

Saying 'no' in presence

Setting limits through body sense

Friedgard E. Blob

Abstract: Any 'no' of a client can express a primary organismic No¹ that has an implicit life enhancing target. The client tries to communicate that he or she is missing something that allows his or her body to make it's living along with others. Expressing 'no' can create irritation, confusion or anger in everyday life and in a clinical setting. It may feel necessary to try and overcome a 'no'. The chapter shows that two phases of 'clearing a space' allow the life yearning power of a 'no' to come into effect: The phase of 'taking up space' as a woman or a man in a very concrete and embodied way, and the phase of creating space usually known as 'clearing a space'. Both phases enable the client to own his or her self-in-presence aligned to personal boundaries and to meet his or her self-esteem fully. A F² exercise on how to introduce the first phase in counselling and psychotherapy is presented.

Key words: primal No, organismic self-protecting shelter, stoppage, interactive responsiveness, dimensions of therapeutic presence, two-step process of coming into self-in-presence, aligning to one's space and demarcation, existential self-expression, intermodal Focusing with the arts

Saying 'yes' or 'no' is radically condensed communication. A Yes or No is rarely shown in its pure form. Often a Yes is mixed up with a No to a certain percentage ('yes of course, but ...'). Likewise the No can include a subtle Yes that dilutes the No ('no, not really ...').

Why is it difficult to say 'yes' or 'no' with a clear voice?

A Yes, and above all a No, is directly targeting the level of relationship. An unconditional Yes can evoke a feeling of being understood and deeply touched in a very elementary way. It may open a person to changes that have been beyond their imagination. Within the therapeutic context any relationship benefits from unconditional Yes. That is why therapeutic literature deals a lot with the implementation of affirmative, unreservedly appreciative acceptance.

After a No has been said, the relationship is also changed. To receive a No usually makes someone feel rejected. For the actors involved, the No is associated with emotional demarcation. Distance creating separation is not as easy to experience as affinity established by a Yes.

Even a No set with greatest benevolence has something negative about it. Setting limits is a necessary intervention in therapy and psychosocial care. The No might become a precondition to initiate development opportunities. Delimitation is one of the important behaviours for professionals to prevent occupational exhaustion.

1

The upper and lower case of the word 'no' results from the context. The lower case refers to literal speech, the upper case refers to the word 'no' as a term.

2

The capital 'F' stands for 'Focusing'.

It is easier to make a demarcation with regard to those to be cared for than with regard to colleagues. Among colleagues there is no professional role protecting against feelings of injury. Also, the necessity of a No cannot be legitimized by a catalogue of therapeutic measures.

The fear of rejection and social exclusion is deeply rooted in people. It is interwoven with the complex feelings of early insults and experiences of humiliation (Wardetzki, 2004). In my opinion, this does not explain why saying 'no' is so difficult. It also does not explain the helplessness to answer a No appropriately without feelings of insult. In order to get to know and appreciate the life-affirming meaning of a No, it is essential to include the reality of the body which fundamentally generates and structures our human experience (Meyer-Drawe, 1984).

The primal No: Embodied movement in resonance with the world

The Swiss body psychotherapist Peter Schellenbaum describes a No that is not rooted in the rejection of unpleasant experiences as Sloterdijk sketches it. The No is not directed against the world (Sloterdijk, 1993) but rather it is an expression of resonance with a world expected or needed that did not happen (Schellenbaum, 1996, p. 214). The world as it appears or affects the person concerned is inappropriate to his or her bodily needs for life and development.

Expressing 'no' as primal No marks the lack of resonance between culture and one's own being. The No is pre-linguistic and forms itself at the borderline between non-being and be-ing. The original matrix of transition is happening (Schellenbaum, 1996, p. 214). The English word for being indicates a process that is taking place. To come from non-being into be-ing is processual being-in-development.

The humanistic person-centered terminology has its own way to express this. According to Rogers (Rogers, 2016) the actualising tendency of a person can unfold harmoniously within the framework of existing relationships or it can not.

The early co-researcher of Carl Rogers, Prof. Eugene Gendlin, philosopher and psychotherapist, has further explored Rogers' variable of organismic actualising tendency. In his theory and practice of the implicit, Gendlin describes how everybody owns a continuously ongoing life forward direction. It is constantly updated by environmental interactions. If relationships are such that the organismic self-actualising tendency of a person cannot unfold, the responsive order of the body is frozen in to structure-bound experiences and stereotypical behaviour patterns (Stumm et al, 2003, p. 295).

Body is interaction

The primal No in its pre-linguistic organisation is physical. It manifests itself in a relational experience which is as a 'frozen whole' (Gendlin, 1964, pp. 128-129). Yet the body does not stop its living as an organism. The body keeps on searching for something that helps to expand and carry further its aliveness.

How does the body do this?

According to Gendlin, the body is interaction (Gendlin, 2003, p. 103; Gendlin, 1992a, pp. 344, 349, 351). It is unseparated interaction with the environment (Gendlin & Wiltschko, 2004, p. 31; Gendlin, 2003, p. 103). It is not merely, as the philosopher and phenomenologist Merleau-Ponty describes it (Merleau-Ponty, 1966, pp. 272-273), a living thing of sensory perception. Gendlin

argues that perception is not the starting point to understand the body (Gendlin, 2003, p.101). If the living body was reduced to perception, this would not explain how the body lives its interactions with the world and organizes itself in its way of living further.

Perception per se always involves a subject-object division, a separation between the perceiver and the perceived. This subject-object division does not exist for the living body. Not only does the body perceive the quality of the air inhaling (cold, dry, etc.), it also takes real air into its lungs (Gendlin, 2003, p. 104) and pushes it out again in one moment of exchange. This one movement of breathing in and out is changing something for the body's situation (and also the air is changed, e.g. it is warmed up by the body temperature when exhaling). The body continues its life in a changed way that is different from the previous breathing movement before.

According to Gendlin the living body is always responsively related to something. The quality of this responsiveness comes to human consciousness through experiencing. The act of experiencing is tied up to perception.

How does that happen?

Physical experience is organised holistically. It is already a symbolisation of the direct orientation of the body towards everything that constitutes a situation as a whole. It is revealed to a person through inner body awareness. The precise reference of the body to a situation is marked by physical sensations as the point of reference. The point of reference is like an ambassador who communicates multiple situational meanings. It is also called felt meaning or felt sense. The English term 'felt sense' is commonly used in German (Stumm et al 2003, p. 115.). Initially the felt sense manifests in a vague and blurred fashion and at the same time is clearly localised as a bodily sensation.

Gendlin refers to the body as the body felt from the inside, though he includes the concrete visible body and its natural conditions into his theory. 'So it is important to notice that when we talk about Focusing³ we use the word "body" in a certain way: We use it to talk about how we feel *our bodies from inside*.' (Gendlin, 1993, p. 22).

The ability of the body to feel from within includes:

- to be able to experience oneself as a person in one's own spatial localisation (where am I here?)
- to be able to perceive oneself with one's own state while feeling in this localisation from within (how do I feel physically with where I am?)
- to be able to perceive the surrounding environment and its responding or non-responding quality which is bound to the corresponding localisation (how does my body feel with all that is here and what it is like here?).

In the body-environment-interaction the world reference is therefore always established situationally and spatially.

Responsiveness as a reference towards the world

The term responsiveness is derived from the Latin word *respondere*. It describes the fact of interaction and has a broad meaning: To answer to something, to relate to one another in alternation, to react to one another in vibration, to merge with one another, to reciprocate, to encounter. The

English meaning of the word ‘to respond’ also means ‘to correspond⁴’: It is about togetherness and the world around us.

In one of his early publications, Gendlin describes the characteristic way in which people relate to each other (respond). From his point of view this process is highly complex and never happens only through feeling or thinking. ‘Thus, the “feeling” we respond to in another person is not usually a sharply-defined emotion, not usually separate from the situation, and not without some implicit intellectual cognition.’ (Gendlin, 2006, p. 209).

The term ‘resonance’ as Peter Schellenbaum defines it, describes a somewhat different reference to the world. Being in resonance with something can include being free of interpersonal reference. The meaning of resonating is: sound, reverberate or finding reverberation. For example, one can resonate with an atmospheric mood, art can find reverberation in one's own experience and a tone can reverberate in one's own inner being. Resonating seems to capture processes that involve an organismic experience that is located before interpersonal relationships.

Resonating becomes responding when the significant other who embodies the world, also comes into vibration in such a way that he or she answers in a harmonious way like in an alternating song. Different binding processes are then possible in mutual transient oscillation (Stiefel 2017, pp. 264-266).

In therapeutic and nursing settings the different qualities of bonding processes have to be considered. They are of crucial importance for client-therapist interactions and the relationship between a caregiver and the person cared for.

If the response by the significant other is missing, resonance remains an experience within the domain of one's own self-contained world. It remains an experiential impression instead of becoming an outward and world related expression. The movement of reaching out to the world is bending back. The interactive spheres do not come into interpersonal meaning. When this happens, a No is generated as a Yes to one's own world only, lacking any admixture with others. The person believes he or she can only live without the other; without personal interrelation. The interplay between you and me, which always has to be constellated anew according to the situation, cannot take place. The predominant feeling of being in the world is of not really being able to arrive. The experience of one's own remains unreal and diffuse.

According to Gendlin the body's basic capacity for interactive responsiveness implies that the complexity of any situation is more likely to be grasped by internal physical feelings than by the perceptual system of the five senses (Gendlin in Frie, 2003, p. 104).

What does this mean for the primal No being actualised?

It is not the person who sets the primal No as a man or a woman of his or her culture. Also it is not the cultural pattern of perception that does influence the occurrence of a primal No. Rather it is the interactive body itself that creates or does not create a primal No to reality. The primal No becomes actualized when the body-environment-interaction taking place is non-responsive, e.g. not conducive to life for the person as a whole.

From primal No to relational Yes

The embodied primal No, announcing itself organismically e.g. in a stagnation of the breath, a stiffening of the body or an inner physical feeling of pressure or narrowness in the breathing space,

4

The definition of responsiveness has been set up by Bundschuh-Müller (2004) in personal agreement with Gendlin.

upper abdomen, lower abdomen or in the throat space, always feels like a 'stoppage' (Gendlin, 2015, pp. 67, 76). Following Gendlin the term 'stoppage' indicates that the body, despite blockages, lives on its living life process as an organism.

Any experience of a stoppage, however, is of the kind that it narrows or distorts reality. The multiplicity of meaning contained within a situation possible remains closed up. The flow of experiencing, a synonym for the organisation of the self, is limited to the levels of feeling, thinking and acting. Experiencing is moving within patterns of survival only. A self-propelled process of carrying further does not take place.

In the field of relationships this can be felt, for example, as a sudden insecurity or a massive collapse of self-esteem. The need to withdraw from the field of relationships becomes imperative. What looks like an evasive or exit manoeuvre is less a refusal or exclusion of the significant other than the constellation of a self-protection shell.

The organismic shelter is intended to enable the person to maintain his or her own world of experiencing as it has existed before the non-responsive situation. At the same time, those affected have the strong desire to find access to a world of suitable responsiveness.

The constellation of an organismic shelter to secure one's own self-experience cannot be communicated in everyday language. The organismic No causes massive confusion and annoyance to significant others. It cannot be changed, not even with good persuasion. The self-protecting function of the existential primal No remains unrecognised.

The primal No can provoke reactions that lead to extreme interpersonal polarisations and conflicts. Those affected can feel: 'What is happening here is true only as it is valid for me. As you want it to be, it's not true for me at all'. Why are emotional-cognitive and physical-sensory schemata (Greenberg et al, 2003, p. 89) on both sides intensified in such a self-sealed way? If there is no responsiveness, there is no experiential reality to be shared. The different realities of both protagonists stay disconnected and reinforce themselves.

However, there are opportunities for those who say 'no' and those who receive a No to get out of this halted interaction process. They can leave behind their mutually conditioned negative polarization as their dead-end communication becomes conscious at least to one of them. In clinical settings it usually is the therapist.

On the one hand, this can be done via refilling processing. The body is capable of imaginatively feeling reality as if it is happening right now. The bodily felt sense does not distinguish between what should have been and what is still happening (Gendlin, 2015, pp. 245-246). The organism can revive what would have felt good or nourishing under different conditions. This is possible to the extent a person (the client) is stepping into the F process. Doing so, internal blockages may soften. A Yes to the liveliness that occurs freshly has an energetic effect. It is a power boost. The organism has reorganised its own ongoing life force (Stumm et al, 2003, p. 128). The spectrum of what can become conscious is expanded. A change of perspective becomes possible including a different point of view.

A second possibility is to explore the primal No by installing a situation of safe holding. Holding is part of an experiential setting that enables the client to gain concrete experiences in exploring limits and boundaries (Maas, 2004, p. 20). The therapist is spatially present with his/her sentient body, he/she is wholebodily present. Embedded in this personified container the client can fully explore and understand the organismic quality of the primal No.

Those affected can notice: I gain existential security through the primal No. This security is like standing on my own land. The territory belongs exclusively to me. I regain authorship and possession of my own truth. I can draw a line around this ground. I can do it imaginatively for myself or by showing gestures. Standing on this border line I can face reality to the fullest. I can

choose what really should belong to me and what reality is not mine. I can choose what is allowed to be within my space for to expand who I am and what not.

Exploring the primal No this way makes fears melt. It becomes possible to experience one's own fundamental rights. The client may realize what belongs to his/her basic life equipment and must not get lost by environmental expectations, demands or norms of significant others. His/her relational existence can be redefined, mostly in a promising way.

Any freshly found way of interrelating that belongs to me and to you as well, has a direct physical effect. It shows up as spontaneously deepened breathing, a 'felt shift' (Gendlin, 1973, p. 325). The client feels: 'Now it suits me to be here with you, with the situation, with what I feel is true and with what I am trying to communicate'. A bodily relief can happen. The body is no longer searching for some kind of interconnection that feels right on the organismic level. The person has come to existential self-expression on all levels of his/her being in the world. He or she is able to be real with his or her state of being. He or she literally has arrived in his/her own existence.

Positive demarcation: Expressing primal No effectively

While exploring one's space and limits within a therapeutic setting of personified containment, a client can reduce his/her level of social anxiety. He or she is enabled to say 'no' in attentive presence. As the F process includes action steps to take, the sensory experience of presence can evolve into an attitude.

The person-centred approach describes presence as a profound form of unconditional positive regard. With reference to Buggenthal (1978, 1983, 1987, 1989, quoted from Geller & Greenberg, 2002) Bundschuh-Müller introduces four dimensions of presence (Bundschuh-Müller, 2004, p. 420):

- Availability and accessibility
- Openness to all aspects of experiencing the other person
- Openness to one's own experiences and experiential abilities
- Ability to respond, to resonate, to react appropriately

This means for professional practitioners and therapists 'to be able to be with oneself and with others at the same time and not get confused or lose oneself.' (Bundschuh-Müller, 2004, p. 424, translated from the German by Elisabeth Zinschitz).

How to differentiate oneself from others and from oneself at the same time? There is the need of a good distance to one's own experiencing and to the experiencing of the other. Not to be too close to oneself or the other (identification), and also not to be too far away from one's own experience or the experience of the other. The inner-psychoic representation of a border that belongs to one's own space makes this possible.

Ann Weiser Cornell, one of the most important practitioners to have further developed Gendlin's approach, describes this state in demand as 'self-in-presence' (Weiser Cornell, 2013, p. xxxiii). In practice, the state of self-in-presence can be created in a two-step process (Maas, 2002, pp. 5-6). In addition to the benevolently accepting basic attitude towards oneself, it is about

- letting oneself 'take space' in one's own physically grounded presence, and

- letting oneself 'create space' in a formative presence.

The formative character of this second kind of presence is setting free from actually foreign but already internalized representations.

'Taking up space' is becoming aware of one's own existence. It affirms a state of being and is the prerequisite for being able to perceive the right to one's own primal being at all. 'Creating space' is an orderly way of dealing with one's own existence and an active, directed action (Maas, 2004, p. 7; Maas, 2002, p. 6). Methodologically, both are referred to as 'creating free space'.

A two-phase model for the generating self-in-presence is described here. In practice and experience, both phases are not necessarily perceived as separate. As the body has been able to establish itself in 'space', the physical reality is changed and 'creating space' is the next natural step for the organism.

There are many practical exercises for 'creating free space' that Prof. Eugene Gendlin and practitioners of Gendlin's approach have developed in the Gendlin-founded method of F (Gendlin, 2012, pp. 93-125). In my opinion, the exercises designed by René Maas, a Dutch psychotherapist, are particularly convincing. René Maas who's work has become known to German person-centred psychotherapist in the 80s, created a style of F that is highly intermodal. For him generating a No in presence takes place through spatial whole-body sensing that allows those affected to experience directly and beyond doubt that their living space and outer demarcations belong to them.

Exercising: Finding out about one's own way of saying 'no' in presence

Coming to presence and finding out about one's own demarcation line is a fundamental part of the Focusing Oriented Therapy of René Maas (Maas 2002; Maas 2004). In his own words, it is the step before Gendlin's first step.

To illustrate the two-step-process of René Maas his F style is presented as a group exercise. The exercise is designed for non-focusers and experienced focusers as well. The interventions are recording the first phase, the moment of 'taking up space'. The exercise is also offering artistic expression to deepen the experience of the participants, following the mindfulness-based approach of Focusing Oriented Expressive Arts FOAT® by Laury Rappaport (Rappaport, 2009).

Exercise: Creating space and demarcation line with art

Find a comfortable way to sit. Take a few breaths into your body. Notice the breath as it comes in and moves out of your body. If you want to stand instead of sitting, feel free to do so. Let yourself notice your breathing. Check the location where you put your seat or chose to stand. Ask yourself: 'Is there enough space around?'. Your space around has a front side, left and right, and a back side.

I invite you to stretch both arms and use them for localization. Allow yourself to feel: 'Is there enough distance between my arms and the wall behind me? ... Is there enough space between my arms and objects or persons next to me?'. Make space for yourself. You may move your chair or move the objects that interfere. Now ask yourself, 'all in all, do I feel comfortable where I am located now?'. You may still change something in the space around you.

You may also try to stretch your arms up to the sky. Get a sense of the space up there. The space up there belongs to you as well. Ask yourself, 'The space above me, is it limited to the end of my arms or is it going further?'. Maybe it goes further beyond the ceiling. Just feel as it is for you.

Now go back to your breath again. Become aware of your breath as it comes in and moves out of your body creating some inner space. You do not have to do anything with your breathing. Just notice it without judgment.

Ask yourself, 'as my breath sinks down while breathing out, do I feel this downward movement inside?'. To get a sense of downward orientation you might put your feet in the ground. To find your feet you can bend your toes just to feel. Take your feet into focus and feel the ground below. As your breath is sinking downwards while breathing out, your body might get a sense of gravity. Maybe something inside your body is sinking down or softening a bit.

Now ask yourself, 'how do I feel right now in my physical presence as a woman or a man sitting or standing here?'. Check inside and just wait Say 'hello' to whatever you may find without judgment.

We are now going to explore the space around you. You can get a sense of space and distance using both your arms. But this space is limited. Your listening capacity can reach out much wider than your arms can do.

Imagine you have a directional microphone that is supporting your listening capacity. This microphone can capture sounds from great distances. Maybe you want to prick up your ears: What kind of sounds can you hear with eyes closed? ... I invite you to touch your clothes and listen to the sound of this touch. ... Now focus on the sound of my voice ..., any sound outside this room ..., the sounds from the street. Just reach out with your ears as far as possible. What can you hear from far away distance now?

You can use your arms for orientation. Maybe you want to show with your arms from where you can hear something, from what direction. ... Reaching out with your ears and arms you get a sense of your wider environment. You get a sense of your acoustic territory. Allow yourself to feel this acoustic space. All this space belongs to you.

I invite you to touch yourself again and listen to the sound of your fingers on your clothes. You also might touch the skin of your face and stroke your cheeks. What kind of sound do you hear from that close distance?

Now imagine the acoustic space around you is wide open. This space is reaching from far away to very close. Within this space you are free to make a demarcation line that keeps off any sound you do not like to hear or come too close to you. Maybe this is the voice of someone who is devaluing and criticizing you. Maybe it is some other sound. Receive whatever sound is showing up in your imagination. How far do you want this sound to stay away? How close do you allow this sound to come?

Imagine the demarcation line is symbolising your No to this sound. Your No is keeping this sound out. What distance of demarcation feels right for you? Please check while setting up your demarcation line. Ask yourself: 'Do I feel safe and comfortable within my acoustic territory with the demarcation I am setting up right now?'. You can always change the distance of the demarcation so that you sure feel safe and comfortable.

Now imagine you want to show your demarcation to a person who is deaf and cannot hear. Please show this person clearly where you decided to make the demarcation line in your imagination. You may use both your arms to illustrate this. Imagine you truly want the deaf person to get it right.

Maybe you want to draw your demarcation line on the floor or use objects to mark it. To make your demarcation visible helps the deaf person to see the space you decided is yours.

Now that the demarcation line is visible to you, check again: 'Does this feel right to me?'. You may close your eyes, and feel the distance from the body sense. Ask yourself, 'How does it feel in my body to have the demarcation line set up this way? Does it feel right and all fine?'.

Maybe you want to make some changes on the symbolisation on the floor. Check against your body to see if you feel comfortable with the symbolisation as it is. When you have a sense of 'okay', just appreciate and stay with it.

Allow yourself to let the sense of 'okay' sink into your body. You may stay with it in silence or you may invite an image to come Check the image against your body to see if it matches the felt sense. If the image does not feel right, let it go, and invite another image to come from your body sense. If you get a gesture, a movement, a sound or a phrase instead, that's fine. Just receive whatever you get from the inside.

When you have the image or any other symbolisation of your felt sense, take your time to come back into the room. Maybe you want to write what you received in your journal or express it in gesture, movement or sound. If you received an image, approach the different art materials and choose what feels right to express your body sense.

(Art materials: Sticks, different chinks, water colours and finger colours, coloured paper, different sized boxes, coloured strings, wire, different kinds of textiles).

After you have finished your art work, see if it feels right to address the artwork as such. You may ask: 'What do you have to say to me? ... Where do you come from? ... What do you want me to know that I do not yet know? ... What is the more of that you are carrying into my life?'. Any answer you get is welcome. Just wait and receive.

Effects of aligning space and demarcation

Experiencing one's own existential right of space and demarcation can be described in these ways (Maas, 2002, p. 6):

- In terms of being physically present: I feel the tension and the relaxation. I'm aware of my disposition. I want to put down roots. I'm landing. I'll make contact with the earth.
- With regard to internal and external perceptions: I am aware that I exist. I am present. I feel and understand my own boundaries. I meet feelings. I take myself seriously. I meet my self-esteem.
- In terms of linguistic self-expression: I'm shielding myself. I align my inner compass. I connect to my anchor. I make myself the owner of my own experiences. I am aware of my charisma.
- In terms of relationships with others: I come to the here and now. I feel safe. I take a seat. I am taking distance from my problems. I am stepping back a little. I make contact with my surroundings. I become aware of myself both physically and mentally. I distinguish myself from others. I am demarcating my territory.

The exercise will require considerable effort for persons whose family background prevented the naturalness of the primal No. They have to try out, discard and try again many times to fully embody the primal No in presence. For these persons it is often overwhelming to experience that there is an inner knowledge about demarcated existence. Clients I worked with testified: 'I never knew I have boundaries up to now'. 'I get a sense of "me" for the first time in my life'. 'My space with demarcation feels like a huge egg, and I am sitting in the middle of it, feeling totally safe. This is a brand new experience for me'.

Through concrete exercises on exploring space and setting boundaries those clients learn that they can trust their implicit body knowledge. Confidence arises in relying on this body knowledge and everyday relationships can change.

'Taking space' and 'creating space' can be practiced alone. However, it is better to practice in companionship. The job of the facilitator is to hold space in presence, something the practitioner may experience for the first time in his or her life. Exercising with a facilitator in presence, the practitioner will learn to leave behind his or her need of exaggerated or rigid demarcation and the fear of interpersonal blending. He or she will come to live relationships more harmoniously for he or she has come into contact with his/her right to form a self of his or her own. As illustrated by Peter Schellenbaum (Schellenbaum, 1996) anxiety gives way to self-expression, spontaneous desire unfolds to natural radiance and entanglement with the inappropriate eliminates. The existential moment of self-reception can be expressed physically and linguistically. A liberating unambiguous Yes to the interpersonal is born.

Conclusion

To understand the self-protecting and yet life-affirming meaning of a 'no' of a client it is important to look at the primal No to reality. The primal No occurs when there is a lack of resonance between culture and one's own being. It is the interactive body itself that creates or does not create the primal No, depending on the body-environment-interaction being responsive or non-responsive.

There are two ways to facilitate environmental responsiveness as a therapist or counsellor: By offering a setting where bodily refilling processing can take place, and by inviting the client to explore his or her primal No within a safe holding. Exploring one's own space and limits can happen experientially when the client is in a state of self-in-presence.

The client might need a two-step-process to be able to install this state. The two steps include: 'taking up space' for to become aware of one's own existence and 'creating space' usually know as 'clearing a space'. Both steps can be experienced through spatial whole-body sensing and intermodal Focusing. Offering the possibility for artistic expression, the therapist can help the client to deepen his or her experience.

The client can step into this two-phase-process when the therapist is in a state of therapeutic presence that allows him or her to be with the client and with himself/herself at the same time without getting confused or lost in the process of experiential interaffecting. Availability, accessibility, appropriate responding to the client and openness to the unlimited space of experiencing are the necessary pre-conditions for this kind of therapeutic presence.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Fiona Parr/UK and Prof. Workineh Kelbessa/Ethiopia for their support in editing the chapter in English.

References

- Bundschuh-Müller, K. (2004). „Es ist wie es ist sagt die Liebe...“ – Achtsamkeit und Akzeptanz in der Personenzentrierten und Experientiellen Psychotherapie. In T. Heidenreich & J. Michalak (Hrsg.), *Achtsamkeit und Akzeptanz in der Psychotherapie*, pp. 405-456. 2. Auflage. Tübingen: DGVT-Verlag, from <https://www.gwg-ev.org/sites/default/files/Bundschuh%20Achtsamkeit%202005.pdf>.
- Geller, S. & L. Greenberg (2002). Therapeutic Presence: Therapists' experience of presence in the psychotherapy encounter. *Person-Centered & Experiential Psychotherapies*, 1 (1 & 2), 71–86.
- Gendlin, E. T. (2015). A Process Modell. Dt. C. Geiser & D. Schoeller (Hrsg.), *Ein Prozess-Modell*. Freiburg: Karl Alber.
- Gendlin, E. T. (2012). *Focusing: Selbsthilfe bei der Lösung persönlicher Probleme*. 11. Auflage. Reinbek: Rowohlt.
- Gendlin, E. T. (2006). *The Experiential Response*. Reprinted from Use of Interpretation in Treatment Copyright Grune & Stratton, Inc., 1968, from http://focusing.org/fot/gendlin_experiential68.pdf
- Gendlin, E. T., J. Wiltschko (2004). *Focusing in der Praxis. Eine schulenübergreifende Methode für Psychotherapie und Alltag*. 2. Auflage. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Gendlin, E. T. (2003). Beyond Postmodernism: From Concepts through Experience. In R. Frie (Ed.), *Understanding Experience: Psychotherapy and Postmodernism*, pp. 110-115. London: Routledge, from http://www.focusing.org/gendlin/docs/gol_2164.html
- Gendlin, E. T. (1993). Three Assertions about the Body. *The Folio 12* (1), 341-353. Dt. D. Müller, Über den Körper. Wie ist Focusing theoretisch möglich?, from http://www.focusing.org/three_assertions_de.html
- Gendlin, E. T. (1992a). The Primacy of the Body, not the Primacy of Perception: How the Body knows the Situation and Philosophy. In: *Man and World 25* (3-4), 341-353, from http://www.focusing.org/gendlin/docs/gol_2220.html
- Gendlin, E. T. (1973). Experiential Psychotherapy. In R. Corsini (Ed.), *Current Psychotherapies*, Itasca IL, pp. 317-352, from http://www.org/gendlin/docs/gol_2029.html
- Gendlin, E. T. (1964). A theory of personality change. In Worchel P., D. Byrne (Eds.), *Personality change*, pp.100-148. New York: Wiley, from http://focusing.org/gendlin/docs/gol_2145.html
- Greenberg, L., L. Rice, R. Elliott (2003). *Emotionale Veränderung fördern. Grundlagen einer prozess- und erlebensorientierten Therapie*. Paderborn: Junfermann.
- Maas, R. (2004). *Integration von Focusing in den eigenen Therapiestil*, from <http://www.renemaas.nl/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Maas-Rene-2004-Die-Integration-des-Focusing.pdf>
- Maas, R. (2002). Dem Zuhören lauschen. In: *Focusing Journal. Zeitschrift für Kultur der Achtsamkeit* 2002/9,DAF Akademie, from <https://www.renemaas.nl/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Maas-Rene-2002-Dem-Zuho%CC%88ren-lauschen.pdf>
- Meyer-Drawe, K. (2001). *Leiblichkeit und Sozialität. Phänomenologische Beiträge zu einer pädagogischen Theorie der Inter-Subjektivität*. 3. Auflage. München: Fink.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1966). *Phänomenologie der Wahrnehmung*. Berlin: De Grueter.
- Moore, J. (2001). Acceptance of the Truth of the Present Moment as a Trust-worthy Foundation for Unconditional Positive Regard. In J. Bozarth, E. Wilins (Eds). *Rogers' therapeutic conditions: Evolution, Theory and Practise*, Vol III. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS-Books.
- Rappaport, L. (2009): *Focusing-Oriented Art Therapy. Accessing the Body's Wisdom and Creative Intelligence*. London, Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley.
- Rogers, C. (2016). *Entwicklung der Persönlichkeit: Psychotherapie aus der Sicht eines Psychotherapeuten*. 20. Auflage. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Schellenbaum, P. (1996). *Die Spur des verborgenen Kindes. Heilung aus dem Ursprung*. Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe.

Sloterdijk, P. (1993). *Weltfremdheit*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Stiefel, S. (2017). Bindungsprozesse. In Berufsverband SGfK/Ausbildungsinstitut GfK (Hrsg.), *Gesprächspsychotherapie, Focusing, Körperpsychotherapie. Prozesse verstehen – Prozesse begleiten*, pp. 247-270. Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

Stumm, G., J. Wiltschko, W. Keil (2003). *Grundbegriffe der Personzentrierten und Focusing-orientierten Psychotherapie und Beratung*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.

Wardetzki, B. (2004). *Ohrfeige für die Seele: Wie wir mit Kränkung und Zurückweisung besser umgehen können*. München: dtv Verlagsgesellschaft.

Weiser Cornell, A. (2013). *Die Kunst des Annehmens. Leben und Arbeiten mit Focusing*. Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

This chapter is published in:

N. Kypriotakis, J. Moore (2021). Senses of Focusing, Vol. II, pp. 469-483, Athens: Eurasia Publications.

Republished with permission

First publication in German in: Färber, H.-P., K. Barthold, V. Bez., A. Blunck, J. Leibfritz, G. Mohler, W. Welte (Hrsg.) (2018): *Beziehungen professionell gestalten in Pädagogik, Therapie und Pflege. Schriftenreihe der Stiftung KBF*, pp. 123-135. Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

Second publication in German in: *Gesprächspsychotherapie und Personzentrierte Beratung 4/18*, 212-216, 49. Jahrgang, Dezember 2018. Organ der GwG – Gesellschaft für Personzentrierte Psychotherapie und Beratung e.V. (Hrsg).

Both German publications are without the F exercise manual and the conclusion.