gaping mouth of terror
and re-emerges with themes, modes of expression, and sharing. Expressiveness and the smile look outward to face the world of offerings and access. Focus in therapy can be posed toward a shaking loose of the stare or a severely restricted horizon. This is a movement from a constricting withdrawal to an ongoing dialogue with an extended periphery, our surroundings.

The existence of a smile and stare can be seen in therapy. An attempt at dialogue appears between a face which emerges well within the dialectic of seeing and being seen (a fundamental project of phenomenology) and a face that is less visible and which draws one downward, responding to a power that seems to draw one inward. Phenomenological therapy may take as its form a working toward the clarification and vivification of different world views. Here the viewed speaks of the position of the viewer. A relationship is placed within verbal, historical, and cultural perspectives. Multiple modalities through which one gains access to the world are illuminated. In opposition to a fragmented modern consciousness, a rich shared unity is sought in the altered themes of phenomenological thought. This thought attends to fundamental relations to the world: dialogue and being in relation to the other.

Therapy makes place for the other. It often takes the form of the telling of tales. It works toward weaving together a self-evident ground. In the tale told in therapy a capturing in words provides a place which gives the
supportive form of community; speaking with another such that one does not face the terrifying in fragile solitude. The other is brought forward in the telling of a tale.

Let us describe Michael, a psychiatric patient, to reveal the smile and stare in therapy. The smile is seen in the perspective of the therapist, the stare in that of the patient.

Michael's stare blinds us to a self-evident ground that allows an illumination of the other as presence. His funneled stare seems to constrict and severely limit how one approaches him. To stare is defined as, "to bring a person into a specific condition or action." And this is the effect Michael has on limiting the approach others have to him. A therapist makes place for Michael in receiving a tale told of a different existence with different words. Initially, therapy may be a description of a unique world view, but it may change, move; the therapist may also help create a place for himself in Michael's world.

Here the look of the therapist is that of a smile in relation to Michael. A smile in the sense that he refuses to remain balancing in a contracted funnel of vision; he also addresses and brings in the periphery. He expands a horizon as he refuses to remain in a specific condition or action, legislated totally by the rigid gaze of Michael. He moves out of a specific condition, brings to the situation different ways of being in relationship to
the other. With the movement of the therapist a funnelled vision of the patient can waver.

    The smile finds closure on objects, it can bounce, be done with things. With this completion change can emerge, time can pass, other objects can have our attention. Michael and the therapist can be present, given attention. The fragmenting in upon themselves of stared down objects, a fullness that excludes, gives way to space. The smile is experienced as expansion, just as the mouth and lips draw apart. A corresponding quality as "seen" experience is a making place for the exotic, the other is brought forth.

    

**Michael**

Michael is staring at the wall and appears as though he is participating in a private ritual. His eyes are similar to those portrayed in Sartre's work, *Nausea*:

    His look was extraordinary; although abstracted yet shining with high endeavour. His dazzling eyes devoured his whole face. Behind this glow I notice thin, light lips of a mystic.²

Michael lives in a special world. He is set apart from others while he speaks: "I'm confused. How do I know what is real: What I think or what other people say is real?" Michael continually repeats, "When I just enter a room I hurt people." In Michael's world things seem specifically embellished. As he stares at what one would think to be small details, these details fall away from being entwined in the ordinary world. There is a quality of the holy
about Michael. The holy is described by John E. Smith:

A distinction to be found in some form in every culture known to us is the distinction between those persons, objects, events, and places that are said to be "Holy" and those that are called "profane." The most distinctive and yet most abstract characteristic of the Holy is that it is set apart from what is ordinary in human life, because of the sense that the Holy is powerful, awe-inspiring, dangerous, important, precious, and to be approached only with fitting seriousness and gravity. The Holy stands over against the profane, which is, by contrast, open, manifest, obvious, ordinary, and devoid of any special power to evoke awe and reverence. The profane belongs to the ordinary or customary course of events and harbors no mysterious depth within itself. Whereas the Holy can be approached only with due preparation, profane existence is readily available and is taken for granted without evoking much thought or concern.5

Michael expresses a belief that he wounds others. Yet, his cowering stance is as if he has been wounded. The mere thereness of things wounds him so deeply he appears disconnected. Things in no way seem to be related to his own existence. Rather, things seem to oppose his own human reality.

His stare might be seen as a desperate ritual to form a link, to create a relatedness across this abyss. A sense of terror experienced by someone that is the object of this stare may, in part, be felt as transgression. In looking into Michael's staring eyes they seem to exhibit no pattern, no definable reason for being themselves; just what they are, rather than something else.
False Atonomy

Michael's actions can be seen as a severance from the other in a monologue. The other person is excluded in his mourning; he enacts two parts: that of the mourner and that of the loss or death. In Michael's stare a face is not offered. There seems no fruitful opposition to reveal that which creates distance, the exotic, the other. Things seem to dissolve. There is a contagiousness, permeability about objects. There seems an extreme blurring of boundaries. He has not developed being the "other" to someone.

The Word

Often, in working with patients, one hears very irrational sounding statements. In order to translate, interpret, or make sense of these hanging, bizarre statements, it is often fruitful to put them in the context of the patient's language. This language is born out of the context and vision of the patient's world and is often unique and specific to him. There is a quest to find a universality in the words; to decipher the actions of madness. Desperate patterns emerge, i.e., "People know what I'm thinking; people are pursuing me; there is resolution in death."

When Michael says, "I hurt people," one mode of exploring this is to establish in what context this makes a kind of sense. This context is the construction of Michael's world and the search for what "hurt" specifically
refers to what constitutes giving pain to others. Who are the people and who is Michael specifically referring to, such that this activity arrives for Michael as an actual occurrence. The search for his view is an attempt to reinsert Michael in the world. The world of universal communication, one in which there is a general common denominator of sense in relation to the subject matter. With Michael's words he has departed from using a language which clarifies to others what his vision of things are. In abandoning the shared terms, he severs himself from a shared communion.

Locked Unity and Separation

His last connection and disconnection is found in his vision, his funneled world view. In staring he is glued and severed—in one moment. He is glued in not experiencing closure with his objects. He is severed for the sharing through language is abandoned. His vision enacts an exaggerated unrythmic creation of unity and separation. He is one with his object and separated from a responsive world. He seems not to be simply experiencing momentarily being the object of his attention; as one might say when you're hungry you are your stomach. But his is locked into one thing. When he regards an object, say a tree, he seems frozen upon it. Perceptually, he seems unable to weave and be interwoven. In this way the object and Michael do not enter well into the fabric of the world. Closure and
resolution do not come into being. Initiation and the future cannot arrive.

The vivification of a world view, a view of the room one lives in or a view of an exchange between people may reach a summit in literature. Therein, is a capturing, a vision, which can be shared and appreciated by many while remaining unique to one. In the elegance of this mode, in the vivid capturing of a vision which others can share, personal isolation can be broken.

Other Channels

Standing near the brink of the literary mode, the desire for expression surges. Yet for Michael it turns throwing him into the retreat of individual symbolism. It is difficult to find words that express Michael's experience: a form, language that can communicate to many as is found in the literary mode. Yet in established literary work one can find expressions that do exemplify Michael's world.

In speaking to Michael it is as if he is connecting from another channel; his eyes seem to stare by the act of another entity. His vision does not seem to rush toward things. It does not express reason for attending to one thing more than another. Though more stationary, Michael's vision has a quality of originating from something other than himself. His eyes are like that of the matron in Djuna Barne's Nightwood:
The long rococo halls, giddy with plush and whorled designs in gold, were peopled with Roman fragments, white and disassociated; a runners leg, the chilly half turned face of a matron stricken at the bosom, the blind bold sockets of the eyes given a pupil by every shifting shadow so that what they looked upon was an act of the sun.  

One thinks that his words, if they were presented in a coherent form, would be description of things erupting toward him, through him, and him through them. In "hurting" people he seems to experience penetrating them. When people seem to know all that he thinks, he seems penetrated. The solidity of a self differentiating between objects seems to dissolve for Michael. The surface which holds his distance from another seems to burst. Objects and moments flow out of an arhythmic time and space. In a situation where all becomes unleashed toward someone, the response of withdrawal achieves meaning—withdrawal being preferable to the dissolving self in mergence with all objects.

Michael speaks of a power to hurt people by his mere presence, his entering into a room. A painfulness may be experienced in being regarded by Michael. In looking upon his staring eyes a world seems to contract. The offering of the world dims and a reordering of things fragments.

While his actual regard finds one object and attempts to hold on to it, his subject matter ("hurting" people) has a funneled singularity. He sees with his
existence. His act of perception can be seen as similar to his life motif.
FOOTNOTES


CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

There is an immediate contradiction inherent in the attempt to "conclude" a descriptive study. Such is the nature of description that it evokes stimulation for still further enlargement. It calls for a further unfolding of the subject. There is no concrete ending, or conclusion, only an invitation to engage one's interest more deeply.

The stare and the smile as fundamental modes of seeing and being seen calls forth a phenomenological rethematization. This emphasis makes possible a radical reordering of what-is-smile and what-is-stare in psychological case studies, psychotherapeutic practices, and the human sciences.

The two modes of seeing and being seen, the stare and the smile, may be explored for wider perspectives and new meaning in the world of human exchange. In the preceding is a science of smiling which attends to the play of surfaces and appearances exchanged in dialogue. The science of staring attempts to keep the variables that constellate a specific focus at a minimum. The former allows; it has a protean ability to change, mingle, and create ground between self and other. The latter holds the world
at bay and prodigiously seeks fathomless pits to be placed between its subject and object.

In psychotherapy one never departs from the power of the "look." What a world view expresses may be fundamental to the encounter of psychotherapist and patient. New ways of imagining the "look" have been presented here in order to have a firmer grasp on the yet ungraspable, to seek a radical differentiation in the hither to "simple" looking of one person by another.

In the quest to describe and reenvision the significance of smiling and staring, a way of clarifying and reexamining one's position in-relation-to-other is sought. That is, if one may attend to the "look" of the other in a new manner, one's own natural attitude is exposed and open to reexamination. To look is also to be seen, and to be visible is to be viewing. There exists, then, a rich dialectical exchange in the world of seeing.
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