

A Psychological Application of Zubiri's Notion of "Projection"

Theo A. Cope
South China Normal University
Guangzhou, China

Abstract

Xavier Zubiri provided a sketch of reality that offers much for us to pause and think about. One core concept he presents is that of projection. Reality is the projected actuality, ad-extra, of the divine. Humans must make their lives, with things, with others, and with ourselves and do so as a being relegated to reality. Each action we carry out is done so in a reality that we have been implanted in as a relatively absolute reality. Since we are relatively absolute, there is a tensive unity between us and the absolutely absolute reality, which Zubiri defines as God. Reality projects its inside to the outside; humans project their lives in many ways and enact projects in the making of life. As a form of reality, the human psycho-organic being projects life and appropriates ways of being in reality. These are the possibilities of our reality that empower us in the making of life. This article considers this dynamic structure of projection as it relates to things, to others, to ourselves; the ground of this projective structure is the projection of the divine.

Resumen

Xavier Zubiri proporcionó una concepción de la realidad que es fecunda para hacer una reflexión. Un concepto central que presenta es el de "proyección." Realidad es la actualidad proyectada, ad-extra, de lo divino. Los seres humanos tienen que hacer sus vidas con las cosas, con los demás, y consigo mismos, y hacerlo como seres relegados a la realidad. Cada acción que llevamos a cabo la hacemos en una realidad en que estamos implantados, en cuanto en una realidad relativamente absoluta. Puesto que somos relativamente absolutos, hay una unidad tensiva entre nosotros y la realidad absolutamente absoluta que Zubiri define como Dios. La realidad proyecta su interior al exterior; los seres humanos proyectan sus vidas de muchas maneras y dan corporeidad a los proyectos en la realización de vida. Como una forma de realidad, el ser sico-orgánico humano proyecta su vida y se apropia maneras de ser en realidad. Éstas son las posibilidades de nuestra realidad que nos confiere el poder para la construcción de nuestra vida. Este artículo considera esta estructura dinámica de proyección en lo que se refiere a las cosas, a los demás, a uno mismo. El fundamento de esta estructura proyectiva es la proyección de la divinidad.

Introduction

The merit of a philosophy is not only in how it enables one to pause and think differently about reality, but also how it offers possibilities for one to live differently in reality. One of Xavier Zubiri's life projects was to create a philosophy of intelligence, as well as an approach to being in reality that was founded upon a manifestation of the inner reality of things and of

humans. Another of Zubiri's way of projecting his being in the world was to sketch what he thought was a viable way that contributed to the creation of a philosophy of the human as a distinct form of reality. For one who has read Zubiri's works, there are many lines of interest to be read, groped at, grasped, understood, comprehended, and developed. One may undertake such lines of thought from

many different approaches, that is, different mentalities: philosophical, theological, poetical, metaphysical, and for my intent, psychological.

As a psychologically minded person, I read Zubiri with intent towards application. This application is not to be seen as a reductive stance, but an expansive one. I am interested in how Zubiri's thought provides a viable philosophical manner of thinking about human psychology in order to deepen comprehension of our reality. This approach to psychology, however, is premised upon the reality of the human intellectual psyche, that is, the human rational soul. I find it telling that historically, rationality was considered to be the fundamental capacity of the soul; it was done so constructed along the line of philosophy that took rationality to be the pinnacle of intellectual thought and the soul as "disembodied". Zubiri asserts that the Greeks did not leave us a philosophy of the human, but of things. However, he presented a view of the human psyche, qua embodied reality, a form of reality distinct from that of things, a reality which he conceived as a corporealization of the human reality. As such, he averred that there is great need for a philosophy of the human and set out to sketch one. His sketch comes from many systems of reference, and he in turn transmits a system of reference which gives us possibilities to see how the human psyche is not just rational, but intellectual; it is a sketch of a sentient intelligence.

Underlying every approach to psychology is a philosophy. Some philosophical views seem to be not applicable to daily life or psychology, but many of Zubiri's do. I want to appropriate, as a project, the psychological application of his philosophical sketch. His is one system of reference I use to comprehend human reality.

Another system of reference I will use is a psychological one that adheres to the reality of the human psyche. There are a few approaches to psychology and psychotherapy that explicitly accept psychic reality, and one that I will use here derives from Nossrat Peseshkian, the developer of

Positive Psychotherapy. It is not just an approach to therapy, but a form of self-help and educational ideas for child rearing; it is also known as "differentiation analysis" and focuses on a differentiation of human capacities, philosophically called "virtues". This approach to psychology will be used inasmuch as there are implicit and explicit terminological similarities between it and Zubiri's philosophy and I am working to better understand both approaches to better assist my clients.

Both views focus on human possibilities which must be acquired; both explicitly affirm that a system of reference is mandated for knowledge of how to be in the world, and for there to be knowledge of the world; both place divine reality at the center of human reality; both are explicitly approaches to life that are founded upon a revelation of the divine. While similar terminology does not always lend itself to similar application, and while Zubiri developed a philosophy and metaphysic, Peseshkian's contribution to psychology is, I submit, very harmonious with Zubiri's view. In fact, I assert that Zubiri's contribution provides a solid philosophical foundation for Peseshkian's psychology; on the other hand, Zubiri's thought can be used to illumine the soundness of this approach to psychology.

I will not limit myself to just Positive Psychotherapy, however, in that the psychological concept of projection is not developed by Peseshkian. Thus, I will draw on other psychological approaches to explicate this dynamic activity.

In order to develop this project, it will be necessary to draw out Zubiri's thoughts on projection as it pertains to life "with things", "with other humans", and "with myself" and we must include "with Divine Reality" which he accepted as the ground which religates us to reality. This religation becomes molded as religion,¹ but even without one formally adopting a particular religious orientation, one is religated to reality. Zubiri accepted Christianity and was seized by this religion which provided him "a concrete vision of God, of man, and of the world".² What I find most poignant

about Zubiri's contribution to philosophy qua religated to reality is that one who projects a life which accepts theism in its various forms, develops possibilities fundamentally different than one who is agnostic or atheistic. I think that Redondo, who translated a few of Zubiri's major theological works, expresses it well when he writes in the translator's preface to *Man and God*, "The difference comes from the intellectual justification each provides for taking God into account or not, which results in a greater or lesser radical intellection of what it is to be human."³

Life is imposed upon us and we are impelled to make a life. But the fact of the need to make ourselves demands that we need things to do so; without things and others one cannot be oneself. "This is to say that man, upon existing, does not merely find himself with things which 'are' and with which he has to create himself; but rather he finds himself with the 'necessity' to make himself and the necessity to be making himself always. Besides things, there 'is' also that which makes man to be."⁴ This which makes man to be is reality; we 'come from' reality. This relegation is something which concerns not only human reality, but the 'entire world.' In humanity, this relegation is actualized:

Human existence, then, is not only thrown among things, but also relegated through its roots. Religation—*rreligatum esse*, *religio*, religion, in its primary sense—is a dimension formally constitutive of existence. Therefore religation or religion is not something which one simply has or does not have. Man does not have religion, but rather, *velis nolis*, consists in religation or religion. Hence man can have, or equally not have, a religion, in the sense of positive religions. And, from the Christian point of view, it is evident that only man is capable of Revelation, because only he consists in religation; religation is the ontological presupposition of all revelation.⁵

It must be stated clearly that it is not only the Christian point of view which asserts

the need or capability of Revelation—this is an affirmation of Jewish, Islamic, Babí, and the Bahá'í Faiths as well—it is an affirmation of the Semitic tradition. This religion qua relegation is, Zubiri affirmed, a ground of human reality. It is life with 'divine reality' actualized or not in one's person. This theological ground has, in Zubiri's thought, the nature of a fountain. However, similar to the notion of revelatory finality in Islam, Zubiri believed that "With the death of the last apostle, we have mentioned that the action of God as fountain of revelation has finished."⁶ Obviously Islam would concede differently and the Babí and Bahá'í religions would concur—religion derived from revelation is eternal and progressive, though this is an article for another time.

The projects one undertakes in life are conditioned by one's conscious or unconscious acceptance of being religated to reality. Other forms of reality do not intentionally undertake projects, but merely project their in, *intus*, their interior, to the exterior, the *ex*; the human can intentionally appropriate and project modes of reality, modes of manifesting the reality of the self, which things do not. I am thinking here specifically of human virtues:

Virtue is not just a value at which I decide to aim, but is the physical character of being now in this value, or of having incorporated it into my physical reality. It is not an act of will which accepts some value as an object; but rather a physical character of this act of accepting itself, a valuable affecting in itself qua acceptance. Virtue is "moral physics."⁷

Again,

Virtue is certainly not something that humans have by nature, but it is something more than just a value; it is a real and physical appropriation of certain possibilities for living. That is to say, it is a moment of my personal being, of my personality.⁸

As I compose the following sections, I do so separately, though in reality we do not

experience them as separated. When we apprehend others, they and we are with things; when we apprehend things we are often with others; in all situations of apprehension of reality, we are with ourselves as a reality apprehending reality. In all these aspects, we are relegated to reality, in reality. Thus, these constitutive moments of human life are not discreet categories, but unified in our experience of life.

In order to keep this article relatively short, I shall not greatly develop each subtopic, but provide what I hope to be sufficient to complete this project. There are many lines of thought that are interwoven into the philosophical tapestry Zubiri wove, and each thread of thought can be followed through its many intertwining patterns. Were I to follow all the threads that I see are part of Zubiri's notion of projection, this article would be too long. I shall not draw out Zubiri's analysis of *objectual* reality, important though it is for a full grasp of his view of projection as a structure of reality, since it does not explicitly have relevance for psychological reality. It does implicitly, in that one's psychological attitude affects the objectual reality apprehended.

One other important analysis which is vital to keep in mind, is Zubiri's analysis of the three 'moments' of apprehension, as these are integral aspects of projection as being considered here. When we apprehend something, there is an impression of reality. This apprehension *affects* the apprehendor; it affects one as something other than the apprehendor; this other affects the apprehendor with a *force of imposition* which may be great or small. Affection, otherness, and force of imposition are the three moments of sentient impression. Animals and humans share such impressions, what the human has is the *formality of reality*—some real thing which is other than ourselves is really affecting us with a certain real force, and we apprehend each moment.

Psychologically speaking, something may forcefully affect us one time and remain part of our psychophysiological

manner of being in the world; the same event may affect another with little force and not be remembered unless recalled intentionally. The human reality is a unique form of reality where *individual* must be maintained when considering the psychic and organic dimensions. Each unique psyche responds to life's events differently, making the organic response different as well. As no two persons fingerprints are identical, no two persons neurological structures are identical, nor are their psychological structures. This individuality, this uniqueness of each person is what Zubiri refers to as "each one" (*Sp. cada cual*):

Every human being is its own and its being is to be *I*. But this *I* is determined as a proper mode with respect to the *I*'s of other persons. And this mode has a very precise character: it is that dimension according to which the "*I*" is an "*I*" with respect to a "*you*", to a "*him or them*", etc. The *I* as worldly actuality of my substantive reality has this dimension with respect to other persons, which we call "each-being-thus": the *I* has the dimensional character of being "*I*"; this is the "each-quality" of the "*I*". The its-ownness or self-possession of the *I* is beyond any "each-quality". While the *I* is the worldly actuality of my personal reality, the *I* is the actuality of the human person with respect to other persons. This is the *I* as co-determined with respect to a you and to a him. In this fashion "*I*" am absolute but diversely. This is the individual dimension of the human person.⁹

Life "with divine reality"

In Zubiri's thought, as mentioned, the ground of the world is 'divine reality'. We are relegated to this dimension of reality and have the possibility to intellectually actualize this relegation. In order to do so, however, we find ourselves lead to an enigma: reality is what gives of itself, and makes humans to be relatively absolute

realities. Reality has a power over us, it dominates us. As such, the domination of reality imposes itself upon us as an enigma. Human reality is a form of reality that must make its own life and that must "adopt a determinate form of reality. And this is where the enigma lies."¹⁰ The real things we are with provide us with possibilities of making our life, but none are "the" reality. Each thing is real but each real thing is 'more'; this 'more' is "the" reality which things carry. Humans do not have specific responses to the events of life, but must choose or create them. Through our choices, we project our reality in reality:

Reality itself is in "this" reality, but is so enigmatically. And this enigma is manifest to us in the very experience of religation. Reality itself is not "this" real thing, but neither is it something outside of it. Reality is a "more" but not a "more" on top of the thing, but a "more" *in the thing itself*. That is the reason why, when I am with "this" reality, I am in reality itself. For the same reason, "this" real thing can compel me to adopt a form in reality itself. This is not a question of concepts, but a physical character of the power of the real.¹¹

The forms we adopt with real things are done so freely, and are done so in reality. We find ourselves "implanted in existence...implanted in being" and we are beings that must realize ourselves. Since reality is enigmatic, the making of one's life is enigmatic. The human reality is a relatively absolute reality (God is the absolutely absolute reality in Zubiri's theological thought) and confronts real things through apprehending them. With these things we wonder: "What is going to become of me?...What am I going to make of myself?"¹² The actions we choose are our response to these fundamental questions. The unity of these questions constitutes the restlessness of human life. To be human is to be restless, to be searching for the absolute dimension of our being makes us restless—a "dynamic repose", an

inner disquietude, Zubiri says. This "restlessness is the human and lived expression of the tensive unity between humans and God. Humans are restless, because their *I* formally consists in a tension, in a tensiveness with God. The tensive restlessness of the constitution of the *I* is the concrete form by which each human being finds itself in its being, which is the *I*, religated to the relatively absolute reality."¹³ In the making of our person, in our facing reality qua ground, we find the theological dimension of our reality. "The theological is what concerns the turning towards the problem of God."¹⁴ Since we are a personal reality, we face the problem of God as a personal reality—our personal reality facing the personal reality of God.

Since we are relegated to reality, the ground of which is God, it is God that is making us make our being, our *I*:

That is the properly dynamic aspect of this tension. God is not mere *natura me naturans*, but *realitas me reificans*. Because to make my *I* is to constitute my reality in the form of my being, i.e., to make my reality be *realitas in essendo*. This making that I be my *I*, that I be my relatively absolute being, is essential to the function of God in my life... Since any act, however minuscule and lacking in transcendence it may be by virtue of its content, contributes to the building of my *I* and my relative absolute being, it becomes clear that any act is formally a *taking of a position* with respect to God. Because of this, insofar as I am the constructor of my *I*, no act, however modest in content, lacks transcendence: everything has the transcendence of constituting me in God. The human being is *implanted* in divinity, metaphysically immersed in it, precisely because any action of his is the configuration of his absolute substantive being.¹⁵

Each act, each choice and problem we solve contribute to the projection of our reality in this world.

We have different ways to resolve the

problem of how to configure our being, but it must be resolved individually. One may take an atheistic stance and assume that there is no greater personal reality than his or her own. The atheist thinks that life rests upon itself, there is no ground and there is no problem of God. The theist, on the other hand, assumes there is a greater reality which is exactly the ground of all reality. In both cases, there is a surrender to reality: the atheist surrenders to his or her own reality while the theist surrenders to the reality of God as accepted. The atheist believes in their own reality, in the facticity of life, and in their own relatively absolute character. The theist accepts these as well but holds that there is something 'more' that makes us have to make our own relatively absolute reality, there is more than just the facticity of life. Another stance one may take is that of agnosticism. To be agnostic, Zubiri affirms, is to ignore the ground of reality because one has not intellectually found it; it is not the lack of God, but the lack of a specific knowledge of God. Ignorance is an intellectual process in which one knows that one is ignoring something. The agnostic suspends faith in any conclusion regarding the theological problem of God.

Finally, there is a stance of indifference to the grounding problem of God; it is not even given a thought. The individual is unconcerned with this problem, may not think it is a problem and therefore there is no need to search for a ground to life. The very idea of God may be otiose. "It is a kind of indifferent surrender to the grounding of life, a non-blind faith, but one which is indifferent and unconcerned."¹⁶ One who ignores in some measure knows that something is being ignored, and one who is unconcerned senses that which one is unconcerned about. This subliminal awareness is, Zubiri thinks, what directs one towards the problem of the ground of reality. The choice is made to be unconcerned with this problem.

If the problem is not ignored, but is resolved theistically, faith becomes the solution. Faith needs an intellectual justifica-

tion, however, to the problem of God, as much as does atheism. The solution given to this problem affects how we project our reality in reality.

Since my focus in this article is on projection, let me now address this succinctly.

The ground of the world, Zubiri states, is God. However, this concept of 'world' is vague and indeed Zubiri informs us that there is only one world; "the world is the respective unity of all realities insofar as they are realities"¹⁷ Another way of expressing this is that there is one creation—whatever exists has been created in reality. While only God produces reality, humanity co-creates, or as Zubiri expresses it, quasi-creates.¹⁸ We create the possibilities of our being before actualizing them in our actions in reality. We create projects in our lives, a subject I will attend to shortly. Since only God creates, "Creation must be conceived as the very life of God projected freely *ad extra*, consequently in a finite form. Therefore, this coefficient of finitude of divine life projected *ad extra* is precisely finite nature, i.e., things. The pure divine life *ad extra* in its finitude is the characteristic of reality as such."¹⁹ While other theists may agree with this assertion, Zubiri presents this divine projection from a uniquely Catholic perspective. From this perspective, the open essence which is the human reality, he saw as the "projection *ad extra* of the very Trinitarian life.... it is a projection of the life of God towards the outside."²⁰ This is an extramundane metaphysical assumption based upon his faith, and is the ground of Zubiri's view of projection.

If humans surrender to this divine projection through the acts of faith, through the molding of relegation as religion, one has, as cited above, "a concrete vision of God, of man, and of the world". A life lived thusly offers different possibilities for one's life than one lived denying such a projection or being indifferent to it. It remains, nonetheless, part of the problem of God that humans can choose to turn towards. It is the theological dimension of humanity. It affects life 'with myself', 'with others'

and 'with things' because how I live with these aspects of reality and how I understand the essence of these realities differs. If life has no meaning or purpose one lives it differently than if life is suffused with meaning and rife with purpose. If one apprehends the luminosity of the divine within every reality, it is not difficult to see the universe in a grain of sand. The life that one projects is determined by the view one has of life.

Life 'with myself'

As humans develop, we are constitutively with things, with others and with ourselves; it is with these forms of reality that *we* become. Not only this, but Zubiri reminds us that our actions are performed *from* ourselves. It is a dynamic structure of reality that things not only *are*, but also *become*. Developmental psychology has considered many facets of this 'becoming' of the self with things, and others, but the psychological becoming 'with myself' is more elusive. In order to consider this psychological becoming, I need to look at Zubiri's presentation of the metaphysical becoming within the world. It is important to stress that Zubiri's philosophy of the human is such a metaphysic; he states clearly that he is "doing metaphysics from within the world"²¹. He presents an intramundane metaphysics. This is eminently needed for an embodied approach to psychology.

The human reality lies open to its own reality and as such differs from other forms of reality which lack intelligence. Intelligence, in Zubiri's thought, is that capacity which allows the human to apprehend things as real and not just as stimuli. They indeed are stimuli, but to the human they are *real stimuli*, realities which stimulate us. An animal is stimulated but does not have the moment of reality. Intelligence is a note dependent upon the cortical structure of the human brain. The cortical differences between humans and primates are significant.

The human neocortex has a surface area as large as 2500 square centimeters but a thickness of only 1.5 to 3.0 millime-

ters. This area is equivalent to about four pages of a large text book. The neocortex of a primate, if rolled flat, will be the size of one page. Differences of corticalization lead, in Zubiri's thought, to differences in formalization, that is, how the thing is apprehended—from the formality of stimuli to the formality of reality. To an animal, anything is presented merely as stimulating; to the human, it is presented as a reality. The human infant learns rapidly, though unconsciously, that what it exists with are other forms of reality. Through growth and development, it learns that it is also a form of reality, different from other humans and from things. As such, one learns to co-exist with things, with others and with oneself.

Since the human stands open to its own reality and to the reality of things, these things and even one own self acquires *meaning* with respect to the individual. One's own life acquires or is denied a meaning; life is a divine gift and is meant to develop virtues; life is meant to give of oneself; life has no meaning and is merely an absurd cosmic accident.

The psychological understanding of co-existing with oneself has, since the late 19th century, the time of Pierre Janet, Jean-Martin Charcot, Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, Carl Jung, and others, used the concepts of conscious and unconscious, which may or may not co-exist harmoniously. Based upon a mechanistic model of psyche, equilibrium was taken to be important for healthy functioning. Psychic energy could, continuing this mechanistic model, be blocked, dammed up, reverse flow and cause psychopathology. The individual, implicitly aware of inner disharmony, adopts different coping or defense mechanisms in order to live with itself in its given situation(s). Various psychological mechanisms are employed in order to co-exist in various situations and when there is disequilibrium, physical or mental illness may result. Psychosomatic medicine recognizes this disequilibrium and seeks to treat it in different manners. It was the function of psychotherapy to re-establish the harmony of conscious and

unconscious dynamics to re-establish mental health.

In the psychological relationship, the patient (or client) would project their unconscious ideation, feelings, and hopes that have been experienced with other people into the therapeutic dynamic and onto the therapist; this was termed *transference* and had to be resolved. Emotional dynamics of many relationships *with others* (parents, siblings, significant others) thereby potentially become resolved in the therapeutic dynamic. Likewise, the therapist could, in what is termed *countertransference*, project unconscious contents which interfered with the client's healing. The client projects her feelings of her father upon the therapist in the transference; the therapist unconsciously wants to care for this daughter-like woman and projects his paternal attitudes in countertransference. Each approach to psychology and therapy has different views on this dynamic, though projection is a common aspect of psychodynamic psychologies.

The Rorschach inkblot test, where one is shown a series of images of symmetrical dimensions—as each side of the image is the mirror image of the other—has as its purpose a determination of unconscious psychological projection.

Psychodynamic psychology recognizes different forms of projection wherein one's feelings and desires are not seen or admitted as being part of one self, but attributed to another, thus disowning them. *Projective identification* is a dynamic process where the individual splits off unwanted parts of the self from ego consciousness. While projection often creates distance between self and others, this type affirms that the individual who 'contains' the split-off component is threatening and the projector keeps constant watch and control on this other. Aggression towards the other is a common occurrence. There is also *psychotic projection* where external reality is distorted by attributing aggressive or sexual impulses to others; these projected tendencies are seen as coming from the other.

It must be noted that projection is not always a defense mechanism and can be beneficial; through projecting myself into another's situation, I may be empathetic with another's plight.

Zubiri does not accept an "unconscious" or "conscious" and avers that

...things are not the content of consciousness but only the objects or boundaries of consciousness; consciousness is not the receptacle of things. Psychoanalysis has conceived of man and his activity by referring them always to consciousness. Thus it speaks to us of "the" conscious, "the" unconscious, etc. Man would ultimately be a stratification of zones qualified with respect to the conscious. This substantiation is inadmissible. "The" activity of the conscious does not exist; "the" conscious does not exist, nor "the" unconscious, nor "the" subconscious. There are only conscious, unconscious, and subconscious acts. But they are not acts of the conscious, unconscious, or subconscious.²²

This derives from Zubiri's insistence that the one major problem in European philosophy is the substantiation of reality, that is, making all forms of reality into entities, beings; consciousness has been assumed to be a substantive reality, which Zubiri denies. This he called the *entification* of reality. As a corrective he proffered a view which demonstrated that being is an oblique and secondary consideration.²³ Thus, if we do not operate with the concepts of 'the conscious' or 'the unconscious', but hold to conscious and unconscious acts, the reality of projection assumes greater psychological import, positively speaking.

Situation (*situs*) is an important element of Zubiri's philosophy. This, along with location (*locus*), becomes essential metaphysical categories of living organisms, categories which had been overlooked in earlier philosophies. The human reality becomes aware of itself existing in different situations with different people

and in different places. It is a dynamic form of reality which not only exists by continuing to be self, but which exists by *being one's own reality*.²⁴ This dynamism Zubiri terms "the dynamism of self-possession".

Human dynamism has three constitutive forms: *myself*, a "to me", and the character of an "I" [Spanish Yo]. The first is expressed in the middle voice, as in "I have bought *myself* a new coat." The second appears when the human feels oneself to be the center of their world and things turn "to me". There is much written in developmental psychology about this stage of human development. The third is revealed when one considers that, "In intellection, I 'am' aware of something at that moment which 'is' present to me." The "I" confronts things as realities in reality. These three have a unity which is primary and radical; it is "the unity of a *second act*: it is the *reactualization of my own reality* qua mine in each of the acts that I perform as a reality in my life."²⁵ The "myself", "to me" and "I", are the actualization of the individual human reality; the human reality is prior to these three dynamic modes of one's being. "The I is the substantive being of man. And this substantive being of man is precisely what reveals and primarily constitutes what really and effectively belongs to me, and what I have willed to make of myself."²⁶

This confronting of reality takes place psychologically as well as intellectually. Within the family matrix, the individual adapts and acquires different possibilities for being-in-the-world. This entails not only socio-cultural-philosophical-religious traditions which may be handed down, but also unique family traditions—using tradition in the philosophical sense of *parádoxis*, delivery of modes of being. These modes are given to individuals along certain lines of behavior and concepts which may be emulated or rejected, overtly expressed or implied through parental enforcement: "In this family, we have always prided ourselves on being punctual," "Cleanliness is next to godliness, therefore you must put cleanliness above every other virtue;" "You

must never show pride for your accomplishments, but must always be humble;" "I learned from my parents, who learned from their parents, that success is measured by the size of one's bank account;" "When we were young, my father was very disorderly. When I asked him why, he said he learned it from his mother. It drove my mom crazy!" "My grandpa was so successful, but never had time for my dad or aunts; now my dad puts spending time with us ahead of his success, but my aunt is a workaholic." "A woman who does not wear the right clothes is seen as cheap and is an insult to our belief and our family." Within the situations provided by the family, one learns how to be a person in the world. The parents and family become the *systems of reference* for how to be and interact with others.

A system of reference is critical for there to be knowledge. Zubiri takes this from a philosophical mentality and Peseschkian from a psychological one. Intellectually, we use systems of reference when we declare what real things are respectively to other real things. Psychologically, our families are the first systems of reference for our knowing how to live with ourselves and others. These systems of reference and the reference persons give to us core concepts for our life:

The relationship of the parents (or of the first reference persons, as the case may be) to the child and his siblings is of central significance for the relationship to the "I," i.e. for the self-image, the self-evaluation, and self-trust. Here the child learns to assume a relationship to himself which especially depends on how his wants and needs are satisfied. The basic question "Am I accepted or rejected?" is decisive. The answer to this question is provided directly by the reference person-child relationship, and indirectly by the comparison with the treatment of the siblings, for example. In the process a first discovery is made, which, to a certain degree, can become a system of reference for later development. It

may be presumed that this initial discovery influences the later techniques of determination of self-worth: Am I accepted on the grounds of my personality or on the grounds of my achievements?²⁷

Sometimes the family situation is far from ideal and leaves the individual with gaps in psychology functioning and capacities; sometimes it is psychologically toxic and contributes to individual psychopathology; sometimes it is “good enough” for human development and provides opportunities to develop latent capacities. In any case, the human reality must adapt to other persons and their psychosocial capacities. *I* must know how to live with my family; *I* must also learn how to nurture and live with myself. The possibilities of being are acquired in relationship with others and in response to others. They are also acquired in relationship to myself.

Perhaps *I* am a child who is very energetic and extroverted, eager to explore the world, venture away from safety and find out what life has to offer and what *I* can bring forth—life is for me a seeking for adventure. Or perhaps *I* am a child who seeks stability and security, moving cautiously in my environment so as to not upset the order as apprehended—life is my seeking for firmness. Yet again, *I* may live by a restriction of choices, imposed by others and appropriated by me, seeking steadiness in reality and clarity—it is life seeking for science, in the broadest sense of the word.²⁸ In a “good enough” family, the individual is allowed to express her particular manner of being in the world, though it may be very different from her parents and siblings. In some families, however, the model of how one should be is determined and controlled by others; to not conform implies threats or the reality of physical or emotional manipulation or abuse. One’s innate capacities do not have an environment in which they can develop, nor the situations amenable to establishing a healthy relation to one’s self.

One may be extroverted but live in a family which does not establish relations

with others and may need to learn to be introverted to cope with the seclusion. Likewise, one may be inclined to be introverted but develop in a family where there is much social interaction demanding extroverted behavior. Learning to live with *myself* involves compromise with how *I* feel about *myself* in contrast (perhaps) to how others demand that *I* be; it also involves how *I* learn about how life works in *my* family. It is a psychosocial dimension of our becoming. Introversion and extroversion are two psychological attitudes or *habitudes*. Sometimes such habitude is authentic or it may be compensation due to external situations. Habitude is, according to Zubiri, “a way of coping with things...This way of coping with them is the one in which are inserted all the mechanisms of arousal and response of a living being.”²⁹ On this level of consideration, one’s psychological attitude is a way of coping with reality and affects one’s psychophysiological responses to life’s events.

Let me give an example: one may be musically inclined in a family of mechanics or be mechanically inclined in a family of musicians, and each family denigrates the other, which explicitly affects how *I* feel about this capability and interest of *mine*. One may be highly academically intellectual, but live in a family in a country where education is not available or a family that cannot afford it. An individual may find that their capabilities and possibilities are not developed in situations where they may be manifested, where they need to be suppressed or compromised, negatively affecting *my* living with *myself*.

Perhaps *I* cannot live comfortably with *myself*; perhaps *I* consciously think that a certain behavior is so disagreeable that it cannot be accepted as part of *me*. In order to defend against this assault which would come with accepting this psychological darkness, one can defend oneself by denying it, by repressing it or through projection; repression may result in *projection* where the disagreeable aspect is not seen as part of *me*, but part of an ‘other’. These negative self-feelings are disassociated

from ego consciousness and projected outside. The projection is from the inside to the outside and distorts our apprehension of external reality. This distortion may affect relations with others, may lead to feelings of persecution, anger, or distancing oneself from the one who is the *victim* of the projection. Projection is *onto* someone or even something else, it is not *into* a vacuum. It may also contribute to another manner of distorting reality through the mechanism of fantasy: one's desires are projected into an imagined present or future where the fantasy can create any sort of situation to gratify desire, or provide psychic refuge from current difficulties of life.

Projection, psychologically speaking, can be conscious or unconscious. *I* can consciously project my virtues and capacities through my chosen behavior; *I* can intentionally learn new ways of behaving when I learn that other ways are not suitable to the new situation. One may also project a false persona, that is, project confidence as a compensation for feelings of inferiority, narrow-minded belief to compensate for persistent doubt. Regarding unconscious projection, I affirm it is a habitual way of being human. One psychologically and habitually responds to a situation based upon one's perception and past experience of it.

Sensory perception is mediated by specific brain nuclei which are multimodal. Sensory organs as well as cortical brain structures have neural connections to nuclei which respond automatically. For example, in one study, masked, that is "unseen" stimuli (stimuli given at 33 msec. followed by a 167 msec. presentation of an unmasked stimuli) of happy or fearful faces, with a neutral face (mask) shown in-between, measured amygdala response using the functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI) (Whalen, et. al., 1998). The results indicate that even these non-conscious stimuli show significant response. These findings indicate that the amygdala has an early and automatic response to fear stimuli, conscious or unconscious, supporting the findings of other

researchers.³⁰

We are not aware of the response of the amygdala as it is affecting us, but it shows itself in our behavior and response to certain situations evoking fear. The amygdala may respond with great intensity or small intensity and through learning new patterns of behavior, may be mollified. Reality imposes itself upon us and the force of imposition is experienced by an individual with nuclei that respond automatically. The nuclei which respond affect one's psychological disposition which is projected in one's manner of being in the world.

Peseshkian proffers two fundamental psychosocial modes of being: the capacity to know and the capacity to love. The former are learned patterns of relating to others and self, but are not merely cognitive. They have affective components as well. The latter refers to the capacity to love and be loved, and is experienced from birth throughout one's life. We do not learn this in the sense that it is taught to us, as is cleanliness, politeness, loyalty, punctuality, etc., but do learn it implicitly in our relations within our family system. The capacity to love may, under certain circumstances, become problematic for establishing relations with others. "[B]ecause of attachments to the *I*, one neglects the partner; out of consideration for one's own family, one forgets other people; under the pressure of obligations and social engagements, one neglects the family and oneself..."³¹

Finally, in briefly considering life 'with myself', one may *become* within a family matrix where infant and child education are considered unnecessary, where socially proscribed roles determine what is taught in the family, where social inequality and inequity permits extremely limited environments for stimulation—and these situations directly impact the neurological development of the human brain. Many studies show that even rats that grow in stimulation-poor environments, compared to ones who are provided abundant stimulation, have less neuron development in key regions of the brain. There are critical periods of human brain development

which directly affects one's living *with oneself, with others* and *with things*.

Were this section to be more fully developed, we must consider the neurochemical, hormonal, and physiological responses to these "living with myself" dimensions from a psychosocial line of inquiry. While it does not affect the human *qua* animal of reality along the lines of sentient intellection, it does do so along the lines of manifesting one's particular mentality and appropriating possibilities of living, or to use other words, developing one's capacities and virtues. It affects the projects one undertakes in life and how one projects her or his life in their relations with others. The projects of a depressive person, of an anxious and insecure person, for example, may be radically different were they not to be depressed, anxious and had security.

Life "with others"

Humans constitutively exist with others. The first reality that the human infant confronts is her own, *in affective respectivity with herself, things* and *others*. It is not that we are born and then establish relationship with others and things, *we are constitutively with others* and things. The human infant, when it apprehends a reality, does not do so in an unemotional manner. At this stage of development, apprehension and emotion are co-implicated; in fact, they are so throughout one's life, but at this stage, the affectant nature of our apprehension of reality is stronger. In his delineation of the modalities of sensation, Zubiri states that reality is apprehended as affectant, "sorrow and pleasure are the primary expression of that affection. Reality is temperant and affectant."³² Humans share these primary affections with animals, an area Darwin wrote about in his 1872 work, *The Expression of Emotions in Man and Animals*. Many others have subsequently investigated this affectant dimension of reality. The field of affective neuroscience has clearly demonstrated and delineated emotional display in other species and what happens under situations of stress or neurological im-

pairment due to environmental or biophysiological factors. We have many other emotions than just primary ones, however.

Though the child is a being with sentient intellection, the realities it apprehends are apprehended emotionally. This emotional apprehension is due to the neurophysiological development of the human infant. The higher cortical regions of the brain develop during the first two years of life and mature thereafter, however, the structures of the brain that function dominantly during affective apprehension are 'on-line' at birth. The *others* whom the child interacts with need to comprehend this fact of human development and work to moderate the emotional intensity of the infant's apprehension. An infant simply cannot understand without experiencing it emotionally. The force of imposition of reality in the infant is experienced primarily emotionally.

From within the scientific literature of emotions, one gets the idea that it is difficult to exclude many regions of the brain from some sort of emotional involvement. Indeed, the entire limbic system, which includes various paralimbic, thalamic, and hypothalamic nuclei, basal ganglia, basal forebrain, reticular activating system, brainstem, septum, hippocampus, amygdala nuclei and other systems are implicated. Inasmuch as these systems utilize the various neurochemical systems: dopamine, serotonin, norepinephrine, and acetylcholine systems, with their net-like action throughout the entire brain, there is still strong evidence that the right hemisphere is biased to experience negative affects while the left hemisphere favors positive or neutral affects; likewise the right hemisphere favors an imagistic rather than a cognitive-linguistic processing mode.

The sensory systems feed into the orbitofrontal cortex, thalamus and the amygdala (as multimodal nuclei). These brain structures have been taken to fulfill an evaluative function that is learned and automatic, and the thalamocortical system is suggested by many to be central to consciousness. The outputs from these struc-

tures connect directly to the basal ganglia: caudate nucleus, globus pallidus, nucleus accumbens, entopeduncular nucleus, ventral tegmental area and substantia nigra (including the striatum and ventral striatum), and thence back to the thalamus, parietal and prefrontal motor cortices. There are literally millions of neural connections between these structures, and all of them develop in the infant who is 'with others' and 'with things.'

Inasmuch as reality is affectant, for the human, intellection determines affectivity. "The essential part of sensing in its three moments of arousal, tonic modification, and response is formally structured in intellectual apprehension, in feeling, and in volition. Only because there is sentient apprehension of the real, i.e., only because there is impression of reality, is there feeling and volition."³³ These three moments of sensation are a unified structure. Sensation is the release from stimulus. Lower phyla suffer the sensation without being able to release it. As one advances to higher organisms, there is a centralization of sensation which leads to behavior and sentiment.

As the organism becomes more centralized, the psychic character becomes more complex. Moreover, in order to preserve this centralized system and fend against its vulnerability, balance must be maintained, that is, homeostasis appears as a dynamic process of keeping equilibrium. This stabilizing of the organism through dynamic homeostatic processes leads to a further movement in the evolution of life: cerebral corticalization. "Not only is a central axis being constituted, but that central axis ends in a telencephalon, and the telencephalon culminates precisely in a cortex."³⁴ The more developed the animal phyla, the greater the corticalization which culminates in the human who apprehends others not merely as stimuli, but as other realities...animals, things, and humans.

The second moment of sensation, tonic modification, means that the animal or human, aroused by a stimulus, has its present state of living affected; it is modified from its previous state. Life is, accord-

ing to philosophy, a living 'between' states of being. Some of these 'things' one is between are internal, some are external. The organism is aroused, its present state is modified, and it responds. The affect is a "mode of turning toward reality."³⁵ We have an affect when we turn towards our own reality, as example, when we feel pride at our accomplishments, or loathing at our failure. We turn towards others in order to learn how we are perceived by them, which forms the foundation for our apprehension of our own self. We have affective responses to others and it is these others who, in the fashion of a 'looking-glass', mirror their evaluation of us to us. We are modified by the evaluations of others. An example may help here: a child is playing on the floor and is dirty. A parent who is overly fastidious sees the child and screams "Look how filthy you are, you lazy, good for nothing pig! Now I must clean you again!" The vital tone is modified and the affective response may be deeply painful and sad. One comes to think of oneself as a filthy, good for nothing animal which thereafter constrains one's projects undertaken in life.

The human infant is aroused by other humans and learns its responses in relationship with them. A mother's face may be soft *and* comforting, a stranger's soft *but* threatening; her smell is recognized and acknowledged by emotional response, and even her face is distinguished from other faces after a few months of life. Verbalization from others invites mimicry accompanied by affect. Since an infant has no language skills at birth, communication is done through mere vocalizations—crying, whining, whimpering, etc. Anyone who has been an involved parent knows that the child develops unique cries depending upon its discomfort—being hungry, wet or soiled if wearing diapers, displeased with something, etc.

The infant learns quickly which other people provide it with something it needs and are thus safe and secure, consistent and nurturing; who provides it with its needs but also are experienced as uncomfortable or unsafe; and who provide its

needs but who respond to its needs in ways that are angry, invoking fear or experienced as threatening one time and calm, comforting and secure another time, with there being no way to know which interaction from the other is to occur. The psychological consideration of this arousal-response structure draws our attention to psychological and emotional *attachment*.

Attachment theory, begun by John Bowlby and developed by Mary Ainsworth in the U.K., has robust scientific support. For my purpose in this article, I will mention it as it relates to my project. Research has found that children, as early as six months, develop attachment bonds that endure; in fact, these models of attachments have been found to be intergenerational and transmitted from parent to child.³⁶ There are different patterns of relating which develop and endure. Children learn to be *secure* and will seek proximity or contact with the caregiver(s) by smiling or waving or other affective response. Other children are *avoidant* and stays away from the caregiver(s) since they are apprehended as uncomfortable or threatening. There are also children who are *resistant* or *ambivalent* to others and react passively or even actively show hostility toward the caregiver(s) since the infant is not sure what the interaction will feel or be like. Abandonment is another dynamic which is mentioned inasmuch as it severely affects one's attachment behavior. As the child develops, these patterns become *internal working models* of how the world works in relation with others. These models are then projected onto and into relationships with others, and in intimate relations a mature person may still interact emotionally based upon these projections. It must be remembered that these are not conscious processes, but unconscious ones.

It is with these attachment patterns, as well as our interaction with things and ourselves that neurological development occur. Again, an example will help here: an infant learns that the caretaker provides safety and security, meets its needs as suitable (where frustration must be

experienced as well as satiation) for its situation, and becomes securely attached. When the infant sees, hears, smells, or otherwise apprehends this *other*, there are neurochemical, hormonal, and physiological processes that co-occur. Particular neurochemicals produce healthy effects in the brain and body, allowing the individual positive emotions. Even if the infant experiences frustration or trauma, it is soothed, comforted and returns to normal.

On the other hand, imagine an infant who is born into a family where it is unwanted and even resented, perhaps even during pregnancy the matrix environment was experienced as hostile as the mother did not want the baby and did not provide adequate care and nutrition—all impacting the developing fetus. After birth, the infant's needs are not met, its cries are responded to with physical abuse, and it senses hostility and great discomfort in any situation with this particular other. As it develops, the infant not only apprehends the other, it becomes apprehensive, anxious; other neurochemicals and peptides are created by the brain which intensify the fearful state of arousal and affect its entire being. Research by Allan Schore, Bruce Perry, Bessel van der Kolk and many others in the fields of child development, post traumatic stress, and emotional sciences confirm the neurotoxicity of this hyperarousal and how it physically changes developing nuclei. These changes interfere with normal human functioning and one's apprehension of reality.

Keeping with the theme of projection, I have mentioned that these *internal working models* of relationships are maintained through one's life and even transmitted from generation to generation. Cognitive science refers to them as implicit memories. One can, through self-help and various forms of therapy, overcome the force of imposition of such negative models, or ameliorate them to some degree. When an individual seeks to establish emotional relations with persons other than caretakers, they do so with the pattern learned with their caretakers. The model learned is projected onto the significant other, into

the relational events, and one responds accordingly. An avoidant or ambivalent response pattern intervenes in such events. As an example, the male meets a female, and finds himself attracted to her. She reciprocates and a relationship is established. He finds her attractive on many levels, but also finds himself avoiding her—he is afraid to get too close to her or let her get too close to him in case she abuses him or even abandons him. He may be ambivalent about this relationship and one day yearns to be with her and show her attention and affection while the next day mistreats her in some manner and finds her unsafe to be with. Though this particular female has never mistreated or given any cause for being insecure, the male responds in these manners because he is projecting his past experiences into the present relationship. Myriad works in psychotherapy verify these patterns, behaviors, attitudes, and emotions.

In my work as a therapist, some of my clients have had great difficulty in relationships, sabotaging them yet desperately depending on them; desiring a good relationship yet choosing a partner who is abusive or co-dependent, or who tolerates their abuse.³⁷ Some of these clients feel depressed, experience self-loathing even, are hopeless, and feel rejected due to their patterns. It affects their entire living patterns, social interactions, career choices and projects undertaken. When they begin to remember the developmental events which contributed to their internal models of relating, it is deeply painful, evoking many different types of response, depending upon the person. Psychological abreaction, allowing these repressed memories and emotions to become conscious again is difficult for most. However, once one becomes aware of the unconscious patterns of relating, different possibilities of responding are available.

While one may always feel insecure, the intensity and its intrusion into relationships are mollified. From intense insecurity dynamics to twinges of insecurity which are recognized and quelled, one makes progress in creating healthy relat-

ing and new possibilities. One may then feel the insecurity, acknowledge it, and yet not be controlled by the emotions being aroused. Even the projection of these implicit memory patterns onto and into relationships can be 'withdrawn', psychologically speaking, and recognized as patterns which have been learned and are being unlearned. Through communication with the significant other, one may learn to be secure. Through time and effort, different possibilities for being in relationship develop and become permanent responses.

Since reality is apprehended as affectant, human response to these realities apprehended takes on the character of sentiment. In Zubiri's noergics, sentiment is the human experience of tonic modification:

The animal vital tone, we said, is "affection", it is the way of sensing oneself through stimulation generated by the stimulus. On the other hand, the human being senses tonic modification in a different way: I feel not only contented or disgusted, but I sense myself one way or the other in reality. The tonic affection changes now into a way of sensing myself as a reality in reality; this is *feeling* or *sentiment*. Affection is not the same as *feeling*. There is only feeling when the affection formally involves the moment of reality. Furthermore, the apprehension of this real thing, when it modifies my feelings, impels me to respond. In what way? No longer is it the case of tending through stimulation to a new animal situation, but of tending to place oneself really in reality, though in a different way. To do this, one has to choose. Tendency and appetite give way to *volition*. Volition has essentially one moment of reality: a desire to be now in reality in a certain way. With this, the animal process unity, that is, the merely stimulation-based unity of stimulation, tonic affection and tendency, turns into a "human" process unity; that is, into a process of realization (apprehension of the real, feel-

ings of the real, volition of the real).³⁸

Sentiment is not completely subjective, Zubiri affirms, in that there is an objective moment which is value.³⁹ The dimension of value, as an objective moment of reality, is due to the properties things possess.⁴⁰ Subjectively, psychologically, value is experienced by the intensity of affect.

Through human volition, through becoming conscious of unconscious dynamics, one *becomes* and develops psychosocial possibilities which may not have been developed in previous relationships *with others*.

Primary psychosocial capacities (we may legitimately call them virtues) such as patience, contact, trust, confidence, hope, faith, doubt or certainty, etc., based upon one’s emotional experience of others, may not have been adequately developed in childhood and can be appropriated later. Secondary capacities such as punctuality, cleanliness, orderliness, obedience, justice, sincerity, fidelity, etc., are learned through direct or indirect instruction in families and societies and likewise may need to be supplemented through volition. I cite these capacities, which have been delineated in Positive Psychotherapy and found in many approaches to therapy and psychology, inasmuch as these are some of the many possibilities of our being that humans must appropriate. As cited earlier, these virtues are not something that happen by nature but must be appropriated. They are moments of our being, of our personality. Primary capacities are based upon our capacity to experience love and secondary capacities are based upon our capacity to know.⁴¹ These are the areas of potential conflict in our relations with others; each family and society values these psychosocial capacities in differing degrees. (See Table 1).

These values are learned from the significant others in our lives, beginning with parents and siblings (if we have any). These “are the possibilities every person has for developing relationships.”⁴² They are possibilities of relating to myself (I), to another in an intimate relationship (you), to

the social environment (we), and even one’s *weltanschauung* or tradition (primal we).

PRIMARY CAPACITIES	SECONDARY CAPACITIES
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Love (emotionality) • Modeling • Patience • Time • Contact • Sexuality • Trust • Confidence • Hope • Faith • Doubt • Certitude • Unity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punctuality • Cleanliness • Orderliness • Obedience • Courtesy • Honesty/Candor • Faithfulness • Justice • Diligence/ Achievement • Thrift • Reliability • Precision • Conscientiousness

Table 1. Primary and Secondary Human Capacities

The following are merely samples of possibilities we learn. These possibilities directly affect what other possibilities in life we may appropriate or what we avoid, even what things we use as resources to make our lives.

In relation with our parents we learn about ourselves—how valuable were you to them; how much time do they spend with you; do they listen to you when you need it; were your thoughts and feelings taken seriously? Did you learn that no one likes you unless you behave in a particular way; were you told that you can do many things and if you fail to try again...it just takes time; or did you learn ‘if you can’t do it right, don’t do it at all...you stupid child’? We also learn about living with others by observing their relationship—do the parents fight often and abusively or are they calm and consultative; do they spend time together or is one parent always voicing complaints about the other or showing disrespect; was affection shown in the family; did you experience a divorce at a young age; was the relationship with your

siblings full of support or argumentation? In learning to relate to others, we learn from our family such things as 'after three days, fish and guests smell'; 'relatives are great as long as they are kept far away'; 'when you grow up, you must not become like that person'; 'why can't you be more like your brother/sister?'; etc. Did your family spend much time interacting with others, having others over for entertainment regularly, or was your family isolated and kept to themselves; did they spend time together doing activities or was each member alone most of the time; was your family active socially in the community or kept aloof? Finally, we learn about the world from our families by learning such things as the meaning of life, or its absurdity; tradition is more important than honesty or doing what needs to be done now if it involves change; did you learn to live life based on fear of the devil or with a trust in God; were your parents religious, spiritual, atheistic, scientific, etc?

Social psychologists speak of projection from groups of peoples to other groups or individuals—the outsiders are differentiated from insiders by being not only different, but potentially harmful. *They have the evil bombs while ours are moralistic and righteous.* "God' is on our side against those heathens," is an all-too-common phrase interfering in the unifying function of religion, that molding of relegation which Zubiri developed insightfully. "The 'great Satan' which compose countries 'X, Y, Z', must be defeated by the righteous who are in 'A, B, C' countries." "Those people in that neighborhood cannot be trusted, while here you are safe." "Those people in that city are better than those living here as they are more intelligent." These are all just examples one can hear or read about in daily life which speak to the psychological reality of projection. It is a specification of "the grass is greener on the other side of the fence." These are cognitive and affective expressions which cause great challenges for a world in the throes of globalization.

Every apprehension of reality is not just cognitively perceived, it also has an emo-

tional component, a dimension of sentiment of the real. Remember, reality is affectant.

Greenspan and Shanker have undertaken many years of research and study with and on infant development. They state that there is a *dual coding* of apprehension and have:

observed that each sensation, as it is registered by the child also gives rise...to an affect or emotion, that is to say, the infant responds to it according to its emotional as well as physical affect on her. Thus, a blanket may feel smooth *and* pleasant or itchy *and* irritating; a toy may be brilliantly red *and* intriguing or boring, a voice loud *and* inviting or jarring. As a baby's experience grows, sensory impressions become increasingly tied to feelings."⁴³

As the human matures, such dual coding can be an impediment to healthy relating; through volition and other possibilities open to one, painful, dysfunctional or maladaptive coding may be altered. What was adaptive in one situation (early family development) becomes maladaptive in another one; what was an adaptive way of being with any thing in a particular location may prove to be maladaptive in another situation or location. It may be fine for a child to carry and suck on a blanket which stimulates the child and provides a sense of comfort around the house or at nap time, but becomes inappropriate at a later stage of growth or in social situations.

Life "with things"

Since the human stands open to its own reality and to the reality of things, these things, others, and even one own self acquires *meaning* with respect to the individual. Things acquire meaning due to their properties. Zubiri differentiates between things in their naked reality and meaning-things. He uses the example of a room wherein one sees walls; the walls are indifferent to the materials which are used in its construction—stones, plaster, steel, whatever—but it makes a great different to

those using this room that those walls have a particular condition to distinguish it as a lecture hall. Not just any thing can serve as a wall, but what does serve so must have the condition of being able to for the given situation and location:

Precisely because it is a meaning, things acquire a unique character as meaning with respect to life. *In the first place*, they are, they provisionally have the character of *insistences*. They urge on the human being, who cannot avoid performing a vital act. *In the second place*, not only can the human not avoid performing a vital act, it must also perform it by having recourse to those things and to the self in the manner of resources. Resource-insistence is the first formal structure of meaning as such.⁴⁴

Things are resources of possibilities, and resources for actions. The human substantivity itself is a resource for action. Zubiri avers that "The idea of resource is what formally constitutes the character of possibility."⁴⁵ The resources for action come *from* oneself; it is one's own nature that is a resource for possibilities of making one's life, one's personality.

In order to keep my focus on psychology and projection, I will mention here how it is that things acquire, for the individual, the property of being threatening. In their naked reality, things are not threatening, but can become so respective to something or someone else; it is then a meaning-thing that is threatening. As an example: an elevator is seen as threatening to one with claustrophobia, to think of entering one produces a host of anxiety responses. A leather belt in itself is useful, but to one who received severe punishment by a parent using such a belt may, in particular situations, feel apprehensive about a belt. Any thing that one may encounter may, under certain situations, evoke a negative reaction—a phobia may develop of lesser or greater intensity. Such phobias are psycho-emotional projections based upon experience or unfamiliarity. Animal interaction and animal phobias are

very common and one may project internal fears onto them; it may be a learned response to past animal interaction, but becomes intrusive in daily living.

These learned responses may be generalized to things with similar properties. An historical example is the case of Little Albert. In 1920, the behavioral psychologist John B. Watson and his assistant Rosalie Rayner experimented on this 11-month old baby to study how emotions are learned. Watson showed Albert a small white rat which Albert had no fear of and was in fact playful with it. Watson then paired the seeing of the white rat with a loud noise which frightened Albert. The next time Albert saw the rat he was afraid of it and began to cry. After this, when he was shown a small white rabbit, Albert had generalized his fear to it and then to other small animals and things. The fear was learned and then projected onto other things. There are as many types of potential phobias as there are things, depending upon one's experience of them! I am asserting here that these phobias are a form of projection, as well as being learned patterns of behavior with neurophysiological responses.

I agree with Zubiri that a human response is physiological, i.e. organic, and psychological at the same time; humans are psycho-organic substantivities. The fear which develops into a phobia is a projection onto the thing of one's experience with that thing, or something like it. The brain nuclei that 'appraises' the threat is the amygdala, an intermodal and intersensory almond-shaped nuclei which is functioning during the emotion of fear. One can unlearn this fear pattern, and the amygdala responds differently with the passing of time. When the previous phobic producing thing is apprehended again, fear is not projected or experienced.

Another form of projection onto things is termed *displacement*. As an example, a young child has just been scolded by the caregiver. Being powerless and hurt, the child sees the family pet and kicks it out of anger; being angry and hurt, the child picks up an object and throws it at a wall

intending to break it; being angry and dejected, the child sees a picture hanging on the wall and comments about how stupid and ugly that picture looks. The emotions have been displaced onto a thing that is less powerful and will not respond in a way that is hurtful. Again, someone is sitting at an intersection in a line of traffic to turn left, when the left-turn signal turns red, they begin swearing at the light or the driver in front of them is also projecting their anger and frustration into the situation.

There are many examples which can be given, but I hope the point is clear...projection is a common feature of human life with things. One has been aroused, the vital tone has been modified, and the response is unfounded based upon the current situation. One chose a response determined by the intellection of reality judged to be somehow not 'right'.

On the positive side, projection also occurs. The symbolic value of things is well known and documented. Astronomical charts are often seen as being composed of constellations with such names as Canis minor, or major, Capricorn, Cancer, Leo, Pegasus, Tarus, etc. They were imaged as animal figures which were projected into the night skies. A figurine may evoke ecstatic emotions which the religious adherent projects onto it. A building, tree, rock, totem, or other thing, acquires a dimension of respect, reverence, or awe due to the associations one has with it and the emotions projected onto it. One person may go to the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem and upon seeing it, experiencing an overwhelming emotion of humility; another may go and feel nothing; a third may go and have a negative response. The wall is a wall which carries great symbolic value for some humans; their belief and emotions are projected upon the naked reality making of it a meaning-thing. Flags and other national icons also become 'carriers' of people's projections, as do pictures of revered personages of cultural, historical, or religious import. An image experienced as divine by one group may be apprehended as idolatrous to another, bearing

testimony that the meaning-thing is so because of the projections from humans and the properties it possesses as apprehended by humans. Real things have real properties, but some of these real properties may be obscure to somebody.

Projection of one's personal reality as experienced with things, with others and with oneself is a profoundly important socio-psychophysiological reality with significant implications. It is a structure of reality that, I submit, Zubiri did not develop but is latent within his philosophical system.

Projection qua structure of reality

I now turn my reflection to briefly explicate Zubiri's notion of projection as he presented it; this is the structure of the actualization of reality. In *On Essence*, Zubiri creates a new philosophical notion of reality which actualizes notes (qualities, properties) that are expressed from the inside to outside:

One takes his point of departure in the thing and we see in the notes, not something which a subject has, but rather that in which the thing is actual. In this actualization, we find the entire thing actualized in each of its notes; or better, in their totality; a kind of projection of the thing in the entire body of its notes. Then there is no longer any question of a mode of inhesion, but rather of a structure of actualization or projection.⁴⁶

I take this to mean that actualization and projection are equivalent terms with this caveat: the real thing is actual in reality and actualized intellectually. From within any reality which is *de suyo* ("by itself" or "of itself"), the notes are projected externally, they are actualized in reality. The actualization or projection of a reality in its real notes is prior to its intellectual actualization. Intellectual actualization is founded upon actualization of a thing in reality, upon this real thing projecting its notes in reality. Intellection is just actualization of reality. When reality is actualized intellectually, intellection and reality intel-

lectively actual are the same. “[I]n apprehension, the actuality of what is apprehended, as apprehended, and that of the act of apprehending as apprehensor, are one and the same act; if one wishes, there is only one act, which is common to the mind and to the thing. As a consequence, the mind takes on the formal quality of the thing.” This is a restatement of Aristotle’s dictum “knowledge in act is identical with the thing known” from *De anima* 430a20.⁴⁷

So, from the side of reality, projection and actualization are equivalent terms; from the side of intellection they are not. My musings are from the side of the human reality, *qua* psycho-organic.

Inasmuch as Zubiri undertook a metaphysic from within the world, contra the Aristotelian and Platonic approach, things have essential notes. For Plato, Aristotle and subsequent thinkers, the notes (qualities, properties) of any reality are accidental to the essence of that reality. They inhere in the reality which has these particular qualia. They are not constitutive of the essence; they are accidents which emerge from the substance. Zubiri asserts that this view is from without inward.

From an intramundane metaphysics as constructed by Zubiri, the notes do not inhere as unessential qualia, but are the actualized or projected notes of the particular reality. There are notes which are constitutive of the essence and those which are not; the unessential notes he calls adventitious.⁴⁸ His is a philosophy of substantivity, of systems, which may be composed of many substances. It is a view from within outward. What we apprehend in our sentient intellection are really notes of these real things. It is not that one view is better than the other, but they are complementary and “both are necessary for an adequate theory of reality.”⁴⁹

Zubiri provides a unified structure of sentient intellection. First, our primordial apprehension apprehends the naked reality of the real thing, it is actualized in our intelligence; intellection is merely actualization of reality. When one steps back intellectually from the real thing as apprehended, one’s intellectual re-actualization

is retained by the projected notes of the real thing; one uses simple apprehensions (precepts, concepts, and fictions) to declare what this re-actualized reality is ‘in reality’ as a function of other things apprehended. These simple apprehensions are realized in the reality actualized intellectually, or they are not realized. We cannot realize, for example, the fluidity of a rock which is lying on the ground in winter; the real rock does not actualize such a note. On the other hand, it may actualize it in a volcanic flow. If we search for the ground, or foundation to the reality we apprehend and when we have declared what it might be in reality, we search for what it could be ‘in reality itself’. Primordial apprehension, ‘in reality’, and ‘in reality itself’ is Zubiri’s unified structure of sentient intellection; it is sentient intellection, sentient logos, and sentient reason. All these modes of intellection are based upon the projected notes of the different modes of reality as actualized.

Having studied Zubiri’s writings which have been translated into English may leave me at a disadvantage in composing this section; there are perhaps dimensions of projection that he has expressed but only currently available in Spanish. I ask the reader to take this into consideration in critiquing these musings.

His use of projection as a metaphysical structure goes beyond an intramundane consideration. In fact, it is constructed and founded upon an extramundane view, as mentioned at the beginning of this article. It takes leave of intramundane considerations and enters into an extramundane one when he affirms that:

Creation must be conceived as the very life of God projected freely *ad extra*, consequently in a finite form. Therefore, this coefficient of finitude of divine life projected *ad extra* is precisely finite nature, i.e., things. The pure divine life *ad extra* in its finitude is the characteristic of reality as such. From this perspective is how the different modes of creation have to be understood. And we cannot appre-

hend the different modes in any other way but showing that they depend upon the different types of metaphysical reality as such.⁵⁰

In another work, he provides the perspective of the Catholic Greek Fathers' view of the outflowing of divine love, and we see the same metaphysical structure.⁵¹ To grapple with the reality of man and God presents challenges for any thinker, indeed, it is the very problem of the reality of God he wrote about so cogently. It is here that one can discern the importance of Zubiri's comment that "Metaphysics and the metaphysical are not something that are just *there*; they have to be *done*, they have to be *created*. And therein lies the difficulty."⁵² He made one built upon his Catholic belief, and the Trinitarian structure is seen throughout his works.⁵³ One may affirm that he saw this Trinitarian reality projected into the metaphysical structure of reality; contrarily one may affirm that Zubiri projected this Trinitarian perspective into the metaphysical structure. He took this Trinity as the ground of reality and God as self-giving. Reality gives of itself in dynamism.

The different types of metaphysical reality as such are what he calls 'closed essences' and 'open essences'. Things are closed. That is, though they are real, and though they are *de suyo* [in their own right], things are not open to their own reality. They do not *know* they are real with their own reality. Open essences are humans, realities which are open to all forms of reality including their own reality as a form of reality. In closed essences, an example of which is fire which burns because God made fire to be fire, things are of their own what they are and act as they do according to their real properties. Open essences, i.e. humans, are what they are in their own right (*de suyo*) from their own reality and appropriate possibilities in order to project their lives in reality. They do so with a donation from God that is *agape*, love.

If we fail to affirm that Zubiri's intramundane metaphysics is founded upon

this extramundane perspective, I think we do not read Zubiri correctly. He affirms clearly that "there is a reality, God, which is formally extramundane."⁵⁴ This Reality, he states, projects itself *ad extra*, a projection of "the very Trinitarian life,"⁵⁵ adhering to the Greek Fathers. This is the ground of the structure of projection as illumined by Zubiri's mind. As a ground, as any ground is, we must acknowledge that this is a *sketch*, that is, "the conversion of the field into a system of reference for the intellection of the possibility of the ground."⁵⁶ From the intellectual field of Catholic theology, one system of reference Zubiri used in his theological thinking and in his sketching the structure of projection was Greek Catholic thought. Since my intent is keeping with the structure of projection, I shall not develop this line of thought.

For Zubiri's intramundane metaphysics, his point of departure was in the thing; the notes of any real thing in our apprehension are *its projections*, its *ex-*. As a psychologically minded person, I feel the need to assert here that the way Zubiri can take his point of departure from *in the thing* is through the use of his imagination. As a human, as an open essence open to all forms of reality, he was open to the reality of things. However, as a human, he was not a *thing* that could assert "my notes are the projected structure of my reality." As a human reality he could, however, affirm that "my" notes are the projected structure of "my" substantivity, the actualization "of my reality in each of the acts of my life."⁵⁷ This is a constructed metaphysics, a metaphysic of *things* constructed by a human. It is eminently plausible and is so because as a reality the human reality must project life and human "properties", "virtues", "attributes" (notes) of one's being and personality from its own reality.

A human can appropriate notes, i.e. virtues, possibilities of ways of being in reality and makes choices as to what to appropriate and what to not appropriate, something which things cannot do. We know that our action in the world, our

being in the world, is enacted *from within*.⁵⁸ Even if one avers that there is no intellectual psyche, acts of consciousness are enacted from within. Because humans do so, and because humans encompass and comprehend things, we can imagine that this is the structure of projection for things. Without imagination as an act of the intellectual psyche, intellection could not construct new concepts or fictions or create new things in order to comprehend reality better. What we comprehend better are the notes the real thing in reality is projecting to its' exterior and in our apprehension of its reality. Zubiri uses the term fantasy and asserts that it is the "essence of human imagination."⁵⁹ "What man has forged with his fantasy, not simply schematic, but also creative, can be tolerated or not by reality. In whatever measures it tolerates it or not, that activity of the fantasy, as far as the intelligence is concerned, leads to a result: that man may believe he has understood reality."⁶⁰

Conscious projection or unconscious projection is or is not tolerated by reality, depending upon each situation (using projection in a psycho-organic sense). Consciously, one projects the virtues which have been made actual in one's life; one projects them through word, attitude, and behavior. Perhaps these capacities have not been learned in our family environments and then these virtues must be appropriated later: love, patience, time, respect, contact, honor, trust, cleanliness, punctuality, thrift, orderliness, politeness, etc., etc. are some of these virtues.⁶¹ Unfortunately, there are situations when one's capacities which have been appropriated, are inappropriate or are inappropriately applied.

Cleanliness will provide our example. "Cleanliness is next to godliness" is a common idiom heard in the west. This capacity is learned, based upon the capacity to know. Perhaps one grew up in a family where cleanliness was unimportant, or where someone else took care of cleanliness. In other social situations, the lack of cleanliness becomes problematic for oneself and others and leads to conflict. On

the other hand, perhaps one grew in a family where cleanliness was taken to the extreme and any form of uncleanness was not tolerated: children had to be careful when playing not to soil their clothing, even outdoors, lest the caregiver punish the child. "Yesterday I screamed at Lydia 'How often have I told you not to come in so dirty. It always looks like a pigpen in our home!' As a child I also had to look clean as a whistle when I went outside." (40-year-old mother, constant headaches, no organic cause found.)⁶² Cleanliness is consciously projected into the environment, but done so in an inappropriate way.

Reality tolerates what has been forged by imagination, by fantasy, or it does not tolerate it. Psychologists know well that fantasy is used as a compensation to external reality which is not as one desires. A child lives in a family where the caregivers have no time for them and there is no contact between them other than what is minimally needed for sustenance. In compensation, a child projects this need onto things where in fantasy the things have ample time for the child, or in fantasizing living in a home where the child is queen or king.⁶³ I have worked with clients who lived fantasy lives where cartoon characters are substituted for absent parents, or where books serve to substitute for attention from a caregiver. Reality tolerates this when the person is young, but when they mature and are in other situations, such fantasy no longer is tolerated, that is, the psychological compensation no longer 'works'. Social reality tolerates such fantasies as long as they serve a purpose and are not pathologically dysfunctional.

A reader may be asking how Zubiri's philosophical notion of projection and that found in psychology and dynamic psychotherapy can be related other than conceptually. Zubiri refers to the structure of projection as it relates to a reality projecting its notes externally and actualized intellectually; psychotherapy considers projection as an unconscious dynamic. This unconscious is used as an *entified* referent, 'the unconscious', as well as an adject-

tival one; I use it adjectivally and agree with Zubiri that there is not 'the unconscious' though there are unconscious acts. However, in that Zubiri's use of projection implies that a reality projects its inside "naturally," according to its own nature, I use projection in the same manner. All reality exists "in its own right" (*de suyo*). Yet, an open essence, the human, "is defined not by the notes that it naturally has, but by its system of possibilities; and hence it makes itself, so to speak, with the possibilities. 'Its-own-ness' [*suyo*] is what makes an essence to be open. This open essence of man is the ground of his freedom, in turn the ground of his moral nature."⁶⁴

I use projection as something which the human being has "naturally". From an intramundane metaphysic and psychology, the human being as a form of reality, not only projects life but projects one's unconscious dynamics into the life one is projecting. This projection happens "naturally". It is only with conscious awareness of one's unconscious projections that these projections may be 'withdrawn', may be understood, reduced, integrated as conscious actions, and turned into possibilities. Dynamic psychology has demonstrated the usefulness and naturalness of projection for human development, as well as its dysfunctionality in other situations. There is ample psychological evidence to support such a dynamic process. In this sense, the human psycho-organic reality projects aspects of its reality outward, into reality.

Projection, then, as the actualization of the notes of every reality, pertains to the human reality as well. It simply, philosophically must if it does so at all. Human projection must be taken to be psycho-organic as well as manifesting one's reality of which the "myself", "to me", and "I" are integral dimensions. The organism has possibilities it can manifest, possibilities which can be appropriated, and limitations as to what can be appropriated. The psyche likewise has possibilities it manifests, it appropriates and its' limitations; unlike the corporeal organism, the intel-

lective human psyche can *unlearn* possibilities it has appropriated. The body does not unlearn without the involvement of the psyche. Even the family system can unlearn unhealthy manners of projecting family life. This unlearning affects the organism. Once the body has learned something (thinking here neurophysiologically and biochemically) it does not change in the sense of *becoming*, without intervention. This intervention may be chemical, i.e. medicinal or psychotropic, or it may be psychological. The field of psychoneuro-immunology documents in great detail how psyche changes the body and the immune system, the brain system, and hormonal system, to name only these. The corporeal reality does not unlearn on its own. Since the human is a psycho-organic reality we cannot separate this system in reality, but illumine different aspects of it philosophically. Hormonal changes in the body, neurological changes in the brain likewise implicate psyche. Changes in any subsystem implicate the entire substantivity.

The project and the situation

As mentioned previously, situation is an important metaphysical category in Zubiri's philosophy. It is so, he asserts, only for living organisms. Each living organism, like each reality, is in a position (*locus*). To *things* it is inconsequential what place it is in, though rigorously speaking not all things can be in any place, but it must be in some place. For living organisms, *where* it is matters; it is found among other realities in a particular situation (*situs*). For an organism, "a single positioning gives rise to quite diverse situations. Thus positioned and situated among things, the living organism lives by its vital processes."⁶⁵ One's situation is based upon one's location and provides an orientation in life.

The human finds itself, as expressed earlier, living between states of being in different situations. In the dynamism of life, stability of the organism is maintained only by not being the same. In the process

of life, an organism must maintain itself by not remaining the same—it must ingest nutrients, mobilize enzymes, change positions, adjust to the inner and outer media providing for its life, etc. Living beings are in situations, humans are no exception. “While the animal only resolves situations and makes small predispositions, man transcends his actual situation and produces artifacts that are not only made ad hoc for a determined situation but are also situated in the reality of things, in what these things are ‘of themselves’[*de suyo*].”⁶⁶ Humans must make their lives and shape their substantive being each instant. We do so with things, with myself, and with others.

I do so in reality and with an idea of what *my* reality is and what will become of me. The formal definition of situation given by Zubiri was provided by Augustine of Hippo (354-430 CE): “What is going to become of me.”⁶⁷ The situation, he states, must be resolved. It is resolved, not just with the substances which compose our corporeal form, but by making decisions with the possibilities available for solving it. Some possibilities are appropriated, others are renounced. We *surrender* to those possibilities we have accepted and actualized in the situation we find ourselves in. Different actions might be performed with the resources we have in any situation; these actions are the possibilities open to us. The resources we have are the things surrounding us and those of our own reality and of others.

As an open essence, Zubiri avers that the human is open to its own personality *causally*.⁶⁸ Personal causality is an important element of Zubiri’s philosophy of the human, a form of causality overlooked in many other philosophies; it is a form of causality not given in nature. We are causally open to our own reality in three dimensions:

1) “*the dimension that faces the things themselves*”: since things are resources for possibilities of actions, we must acknowledge that the possibilities are limited depending on the thing and situa-

tion. We are forced to opt for a possibility. We can opt to do nothing, and this is a real option. “Now, this force that possibilities, resources, impose on the human being has an absolutely concrete name: it is *power*, or *Macht* in German. It is a *power*.” The power of the real is “an *ultimate power*”; it is in reality, relegated to reality, that we make our lives and opt for possibilities of how we will be in reality. We are in this sense, the author of our life.

- 2) Zubiri’s philosophy is a philosophy of dynamic structures of reality. Reality is dynamic, a dynamic ‘giving of itself’ and each reality gives of itself. It does so because the divine gives of itself in creating. Human dynamism is called “appropriation.” “Causality in relation to possibility is appropriation on the part of the human being. Human beings appropriate some possibilities and undo others.” This is the second dimension.
- 3) There are consequences to our appropriation when we appropriate a possibility: the option “confers power on a possibility” and “the power of the possibility takes possession of the human being, and that is *empowerment*. In causal appropriation, the human being has power and is constitutively empowered by what it does.” Empowerment is the actualization of possibility through an event or happening in life. Empowerment is the third dimension.

The power of the possibility takes possession of us...we are empowered by the possibilities we opt for. We may make options which are not beneficial to us which we must later rescind or unlearn.

We realize our lives in situations and do so with projects. In the projects of life, we project our lives because we cannot remain the same; no situation is sustainable forever. Moreover, while we remain the same individually, we do not remain the same because the notes of our substantivity are modified by reality. When we opt for a possibility and are empowered by it, we make a “personal response” in our life. For

the human, as a sentient intellection, sensation is intellective and intellection is sentient. Because intellection is defined by Zubiri to be the actualization of reality, we must choose how to respond to the situations we find ourselves in and choose which possibility to enact with the resources (things, others, and ourselves) at our disposal. Since there are a limited number of possibilities each reality provides for us, we choose one or we may invent one. We do not merely respond to stimuli, but to realities; we are empowered by these realities. Zubiri asserts that prior to this empowerment is a dynamic moment "which is the projection, the project. *Every possibility is an inchoate project*" (emphasis original).

When we face the ever changing situations of life and are forced to realize ourselves in life with things, with others, and with ourselves, the possibilities we have appropriated or learned do not guarantee a suitable response. We must choose the response to situations, and often times do so unconsciously, i.e. habitually. There are implicit memory patterns, internal working models, mental models, and ways of responding that happen automatically in our being. We learn many ways of responding in our family of origin that are suitable there, but not suitable for other situations; we must unlearn these and learn or appropriate new possibilities for action.

It was mentioned earlier that value is an objective moment of reality as affectant. Psychologically, value is experienced by the intensity of affect. One values cleanliness and overlooks punctuality, for example, and becomes physically agitated in an unclean environment. When we are forced to be in a new situation, we are forced to be in one state of reality different from the previous one and we have an affect about the situation we find ourselves in. For Zubiri, *state* is an essential concept. It means that: "being-here-and-now' is a 'being situated in' something."⁶⁹ Every situation, with all realities found in that situation, eventually disappears and what is important for the new situation is what remains of the past situation. The previous realities

have disappeared and leave us with their value, "with how much the thing is worth. Together with that, what remains is the *eidos* [idea] of what I was doing and how I felt, i.e. how I was."⁷⁰ The remaining of the idea of what I was doing and how I felt becomes part of our memory; strong affect creates strong memories and it is these events we can often recall more easily. Moreover, the memories of events are not just intellective, they are also neurophysiological; we may say they are psychorganic.

Based upon the past, existing in the present, and anticipating the future, the human reality "is projecting himself in every instant as reality in reality."⁷¹ We project what we have been into what we are and what we might become. We project unconsciously, implicitly, the past experiences of events into the current events and may continue doing so into future events unless we become aware of our projections that are not suitable for the situation. We can project consciously, intentionally, the virtues and attributes we have appropriated in the past into the present situations and continue doing so in future ones. Moreover, we can continue—assuming we have the capability mentally—to appropriate or acquire the uniquely human characteristics we call virtues. We humans mold our lives by surrendering to what we have appropriated and the empowerment from these realities so appropriated. Sometimes we appropriate aspects we do not want, and then we must unlearn them and appropriate other ones.

As mentioned above, we must resolve the situations we find ourselves in. On this resolution Zubiri expresses: "He has to renounce in order to live and has to surrender to what he has accepted. The articulation between renounce and surrender is what gives to the realization of human life the characteristic of risk. This is how one's figure is established, by molding the reality one has projected to be."⁷²

I have written above that in current approaches to psychology, the reality of projection is taken to be largely unconscious. While I am surely not denying this aspect

to projection I submit it is insufficient for a full understanding of human psychological reality. I also submit that Zubiri's notion of projection can be expanded to consider how we project our psycho-organic substantivity into the family and social reality. If, as Zubiri affirms, every reality projects their 'inside' to the 'outside', the human intellectual psyche must do so as affirmed by the last citation from Zubiri. Inasmuch as I, like Zubiri, am adhering to an intramundane consideration of our reality, it must be acknowledged that the psyche, as a reality, projects. Since the psyche and organism form one integrated corporeal system, we cannot say only that the psyche projects but that when the psyche projects, the organism is implicated. When we become aware of our projections and make them conscious the organic subsystem changes on neurophysiological, hormonal, and behavioral levels.

An example will help here: a child has learned to hate a person of another race, tribe, religion, or color. They have learned this from their family who has persistently reinforced it. One day this child, curious about these other people, innocently talks to one of them. The parent observes this and immediately calls the child over, upbraids her or him, punishes her or him and instills fear into the child. This is a learned response; the child then projects this learned prejudice onto members of this other group unconsciously. Later in life, having learned to avoid such people of the other group, the young adult must work with a member of this possibly feared group. The person must make a choice—to continue with this prejudice which has been learned and thenceforward projected, or resolve it and unlearn it. In learning how to unlearn, the person experiences anxiety, fear, nervousness, tension, etc., as they begin to confront this projection. Through time, persistence, patience, and effort, the projection is ceased, the implicit patterns changed, and there is no longer a neurophysiological response when in the

presence of any member of this other group. Projection may come from learning or from our own encounters with particular others that are then generalized and projected onto myriad others.

An example on the positive aspect of projection may be useful as well. A person, having recognized their untruthful pattern of interacting with others, begins to learn new religious teachings which stress the fundamental importance of truthfulness for spiritual development: "Truthfulness is the foundation of all human virtues. Without truthfulness, progress and success in all of the worlds of God are impossible for a soul. When this holy attribute is established in man, all the divine qualities will also become realized."⁷³

Previously, while not a blatant liar, lying was an easy way to escape unpleasant situations, get out of trouble, avoid uncomfortable difficulties, etc. However, when this person lied, they were anxious, noticed their stomach was upset, their appetite reduced, and they perspired lest they be discovered by another; through time, it became less distressful but still noticeable. Having given some thought to this virtue, which is new to them, they begin to notice upon reflection when they have lied and why, though it had been after the fact. In new situations, the habitual pattern of lying occurs and the person becomes aware of it, feeling uncomfortable immediately. Another time in a new situation, the person faces a time where lying may 'work', but has made the conscious decision not to lie. Though it may feel uncomfortable and unfamiliar to be truthful, the person resolves this situation by being truthful. By persistent practice, eventually he or she notices that they have renounced lying and surrendered to being truthful—and may now need to appropriate other virtues and learn tact, wisdom, candor, etc.—and projects this appropriated virtue habitually. Instead of lying, one is truthful and feels positive emotions at the change. It changes one's social dynamics as well as one's psychophysical organism.

Conclusion

In this article I have brought together two different fields of human understanding, the philosophical as presented by Zubiri, and the psychological as created by Nossrat Peseschkian. When I first encountered Peseschkian's contribution to psychotherapy, I was excited at the prospects it held for psychological clients as well as intellectually. I think it's fair to admit that though my mentality is formed psychologically, there is a deep philosophical aspect to it as well. I have written in this journal and a book about Zubiri and Carl Jung, with the intent of using Zubiri to 're-vision' Jung and place it upon a firmer philosophical foundation. With the tools of Peseschkian's Positive Psychotherapy, I find that I can draw out the firm philosophical foundation of his contribution—there is not a lot that I have found to re-think philosophically.

Though Peseschkian does not develop the notion of projection, with the philosophy of Zubiri, I have worked here to draw this element out explicitly. We project the capacities we acquire in our life into our relationship with things, others, and ourselves. Some capacities we have appropriated as infants and youth we must distance ourselves from and unlearn. This distancing mandates that we learn to differentiate the capacities, the virtues we have, in order to unlearn them or develop latent ones.

This notion of "distancing" or "stepping back" is, to one familiar with Zubiri's philosophy, an important moment of sentient intellection. We apprehend something; we 'step back' or distance ourselves intellectually from what this thing is as real and in doing so there is a gap which opens—the gap of what this real thing is 'in reality' among other realities, and what it is *de suyo*. This gap demands to be filled by our simple apprehensions. Psychologically applied, one is obsessed with cleanliness, for example. One then learns to be more relaxed about it, after learning why one was so obsessed by this particular capacity. In the process of this unlearning, one

must learn to hold the tension of an old response pattern, intellectually and emotionally distance oneself from the reality outside which has been identified as 'unclean' and adopt a new option to choose from: it is not *that* unclean, it's ok for now considering....

Zubiri did not develop the real dimension of projection for the human reality, though he mentions it. I think one reason he was reluctant to do so is a concern he had: if we think that we project onto things what their qualities are, we overlook the contribution of an intra-mundane metaphysics he was making. *Things* project their real qualities outside. They do so habitually, unconsciously, as a dimension of their nature. Humans, on the other hand, project some of our capacities intentionally, others unintentionally and unconsciously. We can, by appropriating virtues we are lacking, project a fuller expression of our reality. "Human beings create the possibility of reality before producing the reality. Precisely this resembles divine Creation."⁷⁴

The human must resolve many problems life places in its path—intellectually, emotionally and relationally. The problem of the divine is one that Zubiri faced squarely, and his intramundane metaphysics is founded upon an extramundane theological view: the God projects His reality *ad extra*. Whether or not one chooses to resolve this problem of God, and how one chooses to resolve it, has serious implications for one's life and the capacities one has as possibilities to appropriate. One learns to love another; one learns from the Bible that "God is love", or from the Qur'an that love is one of the many qualities of God. One learns from neuroscience that love has specific neurochemical dimensions. One learns that one can love one's neighbor as oneself, implying that one must learn how to love oneself if the family environment denigrated the self. Furthermore, one learns that by loving more fully, one embodies this attribute of the divine so that one does not just love their country, but learns to love mankind.

By focusing here on the dynamic structure of projection, I have revealed and projected my understanding of it in order that it can be further developed philosophically and psycho-logically. The capacities identified by Peseschkian, the virtues identified in all religious systems are possibilities that we humans must choose to appropriate. Since the divine projects reality, we can choose to project aspects of our reality which are not part of nature but which we can develop. As cited previously from Zubiri, "Virtue is moral physics"; when one

appropriates a virtue, it changes one's neurophysiology and this has profound social repercussions. To become aware of what we are projecting, both positively and negatively, presents a great challenge to humanity in this phase of human evolution—globalization. When we 'withdraw' our negative projections we see the darkness in our own being and metaphorically "pull the beam from our own eye"; when we develop divine virtues, we project the light of divinity into the world and help illumine it.

Notes

- 1 Zubiri (1984). *Man & God*, translated by J. Redondo, Thomas Fowler, and Nelson Orringer, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2009. p. 276-277. (subsequent references given as *M&G*).
- 2 *Ibid.*, p. 276.
- 3 [Editor's note: this quote not included in the "Translators' Introduction" to the published version of *Man and God*.]
- 4 Zubiri (1981). *Nature, History, God*, translated by Thomas Fowler, p. 327 (subsequent references given as *NHG*)
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 373
- 6 Zubiri, (1997). *Christianity*, translated by J. Redondo, p. 567 (subsequent references given as *CHR*).
- 7 Zubiri (1999). *Intelligence and Logos*, part II of *Sentient Intelligence*, translated by T. Fowler, p. 71 (subsequent references given as *IL*.)
- 8 *M&G*, p. 155.
- 9 *Ibid.*, pp. 54. In another work, Dr. Manuel Mejido Costoya, translates *cada cual* as "each one". See Costoya, M (2004). *The Historical Dimension of the Human Being*. Originally published in *De Realitas I* (1972/1973): 11-69. Spain: Madrid. Retrieved Oct. 10, 2007 from http://www.zubiri.org/works/englishworks/Historical_Dimension.htm
- 10 *Ibid.*, p. 78.
- 11 *Ibid.*, p. 79
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 80
- 13 *Ibid.* p. 265-266.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 85
- 15 *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 203
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 28
- 18 Zubiri (2003). *Dynamic Structure of Reality*, translated by N. Orringer, p. 157 (subsequent references given as *DSR*).
- 19 *M&G*, p. 227.
- 20 *CHR*, p. 205. The 'open essence' Zubiri aduced will be discussed in a subsequent section.
- 21 *DSR*, p. 142.
- 22 *NHG*, p. 5
- 23 See *Intelligence and Reality*, part I of *Sentient Intelligence*, translated by T. Fowler, p. 228 (subsequent references given as *IRE*).
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 146
- 25 *DSR*, p. 147
- 26 *CHR*, p. 211. For a fuller discussion of Zubiri's thought, see *Philosophical Problems in the History of Religion* (1993), translated by J. Redondo, p. 34 (cited below as *PPHR*). All of Redondo's works are available at <http://www.catholicphilosophy.com>
- 27 Peseschkian, N. (2000) *Positive Psychotherapy*, New Delhi, India: New Dawn, p. 116
- 28 This triple delineation derives from Zubiri's consideration of 'real truth' in *IRE* p. 247
- 29 *DSR*, p. 113-114
- 30 Whalen, P., Rauch, S., Etcoff, N., McInerney,

- S., Lee, M., & Jenike, M. (1998). "Masked Presentations of Emotional and Facial Expressions Modulate Amygdala Activity without Explicit Knowledge." *The Journal of Neuroscience* 18 (1): 411-418.
- ³¹ Peseshkian, *op. cit.*, p. 124
- ³² *IRE*, p. 103
- ³³ *Ibid.*, p. 284. In this consideration I am only referring to the animal and human generally. Zubiri explicates his view regarding sensation as it pertains to animal evolution in *DSR*.
- ³⁴ *DSR*, p. 120
- ³⁵ *IRE*, p. 284
- ³⁶ For relevant research see, e.g., many the works by John Bowlby, Mary Ainsworth, Allan Schore.
- ³⁷ Simply speaking, co-dependency is a psychological concept referring to patterns of behavior wherein one manifests compulsive, maladaptive behaviors which have been learned in families where there was great distress and/or emotional pain. It initially began as a concept to discuss alcoholic families and their interactions which are carried over into patterns of interaction with others. Again, these patterns are projected onto and into other relationships.
- ³⁸ *M&G*, p. 42
- ³⁹ *PPHR*, p. 21
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.28
- ⁴¹ For a fuller consideration see Peseshkian, N. (1985) *In Search of Meaning*, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag; (1986) *Positive Family Therapy*, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag; and especially (1986) *Psychotherapy of Every Day Life*, Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag; (2000) *Positive Psychotherapy*, New Delhi, India: New Dawn
- ⁴² Peseshkian, N. (1986). *Positive Family Therapy: The Family as Therapist*, p. 160
- ⁴³ Greenspan, S, & Shanker, S. (2004). *The First Idea*. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, p. 56
- ⁴⁴ *DSR*, P. 149
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 153
- ⁴⁶ *OE*, p. 148
- ⁴⁷ Zubiri (1980) *On Essence*, Trans. A. Caponigri. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press p. 400 (subsequent citations given as *OE*)
- ⁴⁸ In *OE*, he delineates these notes a reality projects as constitutive, constitutional, and adventitious. It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this more fully, but mention it since the notes projected derive from all these types of notes.
- ⁴⁹ *OE* 128
- ⁵⁰ *M&G*, p. 227.
- ⁵¹ See *NHG*, "Supernatural being: God and deification in Pauline theology"; see also, *CHR*, p. 201
- ⁵² Zubiri (1994). *Fundamental Problems of Western Metaphysics*, translated by J. Redondo and Thomas Fowler, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, forthcoming November, 2009, p. 20.
- ⁵³ I have commented on this in another article written and included in this journal; see "Some thoughts on metaphor in cognitive psychology and Zubiri's 'Sentient Intelligence'", *Xavier Zubiri Review*, Vol. 9, 2007, p. 133-154 footnote 55.
- ⁵⁴ *OE*, p. 431
- ⁵⁵ *CHR*, p. 205
- ⁵⁶ Zubiri (1999). *Intelligence and Reason*, translated by T. Fowler, p. 220 (subsequent references given as *IR*)
- ⁵⁷ *DSR*, p. 147
- ⁵⁸ This *from within* implies, here, the entire personal human system: corporeal organism (body) and intellective psyche. In Zubiri's thought, neither body of itself, nor psyche of itself has substantivity, each is not a system. Only the psycho-organic unity is a system. "*I* act from *within* this system, not from *outside* of it. "*I* project my thoughts, beliefs, behaviors, moods, affects, etc., from within this system out into the world. "*I* may be conscious or unconscious of what "*I* project.
- ⁵⁹ *IL* p. 101
- ⁶⁰ Zubiri (1986). *On Man*, translated by J. Redondo, p. 656
- ⁶¹ These virtues or capacities are given inasmuch as they are used in Positive Psychotherapy, but there are many more which have been given in the world's religious, mystical, and philosophical literature.

⁶² From Peseshkian, N. *Psychotherapy of Every Day Life*, p. 74

⁶³ I am thinking here not only of things such as toys, but also animals, TV programs, books, and forms of technology.

⁶⁴ Fowler, T. This is from the introduction to *Sentient Intelligence*

⁶⁵ *IRE*, p. 94

⁶⁶ Zubiri (1967). *On the origin of man*, translated by A. R. Caponigri. Retrieved from <http://www.zubiri.org>.

⁶⁷ *OM*, p. 644

⁶⁸ The following citations come from Zubiri's *DSR*, p. 153-157

⁶⁹ *IRE*, p. 63

⁷⁰ *OM*, p. 646

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 654

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 658

⁷³ 'Abdul-Bahá, cited in Shoghi Effendi, *The Advent of Divine Justice* Wilmette, IL: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1990.

⁷⁴ *DSR*, p. 157

About the author: Theo Cope holds a PhD in Applied Psychology. He has been living and teaching in China for over 10 years now. He is a counselor, holding a certificate in Family consultant of Positive Psychotherapy from the Wiesbaden Academy of Psychotherapy. Currently he is counseling and lecturing at Dongbei University of Finance & Economics in Dalian, Liaoning Province, China. He can be reached via email at china.psych@gmail.com