CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Research Topic

This dissertation explores the phenomenon of psychological multiplicity. Psychological multiplicity has been defined as a psyche made up of loosely integrated identities that form a coherent whole. Psychological multiplicity is the experience of having different aspects of oneself that have different emotions, agendas, values, dreams, and hopes at the same time. Aftab Omer defines multiplicity as “the existence of many distinct and often encapsulated centers of subjectivity within the experience of the same individual.” At Meridian University, where psychological multiplicity is explored in the curriculum, it has been noted that when individuals begin to access their multiplicity, there is sometimes a grandiose enactment by one of these parts of the self.

Grandiosity has been defined by Reese Price as an exaggerated claim of an individual’s own importance and an entitled sense of feeling special. A grandiose enactment is an acute change in the thoughts, feelings, and behavior of an individual that reflects this sense of exaggerated importance and entitled specialness. In the context of multiplicity, a grandiose enactment is mediated by a part of the self whose strongly charged energy is able to affect the normal non-grandiose behavior of the individual. These enactments may come from a part that has grandiose energy or come from a non-grandiose part that becomes inflated. Grandiosity is generally linked with narcissism in psychology, but the individuals that exhibit grandiosity as they explore their multiplicity,
may not be pervasively narcissistic or grandiose. This dissertation investigated the nature of grandiose subjectivities in individuals who have explored their own multiplicity.

According to Regina Goulding and Richard C. Schwartz, the multiple identities within an individual psyche are generally called parts, ego states, subpersonalities, selves, or alters in the literature. From the perspective of Imaginal Psychology, Mary Watkins refers to these identities as imaginal figures. Omer uses the term, encapsulated subjectivities, to describe these states. All of these terms are not exactly synonymous, but they all describe subjective states of a psyche that is naturally a multiplicity. When the boundaries of these subjective states become inflexible, the individual may begin to experience some problems. Omer uses the term encapsulated to describe the inflexibility of these subjective states. When an encapsulated subjectivity takes over the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of the individual, it causes them to lose reflexivity. Reflexivity is the capacity to engage and be aware of the imaginal structures that shape and constitute our experience. Omer defines imaginal structures as:

assemblies of sensory, affective, and cognitive aspects of experience constellated into images; they both mediate and constitute experience. The specifics of an imaginal structure are determined by an interaction of personal, cultural, and archetypal influences.

An encapsulated subjectivity is not aware of the imaginal structures that bind it. When an encapsulated subjectivity takes control, it is problematic because the individual responds to life situations with a minimum of self-awareness and flexibility. Flexibility is limited by controlling encapsulated subjectivities because they do not have access to the broad range of capacities that are potentially available to the individual.
Omer defines \textit{capacity} as:

a distinct dimension of human development and human evolution that delineates a specific potential for responding to a domain of life experience. For example, Compassion responds to Suffering; Courage responds to Danger; Fate responds to Uncertainty; Reflexivity responds to Personal Identity, and so on.\textsuperscript{xii}

In Imaginal Psychology, multiplicity is considered the natural state of the psyche. The psyche or soul is inherently a multiplicity of energies and voices. Individuals usually identify with their normal experience of identity and experience themselves as unitary. This sense of self or identity is typically called the ego in psychology but could simply be called the \textit{I}, based on Sigmund Freud’s work, as explained by Bruno Bettelheim.\textsuperscript{xiii} This sense of “I-ness” is based on images of the self.

All individuals have a \textit{core identity} that Omer defines thusly:

Core identity refers to the unique endowment of particularities that unfold, mature, and guide transformations of identity through the life span. Core identity is the unique endowment of particularities that makes individuation a possibility. There is a unique endowment that unfolds, matures, and guides the various transformations of identity.\textsuperscript{xiv}

The core identity becomes an \textit{adaptive identity} when a child has to respond to life stress and trauma. Omer’s full definition of adaptive identity is as follows:

In the course of coping with environmental impingement, as well as overwhelming events, the developing soul constellates self images associated with adaptive patterns of reactivity. These self-images persist as an adaptive identity into subsequent contexts where they are maladaptive and barriers to the unfolding of being.\textsuperscript{xv}

In the state of adaptive identity, the multiplicity of the psyche is repressed by the phenomenon of \textit{gatekeeping}. According to Omer:

Gatekeeping refers to the individual and collective dynamics that resist and restrict experience. The term gatekeeper refers to the personification of these dynamics. Cultural gatekeepers restrict experience; cultural leaders catalyze the deepening and diversification of experience.\textsuperscript{xvi}
As multiplicity is explored, one finds that the I shares the inner world with many other psychic parts or subjectivities. If this exploration is deep enough, individuals can transmute their adaptive identity to a reflexive identity. In reflexive identity, multiplicity is integrated, as Omer puts it, “Reflexive identity sustains coherence while experiencing distinct centers of subjectivity within a spacious field and is responsive to influence.” xvii

In integrated multiplicity the I is experienced as unitary, but one knows that multiplicity exists within that sense of unity. Integrated multiplicity is a relatively well-adjusted state of multiplicity in which reflexivity exists between the I and the major encapsulated subjectivities.

It is through the exploration of imaginal structures that individuals will find that the self is in fact a multiplicity of voices, many of which come from encapsulated subjectivities. Imaginal Process is an approach to transformative learning that is used at Meridian University. xviii Imaginal Process consists of a variety of Transformative Practices including, ritual, dialoguing with an image, art making, body centered practices and, journal writing. xix Transformative Practices can start with an image based on an imaginal structure and bring it to life as an imaginal figure. An imaginal figure is essentially the personified image of psychic energy. xx Transformative Practices use the capacity of personification in which the psyche naturally represents parts of itself like a person, to turn an image into a figure. M. Watkins calls the types of Transformative Practices mentioned above waking dreams because images that come to individuals when awake can sometimes be as powerful as those that appear naturally in dreams. xxi

In Imaginal Psychology, the term imaginal figure is widely used. xxii As personified images, they can be quite fleeting and change rapidly. The term, encapsulated
subjectivity, is related but different. An encapsulated subjectivity is a discrete subjective psychic state bound by imaginal structures. Different imaginal figures might represent the energy of a single encapsulated subjectivity in the psyche at different times. According to M. Watkins, the basic psychic function of an imaginal figure is to connect the individual with the deeper levels of psyche using myth and symbol.

An encapsulated subjectivity is a similar concept to an ego state as defined by John G. Watkins and Helen H. Watkins. In their conception of the psyche, there is a core ego along with multiple ego states. J. Watkins and H. Watkins define an ego state as “an organized system of behavior and experience whose elements are bound together by some common principle, and which is separated from other such states by a boundary that is more or less permeable.” An encapsulated subjectivity is a broader concept than the ego state, however, in that it includes the transpersonal or archetypal dimension of these subjective states just as a complex does, a concept articulated by Carl G. Jung. Complexes are feeling toned aggregates of psychic energy in the personal unconscious. In Imaginal Psychology, Omer posits that encapsulated subjectivities exist with the I and a vast array of potential archetypal energies. Together, all of these psychic states create an individual’s multiplicity.

Goulding and Schwartz suggest that multiplicity is considered the normal state of the psyche in many areas of thought including psychological disciplines, philosophy, and the arts. Robert A. Johnson states that some parts of the psyche are archetypal, inherent to the psyche, and some are developed as life is experienced. There is some overlap between archetypal and developmental subjectivities however. Subjectivities that are formed developmentally have an archetypal aspect in that they follow archetypal
patterns and those that are archetypal, are influenced and shaped by developmental experience.

The developmental view of the formation of ego states of the psyche is summarized well by J. Watkins and H. Watkins. If the innate or archetypal aspects of these subjective states are acknowledged, then this description works well to describe the developmental side of encapsulated subjectivities as well. J. Watkins and H. Watkins state that the psyche normally differentiates into ego states as people experience the world as children. Differentiation is an adaptive process that helps a child to negotiate a complex world. For example, a child develops ego states that allow them to behave differently in the classroom with their teacher, than when at play with peers on the playground.

Multiplicity is a normal phenomenon that has positive effects on individuals. George Boone has shown empirically that multiplicity increases adaptability and flexibility. Boone’s research shows that multiplicity exists in normally well-adjusted people, an assertion that is imbedded in the curriculum at Meridian University. At its best, multiplicity is balanced and the parts of the psyche are highly functional and communicate well with each other. Healthy or integrated multiplicity results when children have supportive enough environments when growing up. Integrated multiplicity is a form of reflexive identity.

Multiplicity becomes problematic when subjectivities become disengaged from the individual’s sense of identity. In these problematic forms of multiplicity, discrete subjectivities do not communicate well or function smoothly with the I or each other. The I may also be problematic in multiplicity if it considers itself the only entity in the
In this case, other subjectivities may result in the individual doing things that create problems for themselves and others.

In problematic multiplicity, the I weakly leads a limited group of encapsulated subjectivities and those subjectivities will assume leadership of the psychic system when they feel threatened. Subjectivities that have succeeded in similar situations in the past will take control during the current situation. The resulting behavior is often not what the individual or many other parts of the psyche desire. Conflict then arises and the individual will experience some form of anxiety.

The intrapsychic conflict or tension that arises in multiplicity does not have to lead to the acting out of encapsulated subjectivities if the identity is reflexive. Hal Stone and Sidra Stone call this state the aware ego. Andrew Samuels suggests that this type of conflict can be resolved by developing a plural psyche. He states “pluralism is an attitude to conflict that tries to reconcile differences without imposing a false resolution on them or losing sight of the unique value of each position.” By working with one’s multiplicity, by letting the subjectivities have their own voice, the adaptive identity can become pluralized or reflexive. In a reflexive identity, many voices are free to speak and the I is able to lead the individual with the guidance of these multiple voices. Omer also calls the I in reflexive identity the “I that leads.” In integrated multiplicity, the I can lead without dominating the parts of self and the I does not have to act alone.

Thomas Moore summarizes the advantages of a reflexive identity when discussing the ego’s role in multiplicity, referring to the parts of the psyche as the many. A relaxed ego that honors the many offers considerable rewards. We find vitality in tension, learn from paradox, gather wisdom by straddling ambivalence, and gain confidence in trusting the confusion that naturally arises from multiplicity.
The relaxed state of identity in Moore’s description comes with the capacity of reflexivity. Reflexivity allows an individual to feel their feelings without being dominated or carried away by them. Reflexivity is also the capacity that allows other capacities to emerge and work together. The capacities or virtues are strongest when many are present at the same time. The ancient Greeks called this the mutual entailment of virtues. Capacities working together allow problematic multiplicity to become integrated multiplicity. With integrated multiplicity, one experiences reflexivity or could be said to have a reflexive identity. With a reflexive identity, capacities or virtues like courage, dignity, compassion, and empathy can arise even if the individual feels threatened or is being challenged. With reflexivity, one need not become defensive in the face of strong affect, in themselves or others, and the psyche need not adopt protective measures like dissociation.

Bennett G. Braun defines dissociation as the separation of behavior, affect, sensation, or thoughts from the rest of the personality. Much of the literature suggests that in traumatic experience, it is the dissociation between pre-existing parts that leads to the less healthy forms of multiplicity. These parts can be either differentiated parts that arose developmentally or archetypal ones. Other authors believe that trauma splits a core unitary self into parts that become dissociated. This view is reflected by the common use of the word fragmentation that is used when trauma and multiplicity are being discussed.

Dissociation is generally viewed to be the cause of pathological forms of multiplicity. If the dissociation is severe enough, very discrete ego states or encapsulated subjectivities will form. If the trauma is severe, chronic, and starts young enough, as in
some cases of child abuse, discrete subjectivities may dissociate even more and result in *Dissociative Identity Disorder* (DID).^{iii}

States of multiplicity exist along a continuum ranging from normal to the *Dissociative Disorders*. There is some confusion around what to term the states of multiplicity that are not in the range of DID. These states have been referred to as normal multiplicity. There is an inherent contradiction in calling these states normal when many of them are causing problems. This dissertation will use the phrase *problematic multiplicity*, coined by Karen Jaenke, to represent the states of multiplicity that are less healthy than a fully integrated multiplicity but not as pathological as seen in DID and the other Dissociative Disorders.^{iii}

From the Jungian point of view, the psyche is a self-balancing multiplicity of archetypal energies.^{lv} An archetype is an inborn potentiality of human behavior.^{lv} Problems can arise when archetypes split and their energies become polarized, especially if one pole is repressed or dissociated.^{lvi} Polarized archetypal energies can become encapsulated subjectivities.

Donald Kalsched has carried these Jungian ideas about the psyche forward into a unified theory called the *archetypal self-care system*. He likens this defensive self-care system of the psyche to the body’s immune system.^{lvii} The normal immune system protects the body from threats like bacteria, viruses, and cancer cells. Similarly, when the psyche is presented with a psychological threat, there is protection and rebalancing through symbolic means.^{lviii} The psyche makes meaning out of the threat, and thus restores psychic balance or health. Normally the immune system protects the body, but sometimes things go awry and an autoimmune disease actually attacks the body.
Kalsched notes that with trauma, protecting archetypal parts can become self-traumatizing much like an autoimmune disease attacks the body.\textsuperscript{lx} Ironically this self-attacking is the result of the psyche trying to protect the core of itself. Kalsched calls this the \textit{archetypal defense of the personal spirit}.\textsuperscript{lx} Kalsched’s model of the traumatized psyche is problematic multiplicity with the self-attacking subjectivities attempting to protect the core identity of the individual.

\textit{Affect Theory}, developed by Silvan Tomkins, explains the full range of human psychological and emotional experience in a way that includes the innate biological affects as well as how human beings use imagery and language.\textsuperscript{lxi} Affect Theory, especially as it relates to \textit{shame}, has helped me to understand others and myself in many ways. The importance of imagery in Affect Theory makes it fit well with Imaginal Psychology.

Of the nine basic affects, as defined by Sylvan Tomkins, shame is the most complex and interesting. Shame is a universal human experience that is not easy to simply define because of its complexity. Shame relates to painful feelings of inadequacy or distress over something that one has done. According to Donald L. Nathanson, shame is the affect that is most linked with an individual's identity or sense of self.\textsuperscript{lxxii} The relationship between identity or sense of self and shame is the aspect of Affect theory that is most integral to the research in this dissertation. Shame has the power to halt all the other affects, to stop an individual’s mental and physical activity and turn their attention inward to think deeply about themselves.\textsuperscript{lxxiii}

In Affect Theory a \textit{governing scene} as explained by Gershon Kaufman is a group of individual scenes that share the same affect, that have been fused together by the mind
into one larger interconnected scene that shape an individual’s view of the world.\textsuperscript{lxiv} Governing scenes involving shame are especially important to the experience of identity.

If shame helps to form an individual’s experience of identity, it is logical to assume that in multiplicity, a self that is made up of a multiple subjective states is also related to shame. Kaufman notes that severe shame can result in dissociation just like trauma can.\textsuperscript{lxv} Kaufman states that shame can become an internalized voice of intolerable defect about the self that can lead to fragmentation of the psyche and multiplicity.\textsuperscript{lxvi} The results of this research suggest that shame is important in the circumscription of the energy of encapsulated subjectivities. Shame may be as important as trauma in the etiology of problematic multiplicity. There is of course some overlap here between shame and trauma because the experience of shame can be very traumatic. Kaufman notes that shame can be so disturbing to the self that he calls it a “sickness of the soul.”\textsuperscript{lxvii} In this dissertation it was assumed that shame was another potential etiology of dissociation between parts of the psyche that creates encapsulated subjectivities. It was also assumed that shame can result in the same type of archetypal splitting that trauma does.

Nathanson states that dissociation can be an unconscious psychological strategy to avoid any strong emotional state but it is seen primarily with intense trauma and shame.\textsuperscript{lxviii} Dissociation is the common link in the disruption of integrated multiplicity during experiences of both trauma and shame. It is dissociation that makes multiplicity turn problematic or pathological, even in DID.

As mentioned earlier, grandiosity, in the form of a grandiose enactment, sometimes emerges as individuals begin to work with their multiplicity. Much is known about grandiosity as the essence of narcissism and how it relates to underlying feelings of
shame. Andrew Morrison states that grandiosity can be a reaction by the self to avoid the pain of inferiority involved with feeling shame.\textsuperscript{lxix} The research in this project is not about narcissism, but is about encapsulated subjectivities that precipitate grandiose enactments and bring out occasional narcissistic tendencies in problematic multiplicity.

Grandiose enactments are sometimes seen when encapsulated subjectivities are personified, given attention, and the chance to speak in multiplicity work. Other times, grandiose enactments seem to naturally erupt in the normal course of events during the life of a group or during therapy as the bonds of the adaptive identity are loosened by the work that is being done in these containers. The ritual space of group work and individual therapy can offer safety and containment for grandiose subjectivities. It is hypothesized in this study, that if grandiosity is worked through, a less problematic, more integrated multiplicity will result. The grandiosity studied in this dissertation includes the more overt exhibitionistic behavior expected with grandiosity but also includes more subtle behaviors as suggested in the definition of grandiosity above, feeling an exaggerated sense of being special and entitled.

Relationship to the Research Topic

I first became interested in multiplicity during my personal therapy years ago when my therapist at the time introduced me to working with parts.\textsuperscript{lxx} I have also experienced subtle grandiose acting out in my self while exploring my multiplicity in my personal therapy and later as a student at Meridian University. An example of a grandiose enactment from my personal therapy from years ago was when I declared, “I’m not going to make mistakes anymore.” The look of shock on my therapist’s face sent me into a
shame state. Upon reflection, I realized that I meant to say something like, “From now on, I will try to make my mistakes learning experiences.” At the time of the first statement I was speaking out of a place of shameful inadequacy and the grandiosity was obvious. Fortunately I made this statement in therapy and was able to explore the shame at the time. The exploration of my grandiose enactments has resulted in some of the most helpful psychological learning experiences that I have had.\textsuperscript{lxxi}

Besides these personal enactments that I remember as transformative moments, I have also noted that I, like most people, am somewhat repulsed by grandiosity in others. This reactivity tells me that I still have shadow material to explore related to grandiose subjectivities because the aspects of others that individuals reject are also what they reject in themselves. Shadow is the Jungian concept that reflects how people repress qualities that do not fit their self-image, like rudeness or selfishness.\textsuperscript{lxii} My personal involvement with grandiose enactments and reactivity to grandiosity make the topic and research question meaningful to me and made the participatory research very rich.

**The Research Problem and Hypothesis**

The Research Problem asks, when grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers? The hypothesis that underlies this research question is that the opportunity to express grandiosity can help shift problematic multiplicity to integrated multiplicity if done with self-awareness.
Research Methodology and Research Design

The research methodology employed was *Imaginal Inquiry*, an aspect of *Imaginal Transformation Praxis*, the theory-in-use at Meridian University. The four phases of Imaginal Inquiry are evoking experience, expressing experience, interpreting experience and integrating experience. Within Imaginal Inquiry, Transformative Practices, an aspect of Imaginal Process, were used to explore the relationships between unfolding multiplicity, shame, and grandiosity.

The research started by showing each participant movie scenes containing examples of a grandiose personality styles in order to evoke and identify problematic subjectivities in each participant. Participants were worked with individually. After watching a film clip, each participant was invited to reflect on the characters depicted to see if the characters related in any way to aspects of themselves. After viewing all of the scenes, the participants easily found encapsulated subjectivities in themselves that made them feel special or think they deserve special consideration or treatment in some way. This dissertation looked for subjectivities that fell into specific categories related to feeling special in a grandiose way.

After seeing the last movie clip, each participant and I collaboratively picked the most problematic subjectivity to work with during the second session. The first session ended with a written reflective dialogue with their chosen problematic subjectivity. This generated data that was used to craft questions for the second meeting.

During the second meeting, I spoke directly with one or more grandiose encapsulated subjectivities in a reflective dialogue, asking the subjectivities questions, looking for grandiosity, exploring any grandiose enactments from its past and looking for
underlying shame issues. Shame was briefly addressed by using Kaufman’s steps for treating shame that were adapted for this study. Briefly stated these were: meeting the encapsulated subjectivity with empathy, returning the responsibility for the shame to the caregivers that were responsible for mistakes made in the original shame scenes, allowing the subjectivity to join the community of subjectivities and finally, helping the subjectivity to begin to develop a more appropriate amount of power within the multiplicity of the psyche. Asking the participants to share their reflections and reactions to how the dialoguing and the whole experience had affected them ended the session.

The research was able to evoke an experience of a grandiose encapsulated subjectivity in all of the participants. The intention was to evoke the experience of a grandiose subjectivity without evoking shame or a grandiose enactment. Exploring the stories and affects associated with these grandiose subjectivities shed light on why they were grandiose. During the interviews I looked for signs of shame in the stories the grandiose subjectivities told. This dissertation assessed the role of shame in creating grandiose encapsulated subjectivities in problematic multiplicity, and how working with shame can begin to foster a more integrated multiplicity.

**Learnings**

There were four major learnings that came from this research and a cumulative learning. The cumulative learning that came from this research, stated simply, is that meeting grandiosity in multiplicity facilitates empowerment. More specifically it was found that actively dialoguing with grandiose subjectivities can empower individuals and
support the emergence of integrated multiplicity. Throughout my work with the participants and their encapsulated subjectivities, there was a sense that engaging grandiose encapsulated subjectivities released a tremendous amount of assertive energy that excited and impressed the participants. This sense was also apparent when the data was reviewed after transcription. In each of the major four learnings there was an undercurrent of empowerment after addressing the shame that underlies grandiosity in multiplicity. The data suggests that shame keeps the energy of encapsulated subjectivities inauthentic and grandiose, but that when that shame is even briefly attended to, a sense of more *authentic power* can begin to emerge and the grandiosity begins to diminish.

*Authentic power* as defined by Omer refers to:

> The spectrum of human capacities and qualities that are responsive to various domains of life experience in ways that engender truth, beauty, and justice. Authentic Power emerges through enduring and transmuting the vulnerabilities we experience when we turn towards the sensitivities that embody the soul’s passionate nature.*lxxvii*

The first learning states that when caregivers are not consistently dependable, childhood shame leads to grandiosity in multiplicity. It was found that experiences of unmet interpersonal needs in normally dependent children give rise to shame and the subsequent formation of psychological defenses that take the form of grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. Shame and experiences of unmet needs were found in the stories of all the grandiose subjectivities that were explored. Stories with this much psychological impact were clearly governing scenes in these participants that reflected failed experiences of normal dependency.

The second learning answered the question asked by the Research Problem. Learning Two states that addressing shame in grandiose encapsulated subjectivities can
be empowering to individuals by supporting the development of an integrated
multiplicity and a reflexive identity. Grandiose subjectivities point to places where
individuals have unhealthy dependency and entitlement issues that conceal shame.
Addressing the shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities was
empowering for the participants by releasing assertive energy and beginning to heal
intrapsychic colonization, the domination and subjugation of one subjectivity by another,
in ways that will allow the development of a more integrated multiplicity and a more
reflexive identity. The use of the term empowerment here refers to authentic power
as opposed to power as force or manipulation.

The subjectivities we worked with were very powerful in the adaptive identities of
the participants in the sense that they control much of the thinking, feeling, and behavior
of the individual. The controlling nature of these subjectivities is not authentic power.
However, it was found that subjectivities that are split off or dissociated from the I are a
source of tremendous potential power. Authentic power is found when there is broader
access to capacities and qualities that come with integrated multiplicity. This access
comes when there is more communication with split off subjectivities. This research
showed that it is possible to release power and passion in individuals very quickly by
working with their grandiose subjectivities. It is the access to dissociated parts of the self
and a more appropriate balance of power between subjectivities that leads to a more
authentic power in integrated multiplicity.

The third learning states that the grandiosity of some protective encapsulated
subjectivities is an inauthentic form of power that is disempowering and harmful to
individuals as a whole. The learning found that some grandiose subjectivities acting as
protectors, prevent painful affects including shame, from surfacing into awareness. This grandiose protectiveness is disempowering because it prevents energy bound by the protected subjectivity from being released that could lead to a more integrated multiplicity. Several participants had very forceful gatekeeping subjectivities that seemed to protect weaker subjectivities, but in this protection, these parts prevented empowerment as seen in the second learning. This controlling behavior was found to be a form of intrapsychic colonization, a form of inauthentic power that disempowers the individual as a whole.

The fourth learning was that in multiplicity, grandiosity may help novice therapists to work with challenging clients. The results of the research suggested that the grandiosity of some subjectivities, in an attempt to avoid the shame and feelings of inferiority of being inexperienced, allowed these participants to work with challenging clients until they actually realized that they could meet the challenge. Grandiosity can help novice therapists to be creative in the therapy room much like an artist is able to access creativity through what has been called adaptive grandiosity.\textsuperscript{lxix}

At Meridian University, the course work values the development of capacities as well as the acquisition of knowledge. Much of this work involves exploring multiplicity and affective responses to others in a collaborative learning community. Similar ways of working with multiplicity and affect, especially shame, must be developed for use in individual therapy. Differentiating and personifying grandiose subjectivities and then dialoguing with them has been shown in this study to be an effective way to do this.
Significance and Implications of the Study

The main relevance of this research to the broader field of psychotherapy is that grandiose enactments are in essence, behaviors that can alert therapists to hidden shame in people that are not pervasively grandiose and not overly shame-bound. The importance of finding areas of shame underneath grandiosity is that working with that shame may prevent problematic grandiose enactments from happening in the lives of clients.

Grandiosity often evokes a negative response in others that experience it and may evoke shame in the individual who does not normally act grandiose. An especially relevant aspect of this research is the potential of the research findings to prevent grandiose enactments aimed at the therapist in the therapy room. Grandiose enactments like this would be a form of negative transference. Transference is the unconscious transferring of feelings formed in relationship to other people to the therapist. Grandiosity as negative transference is important because grandiosity as a form of entitlement has been linked with individuals quitting therapy. According to Morrison, working with underlying shame is the most important therapeutic goal in treating grandiosity. Staying in therapy is obviously critical to this goal as well.

Grandiose enactments can also happen in groups. Working with the shame underlying grandiosity should reduce negative transference directed towards group leaders and teachers as much as therapists in individual therapy. This reduction would result in fewer individuals quitting groups working with psychological issues.

Therapists can also have issues with grandiosity. When a therapist’s personal issues are activated by the therapeutic relationship, identification with the client’s issues, or a client’s grandiosity, the therapist may have grandiosity come up to protect against
their own feelings of shame. To become an effective therapist, anyone practicing psychotherapy should be aware of their own grandiosity; grandiose enactments as they are signs of hidden shame in therapists as well as clients. Exploring areas of grandiosity in countertransference, the therapist’s feelings that are projected onto their client, by working with underlying shame should lead to the development of integrated multiplicity in the therapist, much as exploring transference in the client has the potential to do.

Using grandiosity to find shame within individuals with the goal of developing authentic personal power is the most important clinical relevance of this work. The data from this research suggests that personifying and differentiating grandiose subjectivities and dialoguing with them does help to begin a shift from problematic multiplicity to a more integrated multiplicity and reflexive identity which is empowering. This empowerment comes from the individual having more access to the capacities inherent within their multiplicity, which should prove useful in individual’s personal and professional lives. The cultural relevance of this work is that using grandiosity to develop integrated multiplicity and authentic personal power has the potential to make individuals better cultural leaders. Cultural leadership is very important considering the current perilous global situations socially, politically, and environmentally.

This dissertation explored using grandiosity to find shame in problematic multiplicity leading to potential empowerment and in one sense, the redemption of grandiosity. Shame awareness, one of the major challenges of multiplicity, can indeed redeem grandiosity through the development of the authentic power of an integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction and Overview

This dissertation explored the relationship between grandiosity and shame within problematic multiplicity. The Research Problem asked, when grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers? The hypothesis that underlies this research question is that the opportunity to express grandiosity can help shift problematic multiplicity to integrated multiplicity if done with self-awareness.

There are four sections to this Literature Review; each adds information necessary to understand the research and learnings of this dissertation. The first section will cover normal psychological development and multiplicity. The second section will review what goes wrong with development resulting in the problematic forms of multiplicity. The third section covers shame and identity as well as the relationship of grandiosity to shame. The final section discusses grandiosity, inflation, and unhealthy dependency.

The first section, Multiplicity, Normal Psychological Development, and the Homeostasis of the Psyche, focuses on the normal development of the psyche, which ideally results in integrated multiplicity, interdependency, and the psychological autonomy of an individual. This section discusses multiplicity as the normal state of the
psyche. Contributions from contemporary theorists that discuss multiplicity from various points of view are reviewed as well as their historical antecedents.

This section also covers normal psychological development. The point is made that the same supportive environmental factors that allow the development of mature and healthy dependency or interdependency in a child, allow for the development of integrated multiplicity and psychological autonomy. Discussing normal or ideal development serves as a theoretical groundwork for the discussion of what goes wrong in problematic and pathological multiplicity in the next section. This section also expands the review of the Jungian point of view of the psyche as a self-balancing entity.

In the second section, The Continuum of Multiplicity and Degrees of Dissociation, the literature exploration begins with a review of the models of multiplicity. This section focuses on the forms of multiplicity on the continuum from problematic to pathological. The section reviews theories that focus on problematic multiplicity and their historical antecedents. Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID) is also discussed because there is a rich body of literature that is related to problematic multiplicity. The important point is made that the difference between DID and problematic multiplicity is related to the severity of dissociation between subjectivities, not the presence of multiplicity.

The discussion then moves on to what goes wrong with normal development to create pathology in problematic multiplicity and unhealthy dependency. Unhealthy dependency issues affect one’s relationships with other people as well as the relationships between subjectivities within their own multiplicity. A portion of this section is devoted to the problematic aspects of archetypal splitting. Archetypes can become polarized and
even take on an autonomous life. Split archetypal energy can become either protective or persecutory.

The section finishes with a discussion of dissociation and related aspects of trauma theory. This section focuses on dissociation because of its relationship to problematic multiplicity and DID. Also, the point is made that shame can result in dissociation, showing that dissociation is a key theoretical link in the exploration of shame and problematic multiplicity.

Next, the affect of trauma on the imagination is discussed. Trauma can cause images to become fixed in the imagination leading to what has been called a failure of the imagination. Fixed images suggest that imaginal structures and figures cannot be easily changed or re-imagined. The point is made that shame, not just trauma, can result in fixed images and a failure of the imagination.

The third section is entitled Shame and the Experience of Identity. In the normal differentiation of the self, shame plays a critical role in that it can be a very positive and influential teacher as well as a very punitive taskmaster. Shame is thus important in shaping how individuals view and experience themselves and what they will and will not do. All of these shame-related phenomena shape an individual’s identity. The treatment of shame is also discussed. The shame section lays a foundation for understanding the research related to the relationship between shame, problematic multiplicity, and the hypothesis that treating shame-bound imaginal figures in a similar manner to the way that shame-bound individuals would be treated, will facilitate a more integrated multiplicity.

The relationship between shame and narcissism is also discussed in this section. Narcissism and grandiosity have been shown to be defensive reactions against feelings of
The narcissistic grandiosity of some encapsulated subjectivities in problematic multiplicity and DID is discussed. Narcissistic traits are clearly involved with problematic multiplicity.

The final section on grandiosity, inflation, and dependency provides a background for the research related to grandiose enactments in the context of multiplicity. This dissertation focused on working with grandiose encapsulated subjectivities in each participant using reflective dialoguing and the principles of treating shame.

The concepts in each of these sections lay the theoretical groundwork for the Research Problem. When grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers?

**Multiplicity, Normal Psychological Development, and the Homeostasis of the Psyche**

Multiplicity has already been defined as a psyche made up of loosely integrated identities that form a coherent whole. It could also be said that multiplicity is the personification of an individual’s capacities and defenses. This section covers multiplicity as the normal and natural state of the psyche, interdependency and the Jungian concept of homeostasis of the psyche.

Multiplicity of the psyche is a way of looking at the self from a psychological perspective that honors human experience. Individuals all have a feeling of “I-ness” or an experience of identity that is populated by multiple subjective states. These subjective states become evident when listening to people talk. For instance, people in conflict about a decision will commonly say something like, “a part of me wants to go out tonight, but...”
another part of me just wants to stay home and relax.” All individuals experience parts of themselves that seem to take over their behavior at certain times in an appropriate way. A therapist is different at work with clients than they are at home with family, or at a social function with friends. This is a description of multiplicity that is normal, not problematic or pathological. Multiplicity creates flexibility and adaptability in individuals. Robert Jay Lifton discusses this at length in his book *The Protean Self* saying that in many diverse groups of individuals, despite extensive trauma during childhood and as adults, the psyche has the ability to shift and adapt, and exhibit a marked degree of insight, compassion, and innovation.\textsuperscript{lxxxv}

The human psyche is more like a mosaic than a simple whole.\textsuperscript{lxxxvi} Many disciplines support the concept of multiplicity. Ideas from psychology, literature, neurobiology, philosophy, artificial intelligence, and physics all support this view of multiplicity of the psyche.\textsuperscript{lxxxvii} How do individuals come to possess this mosaic psyche? As mentioned earlier, there are developmental and archetypal models of multiplicity. The developmental view states that individuals develop parts of the self as they experience life. Developing parts due to life experience is a normal phenomenon that increases adaptability and flexibility as individuals grow up. This view is based on the concept of differentiation. It is healthy to differentiate parts of the self to meet different challenges in life. These parts are made up of psychic energy that is bound together with a common boundary that is more or less permeable.\textsuperscript{lxxxviii} J. Watkins and H. Watkins call this normal state of multiplicity *adaptive differentiation* of ego states.\textsuperscript{lxxxix}

The archetypal view is that individuals are all born with inherent potentials called archetypes that are already present in all human beings at birth. These potential energies
coalesce as specific archetypal subjectivities based on individual experience and innate human patterns. From this point of view, psychological health and maturity involve embracing one’s multiplicity and getting to know one’s subjectivities.

There is obviously overlap between the developmental model and the archetypal model. As stated earlier, subjectivities that are formed developmentally have an archetypal aspect in that they follow archetypal patterns and those that are inherent can be influenced and shaped by experience. Whether parts of the psyche are archetypal or developmental, people tend to downplay their experience of them. Individuals usually think of themselves as a unitary whole, not as a complex community of subjectivities.

The idea that the unitary experience of identity is an illusion has been widely accepted by many authors. Jung challenged the idea of a unitary self when he proposed his idea of the complex, a feeling toned aggregate of psychic energy in the personal unconscious. Jung wrote, “the existence of complexes throws serious doubt on the naïve assumption of the unity of consciousness.”

Ernst Hilgard has also stated that the unity of consciousness is an illusion. He came to this conclusion empirically after finding an alternate center of consciousness in normal undergraduate psychology students. He came to call this aspect of the psyche, the hidden observer. He first discovered this during a demonstration of hypnosis. Hilgard made it clear that the hidden observer was a metaphor and that this phenomenon did not prove that there was a secondary personality. His work showed that the normal psyche has multiple centers of consciousness or multiplicity.

The ego or the I, the center of personal consciousness, tends to imagine that it is the only figure in the psyche. This illusion of unity serves to help people have a stable
and coherent sense of identity.\textsuperscript{xcv} This illusion of unity helps individuals to make sense of a complex psyche in a complicated world. From a practical point of view, individuals all experience a multiplicity of voices inside themselves and the illusion of unity helps them to be able to speak with a unified voice and present a brave front when they feel fragmented.\textsuperscript{xcvi} Goulding and Schwartz note that when people are functioning well, the harmony between parts makes their multiplicity seem to be a unity.\textsuperscript{xcvii} 

In the healthy psyche, optimal functioning occurs when there is sufficient differentiation between subjective parts and permeable enough boundaries between them. According to \textit{Internal Family Systems} theory, originated by Schwartz, \textit{optimal multiplicity} is a balanced state of multiple parts. Optimal multiplicity is the state where one wise part, called the Self, leads the other parts.\textsuperscript{xcviii} There is respectful communication between parts leading to a system of shared responsibility and resources between parts. These parts recognize that they exist within a system and respect the needs and views of the other parts. As mentioned earlier, in \textit{Ego State Therapy}, J. Watkins and H. Watkins call this state of the psyche adaptive differentiation. The leader in their system is called the \textit{executive ego state}.\textsuperscript{xcix} In \textit{Voice Dialogue}, Stone and Stone state that an aware ego leads to a similar state as optimal multiplicity or adaptive differentiation. In \textit{Voice Dialogue}, working with the parts of the self can lead to an aware ego. The aware ego is different from the normal ego state, which is called the \textit{operational ego} in \textit{Voice Dialogue}.\textsuperscript{c} In Omer’s teaching, having an aware ego is called accessing the I that leads.\textsuperscript{ci} This leadership involves the capacity of reflexivity.\textsuperscript{cii} It must be noted here that being in a state of reflexivity is not necessarily a state any normal people stay in all the time.
Reflexivity is a state individuals are in when the I is leading with the benefit of the capacities of their integrated multiplicity.

Historically, the discovery that the human personality contained more than one center of consciousness was essentially the beginning of depth psychology. According to Goulding and Schwartz, William James in the United States in 1890 wrote about the possibility of consciousness being split into parts in at least some people. Colin Ross discusses how Pierre Janet and other early European practitioners of hypnosis discovered cases of multiple personality and other phenomena related to dissociation, such as amnesia and fugue that suggested multiplicity. Fugue is a state in which an individual leaves their current life circumstances and assumes a new identity with no recollection of the prior self. These experiences led to the conception of the unconscious mind upon which Freud would build his theories and models.

Freud's two models split the psyche into major parts. His first model, the topographical, conceptualized the mind to be made up of the unconscious mind, the preconscious mind, and the conscious mind. When these divisions of mind became inadequate to explain the unconscious conflicts he was seeing in his patients, he devised the structural model. The structural model visualized the psyche as composed of the ego, the id, and the superego. The ego primarily functions to represent reality and to control and channel the energies of the unconscious drives from the unconscious mind, the id. The id is the unconscious source or raw, unstructured impulses. The superego is a set of moral values and self-critical attitudes that helps the ego to keep the id in check. While these divisions are not subpersonalities seen in multiplicity, these models laid the groundwork for the idea that the natural state of the psyche is a multiplicity.
The next major movement in psychoanalysis developed by Freud’s disciples was ego psychology. Freud was on a hunt for secrets and saw analysis as somewhat of a battle. Even though the ego psychologists still sought a cure by uncovering unconscious material like Freud, the ego psychologists developed a style that was much more interactive and collaborative with their patients. Anna Freud and Heinz Hartmann were perhaps the most famous ego psychologists but one of their lesser-known contemporaries, Paul Federn, was more instrumental in laying the groundwork for the current understanding of multiplicity.

Federn helped to delineate and broaden Freud’s model of the ego in psychoanalysis. Federn posited a two energy system of mind based on ego cathexis and object cathexis. The word object here refers to the psychoanalytic definition of an object, which is a symbolic representation or image of another. Cathexis means simply, an investment of energy. Freud used the concepts of ego-libido and object-libido. Libido is the basic sex drive. Federn, by using the term cathexis, broadened the model to include other psychic energies besides libido.

The principle that Federn was positing was that energy was either invested in the ego or in an object. For Federn, ego cathexis was the energy of selfness. The ego cathexis was not just the energy of the self; it was the subjective experience of self. The self was energy, not content. Representations that had a sense of “me-ness” had ego cathexis and created the identity. The representations that felt like “not me,” had object cathexis.

Federn was also the individual that first used the term ego state in psychoanalytic theory, expanding and deepening the concept of the ego and object-cathexis. Federn made the point that ego states, which were often considered to be part of the conscious
mind, could be unconscious and that internal objects, or introjects, usually considered unconscious in psychoanalytic theory, could also be conscious. According to J. Watkins, neither Federn nor his disciple Eduardo Weiss, who edited much of Federn’s writings, realized the great potential significance of ego states in their treatment procedures. It was J. Watkins who first intentionally worked with ego states in people that did not have Dissociative Identity Disorder. He did this by accessing their ego states in hypnosis and dealing directly with them, rather than talking only to the ego of the person.

J. Watkins, who is a current contributor, defines an ego state as “an organized system of behavior and experience whose elements are bound together by some common principle, and which is separated from other such states by a boundary that is more or less permeable.” For Federn, ego states included only ego-cathected elements whether they are conscious or unconscious. In his work with ego states, J. Watkins found ego states to include object-cathected elements as well. Including object related energy in an ego state means that the “not me” energy is contained within the psyche of the individual. This concept of including energy of otherness within the psyche makes the term ego state a parallel term to Omer’s encapsulated subjectivities. J. Watkins inclusion of object related energy into the ego state, yet persisting in calling it an ego state, might be slightly confusing because the term ego generally implies feelings of “me-ness” and does not include feelings of otherness. Because of this potential confusion, Jung’s idea of the complex and Omer’s term encapsulated subjectivity seem to be better terms to describe discrete subjective psychic states in multiplicity.
Jung’s ideas are more direct antecedents of the current conceptions of multiplicity in Imaginal Psychology than any theorist discussed thus far. To Freud, the unconscious mind was entirely personal.\textsuperscript{cxx} Jung’s ideas embraced a deeper level of the unconscious mind, the collective unconscious. The collective unconscious is universal rather than individual.\textsuperscript{cxi} The contents of the collective unconscious are called archetypes, primordial universal images that have been present in humans for eons.\textsuperscript{cxxii} The archetypes form the framework upon which complexes form in the personal unconscious. For instance, a mother complex would involve the individual’s energy as it relates to his or her personal mother as well as archetypal mother energies. Discovering a deeper level of the unconscious was a major breakthrough by Jung that differentiated his theory from Freudian ideas.

Jung likened the idea of the complex to Janet’s “fragmentary personality” noting the marked ability of consciousness to dissociate.\textsuperscript{cxxiii} Jung discussed the autonomy of these personality fragments and the concept that these fragments exist in normal people. He wrote, “even in normal individuals character-splitting is by no means an impossibility. We are, therefore, fully justified in treating personality dissociation as a problem of normal psychology.”\textsuperscript{cxxiv} As stated above, Jung’s idea of the complex is a fairly close but broader, concept than Federn’s ego state.\textsuperscript{cxxv} It also must be noted that a complex may contain more than one encapsulated subjectivity. For example, an individual may have a father complex that contains several encapsulated subjectivities, creating the ambivalent feelings all individuals have to such important people in their lives. Multiplicity was clearly conceptualized as the normal state of the psyche by Jung.
Jung also spoke of the cult-like obsession of modern man with the conscious mind. He referred to this obsession as monotheistic.\textsuperscript{cxvi} For Jung, the psyche was polytheistic, containing many archetypal figures including the ego, shadow, persona, anima/animus, Self, mother, father, puer, divine child, kore, maiden, hero, wise old man, trickster, and many more.\textsuperscript{cxvii} Jung was instrumental in laying the groundwork for all of the work with multiplicity that has come later by introducing the concept of active imagination. Active imagination is focusing on something that the individual finds troubling or problematic, then letting images arise, personifying those images and having a conversation with them.\textsuperscript{cxviii} Active imagination is not passive imagination where images arise and come and go and it is not controlled fantasy where the ego or therapist leads the way.\textsuperscript{cxix} Active imagination is a dialogue in which a personified autonomous image is allowed to converse with the individual.\textsuperscript{cxx} Active imagination has been called dreaming the dream onward.\textsuperscript{cxxx}

Jung and his followers over the years have tended to relate complexes to individual psychology and when discussing broader group and cultural dynamics, using the concept of archetypes. For instance in Jung’s essay on Nazi Germany, he focused on the collective archetypal effect of the god Wotan on the German psyche without going deeply into the cultural and historical events that also were at play at the time.\textsuperscript{cxxxii} Recently the term cultural complex was coined by Samuel Kimbles to describe dynamics that are cultural and not strictly archetypal or personal.\textsuperscript{cxxxiii} The concept of the cultural complex has been expanded by Kimbles in collaboration with Singer. They write:

As personal complexes emerge out of the level of the personal unconscious in their interactions with deeper levels of the psyche and early parental/familial relationships, cultural complexes can be thought of arising out of the cultural unconscious as it interacts with both the archetypal and personal realms of the
Cultural complexes can greatly influence individuals and groups.

There were some other contributors to the field of multiplicity in between Jung and current theorists and therapists. One early contributor was Roberto Assagioli, who called his work *Psychosynthesis*. James Varigu speaking about Psychosynthesis says:

> There are in each of us a diversity of these semi-autonomous subpersonalities, striving to express themselves. So, one of the easiest and most basic ways to facilitate our growth is to get to know our subpersonalities.

Another example of the use of multiplicity in therapy is psychodrama, in which the client plays the role of parts of the self in therapy, engaging them in dialogues. Jacob Moreno originated this practice in the early twentieth century. Another middle era contributor was Fritz Perls who in his *Gestalt Therapy* used the empty chair technique to talk to parts of the self or to other people.

James Hillman has carried the Jungian conceptions of multiplicity and polytheism forward. Hillman locates consciousness in multiple centers and figures. He calls for a polytheistic psychology and a turn towards the rich imagery that was held by the gods of ancient Greece that still resonate deep in the Western psyche. His view is that the multiple images that come from the soul will more accurately reflect the complexity, illusions, and entanglements of the psyche than the monotheistic vision of psychic unity. Hillman also warns against the monotheistic move by Jung and his followers by making the Self and individuation such important parts of their psychology. He refers to the titanic grandiosity of the Self, which he cautions is even more dangerous than the
narcissism that pervades the current era. Hillman even calls discussing the difference between Self and the plural psyche a monistic activity. Hillman clearly is a strong proponent of the concept of a decentralized, polytheistic psyche. When considering the concept of the whole versus parts, he notes that even if unity is the goal, there must be separation first, and that the feeling of unity is only one archetypal experience of many. For Hillman, polytheism is not chaos; polytheism offers a model of disintegrated integration.

Rafael López-Pedraza deepens the discussion of unity vs. multiplicity by discussing the conflict that has arisen in the Western psyche between monotheism and polytheism. López-Pedraza states that the conflict between monotheism and polytheism results in cultural anxiety in Westerners because they are torn, primarily unconsciously, between their polytheistic roots from ancient Greece and the Monotheistic roots of their Judeo-Christian heritage. López-Pedraza uses Freud, Jung, and James Joyce as examples of individual thinkers from this culture that are each in their own way, caught in this conflict.

According to López-Pedraza, the dual stream of monotheism and polytheism creates anxiety because the monotheistic God of the Bible is relatively imageless and yet the psyche’s pagan legacy is rich with well-differentiated polytheistic images. The lens of ego consciousness is also monotheistic and creates a life based on collective consciousness, beliefs, and faith that are strongly influenced by the Bible, even in the nonreligious. According to López-Pedraza the ego wants symbols and concepts that it can understand, but the soul generates images, many of which come from the collective unconscious and are not readily understood by the ego. The experience of images that are
not easily understood sets up a conflict because the ego tends to want to repress the archetypal images that still come from the polytheistic soul.\textsuperscript{cli} The ego, by favoring concepts and symbols over images is blunting the imagination. López-Pedraza suggests that individuals might become more aware of their monotheistic bias while focusing more attention on their polytheistic side.\textsuperscript{clii}

Personification is another Jungian concept emphasized and deepened by Hillman that ties in with polytheism. Personifying is “the basic psychological activity- the spontaneous experiencing, envisioning and speaking of the configurations of existence as psychic presences.”\textsuperscript{cliii} Personification is a way of being and of experiencing the world in a psychological way.\textsuperscript{cliv} Personification is so important to Hillman’s view of the psyche that he defines the psyche’s basic structure as “an inscape of personified images.”\textsuperscript{clv} Personification is critical to depth psychology because it allows individuals to come into a deeper relationship with the images that come from the psyche.

Personification also helps individuals to meet troubling subjectivities by separating their identities from them. A problematic part of the self, or even another, is easier to deal with if it is imagined as only a part of the identity, not the whole person. Hillman calls this process the multiplication of persons.\textsuperscript{clvi} Personification and multiplication make it such that there is never an unbearable amount of power in any one figure in the psyche.\textsuperscript{clvii} The process of personification and multiplication also protects the autonomy and diversity of the psyche. Personification does this by not letting any one part of the psyche become too powerful, including the Self, as mentioned above, and also the ego as is discussed below.\textsuperscript{clviii}
A brief review of normal development as theorized in depth psychology will serve this discussion of multiplicity. After Freud, Margaret Mahler and other ego psychologists began to see the infant as needing a safe environment created by the mother out of which the child’s mind develops psychologically. Ideally, the mother’s stable and mature ego provided a *mirroring* frame of reference for the baby’s immature ego. Mirroring, an appropriate attention and emotional attunement, allows the ego of the baby to emerge from symbiotic state with the mother to become a separate ego. As the child moves through these stages, if the caregivers provide adequate mirroring, a relatively normal individual results. “*Good enough mothering*” was the phrase Donald Winnicott used for this adequate parental care. Heinz Kohut coined the term *optimal frustration* to represent the mother’s help in guiding the child appropriately in a balance between mirroring and helping the child to see the reality around it. Optimal frustration helps the child move from an early stage of grandiosity to a normal individual with an adequate sense of self. Adequate mirroring and optimal frustration together result in an individual that is neither grandiose nor symbiotic.

Good enough mothering is context dependent. A mother is different with her child in different situations. Different behavior by the mother in different situations helps the child’s psyche to normally differentiate into subjective states that are appropriate. If there is good enough mothering, the child develops subjectivities that are flexible and adaptable. Good enough mothering has also been related to healthy dependency. Harry Guntrip asserts that it is healthy interdependency that allows for true independence to develop. A child with good enough mothering develops into an adult that is able to be dependent and independent without being polarized in either way. Healthy
interdependency develops in tandem with integrated multiplicity. In integrated multiplicity, parts of people can be dependent while other parts are independent. In this state there are healthy relationships between individuals and within the self between subjectivities.

The four Modes of Experience, as developed by Omer is a related developmental model. The four modes of experience: symbiotic, bureaucratic, de-centralized, and collaborative can be personified as the mother, father, peer, and Friend. The therapeutic experience or any deep interpersonal relationship is a combination of these personified energies. The Modes of Experience model is an elegant and easy to grasp explanation of how people experience the world and relate to one another. The Modes can be applied personally and culturally.

The developmental aspect of the Modes of Experience model includes useful concepts from both Freudian and Jungian psychology. The child develops through the four phases and incorporates the energies and capacities of earlier stages rather than growing out of them. For instance, as a child moves out of the symbiotic phase and into the bureaucratic phase, it retains an experience of what mother energy is while it begins to experience father energy. This retention of prior experience, learning, and capacities is parallel to concepts contained in Erik Erikson’s developmental model, which was based on Freud’s work and is discussed later.

The first mode of experience is the symbiotic and is personified as the Mother. The infant having a pervasive sense of oneness with the mother characterizes this phase. This feeling of oneness is the state out of which the infant’s beginning sense of self-awareness arises. A good enough symbiotic phase is necessary for the person to develop
the ability to connect with others. With an adequate experience of the mother principle, the child develops the capacities to develop intimacy, empathy, and a sense of community.\textsuperscript{exviii}

The bureaucratic mode comes next chronologically. The bureaucratic mode is necessary for a child to meet the world and is personified as the Father. In symbiosis, the child feels oneness with the mother and the environment. As the infant matures, and learns to crawl and walk away from the mother, it must begin to negotiate the environment and the outside world. The father’s influence (or father energy in female caregivers) allows the child to leave the ecstatic union with the mother in order to grow up and begin to face the world. Father energy is necessary because of the dangers that are real in the world, like streets, cars, stoves, etc. If exposed to enough father energy the child develops the capacities of the father principle, like discipline, restraint, and the ability to set boundaries.\textsuperscript{exix}

The decentralized mode comes next developmentally and is personified as the Peer. The decentralized mode is the phase in which awareness of one’s own siblings and peers develops. The ecstasy of the symbiotic phase and the structure and discipline of bureaucratic phase allows for the flourishing of imagination in the decentralized phase. Imagination with structure and discipline results in the child’s’ ability to be creative. Vitality, peer support, and relationships based on friendship also come out of a successful negotiation of this phase and the development of the peer principle.\textsuperscript{exx}

The last phase is collaborativity. Engaging the mother, father, and peer principles in a collaborative way is personified as the Friend. Engaging these energies allows the interdependence of collaborativity, the last phase. Collaborativity allows the oneness,
discipline, and imagination of the other three phases to come together, which results in a degree of presence and autonomy in the child. The child feels comfortable with its self, and has a healthy sense of entitlement and interdependence with others. These capacities allow the individual to engage in what Omer calls the radical receptivity of experience. This radical receptivity to experience allows one to fully and deeply engage with life in a soulful manner as an adult.clxxi

Before leaving the topic of normal development, the contributions of Mary Watkins need to be discussed because her work specifically addresses multiplicity and development. M. Watkins focuses her exploration of multiplicity on dialoguing that occurs between imaginal figures called imaginal dialoguing.clxxii Traditional developmental theorists tend to suggest that imaginal dialogues should decrease as a child ages and be replaced by dialogues with other people or become abstract thought.clxxiii M. Watkins notes that there is a social taboo against imaginal dialoguing. She argues that developmentally, imaginal dialogues are not primitive and they do not just serve to provide a child with practice for dialoguing with others. Imaginal dialoguing is a natural way of thinking in both children and adults. In their thoughts, adult individuals talk to their critics, parents, spiritual figures, and even their consciences. People do this just as much as they once spoke to their dolls or stuffed animals as children.clxxiv Even adults commonly engage in out loud imaginal dialogues. People talk to things like their reflection in the mirror, a picture of someone they care for, or with their pets. Imaginal dialogues can also be written. M. Watkins not only promotes the idea that imaginal dialogues are normal, she advocates that people find and create a conceptual space for imaginal dialogues to be developed.clxxv
Jung’s ideas on the self-balancing nature of the psyche are important to the discussion on multiplicity as will become more apparent in the next cluster. Jung felt that the psyche, like the body, naturally maintained its own equilibrium. When a process goes too far, psychic compensation keeps the psyche balanced just like the homeostasis of the body.\textsuperscript{clxxvi} When psychic processes tend towards disintegration, compensating functions are activated which lead to reintegration. In other words, in the normal psyche, the threat of disintegration is healed through symbolic means by the psyche.\textsuperscript{clxxvii} Ideally, when a disturbing experience happens, the psyche effectively presents the person with an image of the event, then makes meaning out of it, and thus restores the original balance.

This discussion of multiplicity, normal development, and interdependency will lay the groundwork for the understanding of the abnormal forms of multiplicity and dissociation in the next cluster. All of these concepts will build a base from which the Research Problem can be answered. Specifically an understanding of integrated multiplicity is important because the Research Problem involves facilitating a move from problematic multiplicity towards a more integrated multiplicity.

\textbf{The Continuum of Multiplicity and Degrees of Dissociation}

The phenomenon of multiplicity can be viewed as a continuum of states that range from quite healthy to very pathological.\textsuperscript{clxxviii} Anywhere along this spectrum, as subjectivities become more dissociated, the problematic nature of the multiplicity increases. Also, if subjectivities become too highly differentiated or do not have enough differentiation, boundary issues result. If differentiation and dissociation are extremely high, Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID) results. If differentiation and dissociation are
too low, there is symbiosis between aspects of the self. In problematic multiplicity, issues with dissociation and differentiation decrease flexibility and keep individuals stuck in maladaptive patterns. The level of dysfunction that the research in this dissertation will focus on is problematic multiplicity. This section will include a review of the literature on problematic multiplicity and DID. This section will also cover developmental issues including unhealthy dependency. Finally, splitting of archetypes is reviewed including the self-destructive aspects of the psyche’s self-care system.

There are several models of multiplicity. These models mostly use an analogical scale similar to the one just mentioned above. The farther up the scale of dissociation and differentiation, the worse the symptoms are. Jungian, Archetypal, and Imaginal Psychologists tend to not look at multiplicity in such a linear way.

M. Watkins looks at multiplicity as normal and honors the autonomy of imaginal figures. Her model, which differentiates DID from the less pathological forms of multiplicity is easy to grasp. People with DID have well differentiated and highly dissociated subjectivities or alter personalities that are not capable of having dialogues with other subjectivities. DID is manifested as a succession of monologues, as the center of consciousness switches from one alter personality to the next. There is no dialogue or reflection between subjectivities in DID. This lack of dialogue means that in DID, multiplicity is experienced over time, but not in single moments. Multiplicity in single moments in time is normal, according to M. Watkins, as is the case in integrated multiplicity and problematic multiplicity, if the individual is self-aware in the moment.
M. Watkins notes another problematic aspect of individuals in this culture is that individuals often effectively deny their own multiplicity by imagining and behaving as if their egos are the only voice in their psyches. Jung alluded to this when he wrote, “the ego complex is not the only complex in the psyche.” Hillman also echoes this sentiment, noting that the Western ego, has adopted a heroic stance. This heroic ego takes a stance of outward activity and is characterized by thoughts, feelings and behaviors that reflect independence, strength, achievement, planning, decisive action, coping, virtue, conquest, overpowering masculinity and single-mindedness. He also states that the heroic ego is a monotheistic ego that wants to unite multiplicity by colonizing and civilizing the psyche, much like the Romans conquered the barbarians. Hillman notes that Freud’s famous phrase “where Id was, ego shall be” reflects the heroic desire to strengthen the ego and conquer the unconscious. The heroic ego wants to strengthen itself by curing the soul’s pathologies or even by denying them altogether. This type of ego is prone to moralizing, setting itself up as the only judge of what is right and wrong.

The heroic ego shows propensity towards egotism that reflects a lack of access to multiplicity that is common in modern culture. An individual with a heroic ego lacks access to the rich variety of imaginal figures and encapsulated subjectivities that they could have access to, even if the heroic ego is viewed as functional and healthy from a cultural perspective. When individuals embrace their multiplicity, the interactions of the I with the subjectivities inside, add richness, character, and capacities to their personalities.

In Internal Family Systems Therapy, Goulding and Schwartz describe the range of multiplicity as a continuum from balanced multiplicity to DID. Ego State Therapy
is a comparable theoretical approach with a very similar scale representing the range of multiplicity according to J. Watkins and H. Watkins. At one end of the spectrum are people with no dissociation and little differentiation of ego states and at the other end are people with DID, severe dissociation and differentiation of ego-states.\textsuperscript{clxxix} In Ego State Therapy the ideal position on the scale, adaptive differentiation, ego states would have adequate differentiation, with no dissociation, and flexible boundaries. At one extreme of the scale an individual with no differentiation or boundaries between ego-states would have little or no access to their multiplicity. Boone notes that such an individual tends to be rigid and have less cognitive and emotional flexibility.\textsuperscript{cxc} Maggie Phillips and Claire Frederick suggest that this lack of flexibility might lead such people to act almost the same in different environments and exhibit a lack color or complexity in their personalities.\textsuperscript{cxci} DID is at the other extreme of the scale, in which the ego-states are too differentiated and have rigid boundaries that are separated by marked dissociation.

Reese Price and others such as Phillip M. Coons describe multiplicity as a range of dissociation.\textsuperscript{cxcii} The left side of the scale is normal dissociation, such as daydreaming or immersion into a task. As one moves up the scale of dissociation, pathological dissociation begins and at the right side of the scale there is extreme dissociation as is seen in DID.

Some authors consider the unitary state of the psyche to be normal and that traumatic experience causes fragmentation of the psyche. Multiplicity is considered abnormal in this model. The literature on DID over time has moved away from this concept and many theorists and therapists have adopted the idea that dissociation is the problem, not the multiplicity. This concept is reflected in the recent trends in treatment of
DID in which many experts are aiming for breaking down the walls between alters and increasing the communication with each other rather than eliminating the dissociated parts. The goal in treating DID for many therapists is thus a more functional form of multiplicity rather than the total elimination of alters. The same goal is used in Imaginal Process, Voice Dialogue, Family Systems Therapy, and Ego State Therapy.

Edwina Barvosa-Carter has proposed a model of multiplicity that she calls the continuum of human psychological integration. Barvosa-Carter’s model blends the elements of the above models nicely. With tightly integrated people, there is a core-unitary state of personality. With a loosely, but fully integrated self, there are multiple social identities. And finally, with very weak integration, there is a fragmentary multiple self. A core-unitary self with tight integration is not healthy in this model, resulting in a rigid and one-dimensional identity that is not well adapted to modern social life. Individuals with multiple identities are generally well adapted to modern life. This state corresponds well to integrated multiplicity. Her last classification contains people that have a fragmentary multiple self. These individuals have a self with multiple but dissociated, repressed, or inhibited identities. These individuals have varying degrees of dysfunction depending on the severity of the defensive structures just mentioned. Problematic multiplicity, DID, and other dissociative disorders would fall into this category. This model agrees with the other models that consider multiplicity a healthy phenomenon, providing that the identities are not too loosely integrated or too tightly integrated.

Boone has developed a model of normal multiplicity, which he calls personality multiplicity. Personality multiplicity involves an executive personality,
and an integration process. This description is similar to the loosely but fully integrated multiple identity aspect of Barvosa-Carter’s model with an internal leader, the executive personality.

There are other current contributors to the field of multiplicity including John Rowan. One principle that comes from his work with multiplicity is an explanation of the difference between an aspect of the self and a subpersonality. Subpersonalities are a “semi-permanent and semi-autonomous region of the personality capable of acting as a person.” A subpersonality may be made up of a variety of aspects. In Omer’s approach the terms encapsulated subjectivities and imaginal figures are parallel concepts to subpersonalities and aspects of the self.

The Voice Dialogue system originated by Hal and Sidra Stone is another current approach that provides a theoretical background and techniques to work with multiplicity. Voice Dialogue is a Jungian based method that primarily works with archetypal parts of the self that Stone and Stone call selves. The selves tend to come in archetypal pairs such as the Rulemaker/Rebel, Observer/Spontaneous, Pusher/Being, and Rational Mind/Feelings. Voice Dialogue is discussed in more detail later on in this section.

A brief overview of Dissociative Identity Disorder is necessary as background to the study of problematic multiplicity because problematic multiplicity is similar in nature to DID but with much less dissociation between subjectivities. DID is a severe dissociative disorder characterized by two or more distinct identities called alter personalities or alters. In classic cases of DID, alters act as if they are separate personalities. There may be one main identity and multiple secondary personality
states. The main personality segment has been called the executive self. There is usually co-consciousness between personality states but sometimes there is not. Even when there is co-consciousness between alters there is generally a failure to fully integrate identity, memory, and consciousness between them.

The center of consciousness in DID changes from alter to alter over time. This phenomenon is called switching. Switching is often triggered by a stressful event, but not always. There is often amnesia after switching. The main personality may find evidence of another alter’s behavior and have gaps in their memory of time. The individual may also find themselves in places that they cannot remember going to and do not know how they got there. DID patients may also have periods of profound depersonalization, an alteration in the individual’s experience of identity such that they lose a sense of personal identity and may feel unreal. In DID, the person often does not retain an observing ego during episodes in which an alter influences their behavior.

In problematic multiplicity the individual may not realize that their behavior is being taken over by an encapsulated subjectivity, but the I is still present and the individual feels like they are the same person.

There is fairly universal agreement that the severe dissociation in DID is caused by overwhelming trauma that is often chronic and starts at a young age. The trauma may be severe physical or sexual abuse, or extreme neglect. DID in these cases is considered a sophisticated defense against overwhelming conditions. Richard Kluft theorizes that there are four things necessary for DID to occur, severe trauma, the biological ability to dissociate, the formation of a split off part of the self, and the lack of a healing and nurturing environment.
When child abuse is the etiology of DID, the child is overwhelmed, helpless, and powerless in relationship to an older and physically stronger person. The abuser is often someone they are attached to or even dependent upon, a family member, family friend, or community leader, making the abuse a form of betrayal. If a victimized child cannot escape from the abuse, which is often repetitive in nature, dissociation may be the only way for the child to cope. The severely abused child in DID forms separate identities to change the perception of time, create amnesia about the trauma, and often idealizes the perpetrator, all in an effort to deal with the horror of their experience. In DID the formation of separate identities creates an internal attachment system to care and protect the individual. Colin Ross writes that alters:

create stable internal persons who are always available for attachment, safety, security, and nurturing. The need for attachment figures drives the narcissistic investment of the alters in separateness, and the delusion of the separate physical bodies they often create.

After this brief discussion of the posttraumatic model of DID etiology, it must be noted that some experts feel that there is an alternative explanation they call the Sociocognitive model of DID. Nicholas Spanos says that in DID “multiple identities are usefully conceptualized as rule-governed social constructions,” and argues that “neither childhood trauma nor a history of severe psychopathology is necessary for the development or maintenance of multiple identities,” and that “multiple identities are established, legitimated, maintained, and altered through social interaction.” Others have strongly argued against this model.

DID was first included as a diagnostic entity in the DSM in 1980 despite a clinical history, which extends back to the seventeenth century. DID has always been a controversial diagnosis that has created disagreements over etiology. Some experts
believe it does not even exist. By those that believe it is a valid clinical entity, DID is now considered relatively common with DID affecting about one percent of the general population.\textsuperscript{ccxvii}

Many DID individuals are highly functional and hard to diagnose by therapists because appropriate alters often take over in appropriate situations.\textsuperscript{ccxvii} In this culture, individuals do not necessarily want to see DID either. DID is associated with falling apart, fragmenting and insanity; states that make individuals very uncomfortable in this culture. The very idea of DID, threatens people’s illusion of their own psychic unity.\textsuperscript{ccxix} Also, assuming that most cases of DID are traumatically induced, people do not want to believe that there is such overwhelmingly and horrific abuse going on in their own communities.\textsuperscript{ccxx}

Before leaving the topic of DID, it must be mentioned that embracing multiplicity as normal has the potential to minimize the suffering of individuals with DID. This dissertation’s tone and approach respects and acknowledges the suffering of those with DID. Acknowledging that multiplicity is normal but that dissociation can be a source of suffering in both DID and problematic multiplicity does not in any way take away from the deep suffering experienced by individuals with severe Dissociative Disorders.\textsuperscript{ccxxi}

Ross believes that this culture has a taboo against multiplicity because the ego in the average person is actually a moderately dissociated executive self.\textsuperscript{ccxxii} He feels that this phenomenon actually keeps many mental health professionals from diagnosing and treating DID.\textsuperscript{ccxxiii} Ross also notes, similarly to the views of Hillman and others, that the stance against multiplicity is created by our monotheistic culture in which it is believed
that there is one God that rules the universe much like the ego wants to rule the psyche.\textsuperscript{ccxxiv}

The types of subjective states seen in problematic multiplicity and DID follow archetypal patterns; they can be young child parts, adult parts, internal self-helpers, and destructive parts. Many authors agree that all parts have positive intention in the system of subpersonalities even though they may be very destructive.\textsuperscript{ccxxv} Schwartz likens the group of figures in an individual’s psyche to a family.\textsuperscript{ccxxvi} Alters may exhibit different traits, talents, and abilities from each other.\textsuperscript{ccxxvii} Even physiological changes and differences in physical appearance can be seen when alters switch in DID.\textsuperscript{ccxxviii} These physiological changes are seen in a more subtle form in problematic multiplicity as well. James Hollis notes that these somatic changes occur whenever a complex grips any person.\textsuperscript{ccxxix}

In the previous section it was discussed that normal development results from good enough mothering and leads to integrated multiplicity and interdependency. According to Winnicott, when there is a failure of parenting, an adequate healthy sense of self does not consolidate and a false self develops.\textsuperscript{ccxxx} This false self is formed out of a necessity to negotiate the outside world before the real self of the infant or child has the abilities to meet these challenges in an appropriate way. The false self is a compliant self, one that is based on images and expectations that come from the environment rather than from a true sense of self which can only develop under more nurturing circumstances.\textsuperscript{ccxxxi} From the multiplicity point of view, ego states can align with the traits of the true self or false self.\textsuperscript{ccxxvii} The false self is a parallel concept to Omer’s adaptive identity. In the multiplicity model, with good enough mothering, subjectivities
become aspects of integrated multiplicity. When the environment fails, subjectivities turn
defensive and they contribute to the false self of problematic multiplicity.

Environmental failure and the development of the false self can also be viewed through the lens of the Modes of Experience. Failure to support and nurture, set boundaries, and optimally frustrate the grandiosity of children, can all be seen as failures of mothering and fathering. All children need these influences, even if not raised by a traditional mother and father family unit. As children age, they become focused on and need to interact with peers. If the caregivers do not support and guide these relationships, there can be failures in the peer arena as well. These failures result in defensive adaptations in the personality structure, which tend to lead to a false self and problematic multiplicity.\textsuperscript{ccxxxiii}

From the dependency point of view, failure of the environment to meet the needs of an infant is a failed experience of dependency for the child. Failed experiences of dependence as a child lead to unhealthy dependency issues in the adult.\textsuperscript{ccxxxiv} Unhealthy dependency means that the individual is either too dependent or too independent. In multiplicity, mature subjectivities can help to parent less mature subjectivities.\textsuperscript{ccxxxv} The therapist can also ally with these more mature parts of the client to facilitate therapy.\textsuperscript{ccxxxvi} Interdependence between subjectivities breaks down with experiences of trauma and shame. A good example of failed interdependency between subjectivities is seen in the archetypal splitting described by Jung.

Archetypes as defined by Jung, are bipolar, having a positive and negative aspect.\textsuperscript{ccxxxvii} Both poles are contained within every individual.\textsuperscript{ccxxxviii} Splitting of these poles can become problematic. As Adolph Guggenbühl-Craig explains it, the ego needs
clarity and tries to eradicate inner ambivalence; this causes one pole of an archetype to be repressed and operate below the conscious level, often causing psychic distress.\textsuperscript{ccxxix} Specifically, regressed parts are repressed and tend to be projected out onto others. An example Guggenbühl-Craig gives is when a therapy client has repressed the archetype of inner healer, and all healing capacities are projected out onto the therapist. This puts the client in a totally dependent role to the therapist. This unhealthy dependency is especially problematic when a therapist assumes an unhealthy power position and projects his or her own wounded parts onto the client.\textsuperscript{ccxl} Split archetypes often involve power issues such as manipulation and not taking responsibility.\textsuperscript{ccxli} Intrapsychically, similar power dynamics can happen when weaker parts of the self are objectified and manipulated by more powerful parts of the self. This power dynamic is a phenomenon discussed in Voice Dialogue, which works with archetypal pairs.\textsuperscript{ccxlii}

The archetypal pairs in Voice Dialogue are polar opposites called selves. The selves that make up the normal personality are called owned selves and repressed parts are called disowned selves. The disowned selves are shadow material in the Jungian sense, aspects of the self that individuals are not very aware of and are unacceptable to their primary personality and ego.\textsuperscript{ccxlii} The owned selves have the power when the owned selves and the ego are in control, but when individuals act out, as in grandiose enactments in non-narcissistic individuals, the repressed, disowned parts take control of people’s behavior.

The therapeutic work in Voice Dialogue is to allow both poles of the split archetype to speak in a dialogue that is facilitated by the therapist. Voice Dialogue is a specific way of working with subjectivities, in which the participant moves from one seat
to another when speaking from different parts of the self. The work integrating the two selves always finishes with the individual speaking from the central seat position that represents the aware ego. This way of working allows disowned selves to come forward and owned selves to let go of some of the control while the aware ego develops more ability to orchestrate their energies. Successful Voice Dialogue results in increased flexibility and richness of the personality. In this dissertation, owned selves are called adaptive subjectivities because they are part of the adaptive identity and disowned selves are called dissociated subjectivities because they are split off from the adaptive self.

In Kalsched’s model, trauma causes an archetypal splitting that results in two major archetypal patterns. One aspect of the psychic split progresses in a protective but controlling way, and the other one regresses in a dependent way. The controlling aspect starts out to be benevolent and protective, a guiding spirit that was called a daimon by the ancient Greeks. In Kalsched’s model, the daimonic part performs some of the normal “self-regulatory and inner/outer mediational functions” that the fragile ego is unable to carry out, but often this daimon eventually turns controlling and demonic. According to Kalsched, this daimon is a personification of the psyche’s dissociative defense mechanisms in children in which early trauma has made psychic integration impossible. The daimon, the Protector/Persecutor, turns demonic when it is overwhelmed and does not have the maturity to really protect the split off pole of the archetype. The daimon’s goal is to protect the inner spirit or core of the child’s personality. Kalsched likens this inner spirit, the true core of the personality, to the Jungian Self, and Winnicott’s True Self. This inner spirit is the child’s core identity,
which has some psychological autonomy, but has not yet developed the capacities to protect itself. At this vulnerable point the core identity needs good enough caregivers to protect it.

In Kalsched’s model, faced with the unthinkable threat to the core identity, the daimon turns from the role of parent and protector and becomes a demonic persecutor. The persecution seems to be related to driving the defenseless inner core deeper and safer into the unconscious by frightening it. Kalsched notes that this persecution actually results in additional trauma to the individual; noting that at this point “the traumatized psyche is self-traumatizing.” The Protector/Persecutor will go to all lengths to protect the inner core of the personality, even to the point of suicide. The persecutory subjectivity actually keeps itself and the regressed part from maturing. An adult person caught in this dynamic may want the patterns in their life to change, but this daimon strongly and often destructively resists change. The Protector/Persecutor is not teachable. At this point it is very dissociated. Dissociation and related issues from trauma theory are the final topics of this section.

There are individual variations as to what constitutes a traumatic experience. An event that is experienced as trauma by one person may be considered only to be stressful to another. A stressful experience is internalized as trauma when an individual’s internal and external protective and coping resources are overwhelmed. When these resources are overwhelmed, dissociation is the next layer of psychic defense. Dissociation is defined in the DSM-IV as “a disruption in the usually integrated functions of consciousness, memory, identity, or perception of the environment.” Ross calls this type of dissociation abnormal psychosocial dissociation; it is the most pertinent type of
dissociation to trauma theory and pathological multiplicity.\textsuperscript{cclvi}

Dissociation is a way of organizing psychic information by compartmentalizing an experience such that the elements of the traumatic experience are not integrated into a unitary whole or an integrated sense of self.\textsuperscript{cclvii} According to Bennett Braun, the \textit{BASK model} of dissociation notes that behavior, affect, sensations, and knowledge (or thought) can all be dissociated from one another.\textsuperscript{cclviii} In this model, mental health is the congruence of all of these elements over time.\textsuperscript{cclix} Braun uses this model to explain a wide range of dissociative states from hypnotic anesthesia to the dissociative disorders and Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). In DID, the four elements of the BASK model vary to create the discrete personality of each alter.\textsuperscript{cclx}

As mentioned above, dissociation is a defensive psychic mechanism triggered in response to overwhelming trauma. Dissociation happens when an event threatens an individual’s emotional or physical safety, or threatens their sense of self. Dissociation can help to maintain a functioning self during a traumatic experience. Dissociation allows the individual to maintain a “normal self” and split off an “emotional self.” The emotional self can hold traumatic affect and memory in a compartmentalized way so that the main personality does not have to experience it directly.\textsuperscript{cclxi} This compartmentalization is helpful during intense trauma but dissociation unfortunately can prevent the individual from working through the traumatic experience at an appropriate time after the event, even in the safety of therapy.

According to Bessel van der Kolk, there are three types of major psychosocial dissociation, primary, secondary, and tertiary.\textsuperscript{cclxii} All three types involve dissociation
into ego states or a split between the observing ego and the experiencing ego. It is easy to imagine how these splits could contribute to problematic multiplicity.

Primary dissociation is a response to overwhelming threat. The consciousness is fragmented such that the sensory and emotional elements of the event are not integrated into memory and the sense of identity. Ego states are formed that are separate from the normal state of consciousness. Primary dissociation is characterized by flashbacks, nightmares, intrusive thoughts, and intrusive memories. Primary dissociation is often seen in PTSD. Secondary dissociation or peritraumatic dissociation is an additional level of dissociation that occurs when there is continuing trauma once the individual is already dissociated. Dissociation happens when the person copes with overwhelm by psychically leaving their bodies and experiences observing the event from a distance. This type of dissociation is seen with childhood abuse, car accidents, kidnapping, hostage situations, and natural disasters. Secondary dissociation at the time of trauma is highly correlated with the subsequent development of PTSD.

Tertiary dissociation is characterized by the formation of distinct multiple ego states that have separate identities, attitudes and memories. Tertiary dissociation happens with severe trauma and is characteristic of DID. Highly dissociated states are extremely adaptive to a victim of severe and chronic trauma. As long as the traumatized aspects of the self are contained in separate ego states, other ego states can keep the person functioning in the world. Tertiary dissociation has been linked with intense, chronic physical, sexual, and psychological abuse that starts at a young age. It is felt that these individuals learn to cope by dissociating and that it becomes easier to dissociate again over time. Ongoing dissociation may hamper consciousness about their plight and also
limit the development of other coping mechanisms.

In general, if an individual develops a dissociative disorder, severe trauma in adulthood tends to result in PTSD and severe trauma occurring in childhood may result in DID or another dissociative disorder.\textsuperscript{cclxiv} The other dissociative disorders are Dissociative Amnesia, Dissociative Fugue, Depersonalization Disorder, and Dissociative Disorder Not Otherwise Specified, (DDNOS).\textsuperscript{cclxv} These disorders share marked dissociation, and some specific symptoms that are seen in DID, amnesia, fugue, and depersonalization, without having fully developed alters that are dissociated and differentiated from each other as in DID. DDNOS is a diagnosis used for individuals that have severe dissociation but do not qualify as DID or the other specific Dissociative Disorders. DDNOS is an example of severe problematic multiplicity.

The concept of dissociation goes back to Janet and the early days of psychology and hypnosis.\textsuperscript{cclxvi} The practice of hypnosis and the concept of dissociation fell out of favor as time passed in the early twentieth century because Freud abandoned hypnosis and concentrated his theory and work around repression, not dissociation.\textsuperscript{cclxvii} The diagnosis of Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD) as DID used to be called, also fell out of favor as interest in dissociation decreased. Many cases of MPD were given the diagnosis of schizophrenia.\textsuperscript{cclxviii} Also, as behaviorism began to take hold in the field of psychology, the interest in MPD also decreased.\textsuperscript{cclxix} As therapists became more aware of trauma and child abuse in the last forty years of the twentieth century, the interest in dissociation and DID increased again.

Hilgard’s \textit{Neodissociation Theory} from the 1980’s combines dissociation and repression to explain psychic phenomena related to forms of divided consciousness. The
model was developed to account for the phenomena Hilgard was seeing in his hypnosis work, which was discussed earlier. Hilgard surmised that there were two different kinds of splits in the consciousness that were based on Freud’s models of the psyche; one can be conceptualized as being horizontal, and the other vertical. The vertical split was based on Freud’s structural model, in which unacceptable psychic contents are repressed downwards into the unconscious mind. The horizontal split of Hilgard’s Neodissociation Theory was based on Freud’s topographical model is most important when considering multiplicity. The horizontal split was between the conscious mind and preconscious mind and represented dissociation as material being pushed out of the conscious mind. These psychic contents were not repressed, just split off into the preconscious mind. The distinction was important to Hilgard because when he conversed with a hidden observer in hypnosis, it was easy to tell that the main personality was not speaking, but the hidden observer still talked in a normal manner, using normal words and imagery. As he put it, the hidden observer spoke without archaic symbols and distortions of primary process thinking that would have suggested that the hidden observer was originating entirely from the unconscious mind. His experience of speaking with a hidden observer was essentially similar to an experience of speaking with an alter personality in a DID patient.

The amount of dissociation in the Neodissociation model could be imagined as the thickness of the barrier between the conscious and the preconscious minds. In DID, the barrier would be very thick representing amnesia between alters. Using the Neodissociation model to look at problematic multiplicity, encapsulated subjectivities would be considered dissociated, split off into the preconscious mind rather than repressed into the unconscious mind.
From the point of view of Greg Mogenson, trauma and dissociation can result in a failure of the imagination. When trauma overwhelms the capacity of the imagination, traumatic events turn into fixed images in the psyche. As he puts it, the psyche then tends to relate to a traumatic event as a monotheistic, omniscient presence. Traumatic events become rigid and spiritualized and the events do not become a past memory, the event stays imbued with negatively charged psychic energy in the present. Trauma stops the soul’s natural psychological reflection. It is this reflection on disturbing and traumatizing events that normally mediates them into experience, allowing some sense of meaning to arise and a lessening of the acute suffering. As Mogenson puts it, trauma leads to a state where the soul “gives itself over to the spirit and ceases to be psychological.” Trauma tends to lead the individual to stop reflecting on the source of its suffering and yearns to find an escape from it, which often involves a turn towards the spiritual or God. Omer calls this phenomenon a spiritual bypass because painful affect is bypassed by a turn towards the spiritual. Only through a return of imagination can the rigidity of the traumatized psyche be healed.

It also must be noted in this discussion that grandiosity after trauma can be a compensatory fantasy about being able to repair the damage done by the traumatic events. In this sense, the grandiose fantasy is essentially a form of fixed imagery one step removed from the original fixed image of trauma. The grandiose state is much less traumatic than the experience of images from the original trauma. In grandiose behavior the individual is pretending to be doing better than they actually are. Within the grandiose fantasy lives the hope that the trauma can be worked through and become a memory, not an intrusive aspect of the present.
There is much to be gained by working with dissociated states and problematic multiplicity. Reflexivity can be considered a capacity that develops as one becomes aware of one’s encapsulated subjectivities and works with the dissociation between them. In answering the question posed by the Research Problem it was necessary to identify problematic subjectivities and to work with them. An understanding of shame was also critical in answering the Research Problem. In the next section it is noted that shame can also lead to fixed images in the psyche and a failure of the imagination as part of its role in problematic multiplicity.

**Shame and the Experience of Identity**

Human emotion has always been an integral part of depth psychology. Exploring repressed emotions, working towards the release of pent up emotion, and the analyses of negative emotional reactions directed towards the therapist were all part of Freud’s original theory and work. Jung stated that the basis of the personality is affectivity and that both thought and action are the result of an individual’s affect. According to Jung, affects are the central organizing principle of the psyche. Affects are also the basis for the complexes, the basic functional units of the psyche. Emotion is what holds a complex together in Jungian terms. Affective experience has already been noted to be a part of the imaginal structures that create encapsulated subjectivities in multiplicity. A general discussion of human emotion is necessary before focusing on shame, the emotion that is most important in shaping the experience of identity.

There are many theories of emotion in the psychological literature. Much of the current thought regarding emotion has been influenced by the work of Silvan Tomkins,
Affect Theory. According to Tomkins, there are nine biologically based affects. Humans are born with these affects hard-wired into them anatomically and physiologically. Pure affects are essentially meaning free, but are the building blocks of the emotions. An individual’s experience of the world adds a layer of personal history to their innate biological affects. Together affect and personal history create the wide variety of emotions that give meaning to life. According to Affect Theory, there would be no emotion, attention, or even consciousness without affect.

There are two positive affects, interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy, and one neutral affect, surprise-startle. There are six negative affects, distress-anguish, fear-terror, anger-rage, dissmell, disgust, and shame-humiliation. All of the complex range of human emotion can be explained as variations or combinations of these nine affects. For example, contempt is a form of anger in combination with dissmell and disgust.

Affect is most fundamentally mobilized to amplify the important physical and emotional needs of the individual. Things that are not important to a person do not create much affect. Affect is also responsible for imprinting events into memory. Tompkins calls events that are remembered, scenes. Through a process called psychological magnification, the mind groups individual scenes that share the same affect into larger interconnected, fused scenes, called governing scenes. Governing scenes shape an individual’s view of their outer and inner worlds, including their experience of identity.

What is shame? All adults know what shame is experientially but it is hard to give it a simple definition. Perhaps this is because shame covers a very wide range of
human experience from mild shyness to extreme mortification. Other variations of the shame experience are: humiliation, embarrassment, chagrin, discouragement, self-consciousness, guilt, disgrace, feeling ridiculous, dishonor, and modesty.\textsuperscript{ccxciv}

Shame is the most complex of the affects and its phenomenology, like all of the affects, can be witnessed early in infancy. The facial signs of shame, blushing, and averted eyes are present in infants.\textsuperscript{ccxcv} Postural signs of shame, slumping of the head and shoulders, develop as soon as there is enough muscular strength to hold the head up.\textsuperscript{ccxcvi}

In the infant, shame is primarily triggered when the desire for an object of attention lasts longer than the pleasure gained from it.\textsuperscript{ccxcvii} This pattern is true for adults as well, but shame gets more complex as individuals mature. Shame inhibits the positive affects of interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy.\textsuperscript{ccxcviii} Because of this inhibition, shame basically makes anything that is an impediment to interest or enjoyment very important to people. In adults, shame is also triggered by any pattern mismatch during affective resonance with other people.\textsuperscript{ccxcix} The complex social structure of human beings is very much shaped by shame.

Shame has many boundary functions, externally in the social world and internally within the psyche that help to shape the experience of identity. As Nathanson puts it:

Shame is intimately tied to our identity, to our very concept of ourselves as human. To the extent that man is a social animal, shame is a shaper of modern life. It may be that shame has built the border between what each of us know as the outside world and the inner realm we have come to call the unconscious. Some have gone so far as to say that there would be no unconscious were it not for shame! \textsuperscript{ccc}

Shame shapes the experience of identity by creating boundaries that form how individuals think and feel about themselves and also limits their actions in the world. Shame also redirects mental focus inwardly so that people think about what has triggered
Shame is a dual phenomenon, it can keep individuals severely trapped and suffering but it can also protect their sense of dignity and privacy and keeps them from doing things that are unacceptable to themselves and to others.

Shame can also become entwined with the other affects to form affect-shame binds. An affect-shame bind means that feeling any of the other affects can trigger shame. For instance, if a child was shamed for his anger, he or she may feel shame when getting angry as an adult or be too ashamed to show any anger at all. It is easy to imagine how shame binds complicate the emotional life.

Nathanson has outlined four distinct phases of shame. First, there is a triggering event. It is the individual’s subjective interpretation of the triggering situation that produces shame, not the specific circumstance. Often the trigger for shame is an impediment to a positive affect, but things that activate shame can also be learned and happen during an experience of any negative affect. This shame-affect bind takes the individual from feeling badly to feeling worse, because shame is added to the experience of the original negative affect. The next phase is the physiological reaction to shame. These physiological reactions to shame are felt by the individual but can also be seen by others. The facial and postural changes mentioned earlier and sometimes the hands covering the face, or some other physical withdrawal, are visible in social situations. These physical changes seen with shame serve to break affective resonance with other people that are involved with the shame-triggering event. The physical symptoms of shame are accompanied by a sense of cognitive shock and a transient inability to think clearly. The next step in the shame reaction is a flooding of thoughts as the individual reviews the cognitive scripts that are stored in memory to try to make sense of the shame.
filled position they feel caught up in. The final step in a shame reaction is the response to
the shame-triggering event.

Responses to shame fall broadly into the categories of acceptance or defense. Sometimes
individuals accept their role in the shame-filled experience and learn from it, but they often become defensive. Kaufman notes that besides forming identity scripts around feeling shame, people also form defending scripts. The purpose of these
defensive strategies is to shift their focus away from shame, because shame is a very
unpleasant feeling. Most of these are defenses against non-acknowledged shame. Humor,
conscious forgetting, and apology are defenses against acknowledged shame. After
this discussion, shame can now be defined as an affect that attenuates the positive affects
and over time develops into a complex group of emotional states that redirects the
attention inward and often results in defensive reactions, but sometimes leads to learning.

Léon Wurmser breaks the experience of shame into three categories, shame
anxiety, shame as a complex affective reaction, and shame as a preventative attitude. Shame anxiety is the anxious feeling that exposure is imminent and humiliation will probably follow. Shame as a complex affect is the sense that after exposure and humiliation, one wants to disappear. As a preventative attitude, shame is felt as the feeling that one must be vigilant and hide to prevent exposure and humiliation. In each of
these, there is an object in front of whom an individual feels shame and a subject that
individual feels shame about. The object in front of whom shame is felt can be another person or even an individual’s self-critical voices. Shame can be experienced as an interpersonal event or a strictly internal one.

Shame is often related to one’s own negative opinions about their competency,
These views shape the experience of identity to a large degree. Shame is more self directed or narcissistic than guilt because it draws the attention to the self rather than to the other. Shame also motivates an individual to conceal inadequacies. Feelings of shame are triggered when one does not feel good enough; shame is about feelings of weakness, failure, or just being flawed. These feelings can be triggered by either external shaming voices or internalized voices of shame. Omer has created the phrase “I-factor” in conceptualizing feelings related to inferiority. Some I-factor components are inferiority, insecurity, incompetency, inadequacy, and indignity. These I-factor feelings clearly result in shame in the individual that feels them.

The positive functions of shame are often overlooked. Looking at shame’s positive side, shame can act as a socializing force and as a protector of the identity and its integrity. Shame also helps to ensure privacy and protect dignity. Shame stops people from doing enjoyable or interesting things that are not culturally or individually acceptable. Because of these things, shame has not only been important in the development of identity, but also in the formation of both human conscience and culture. Historically, the relationship to shame and the development of culture is rooted in Freud’s thoughts on taboo and the development of social structure. The desire to break a taboo and the resulting guilt were not only at the center of Freud’s drive theory, they are the basis of civilization today.

Guilt is the form of shame for which the guilty individual can make amends to another for the action that triggered the guilt. Guilt is the result of some violation or attack upon another that an individual feels badly about. Guilt involves what one has
done wrong according to their own standards or those of their family or community. Guilt keeps individuals mired in the past and often contaminates the present and the future if not adequately processed. Guilt can also motivate an individual to confess. Relieving feelings of guilt involves taking mature responsibility for things that individuals have done wrong.

Hollis notes that there is an inauthentic form of guilt, which is really a defense against anxiety. This type of inauthentic guilt usually arises when people are afraid that they have done something that will upset others and they fear possible repercussions. Inauthentic guilt is an uncomfortable defensive feeling that is labeled as guilt. This feeling is not really guilt, but by acting guilty, an individual hopes to avoid more intolerable feelings from others, like anger, rage, or hatred. Guilt, while not a pleasant affect, is at least somewhat under the individual’s control because they can apologize or make other repartitions for what they feel they have done.

Another way to view guilt is through the archetypal lens of titanism. López-Pedraza notes that both holding too much guilt and projecting too much of it out onto others are both titanic endeavors. Projecting guilt on to other people is a form of blaming attack that reflects underlying shame. López-Pedraza’s point is that excess in either direction is embodied in the image of the Titans. The psychological essence of titanism is expressed in images that reflect either great excessiveness or emptiness. In Greek mythology, the Titans predated the gods. The era of the Titans was a time of great excess; there were no laws, no limits, and no order. The Titans were also less differentiated than the gods to the Greeks, representing only broad abstractions like memory and justice. Their names were empty of the rich personal associations that
the names of the gods evoked. Anything that is empty, void of images, such as
meaningless rhetoric or empty jargon is also psychologically titanic. An individual
that scapegoats another is titanic in the sense that the scapegoater feels no guilt,
projecting it all outwards onto the scapegoat. The scapegoat is also titanic in that it is
excessive in how much guilt they actually take on. López-Pedraza notes that
Western culture is becoming more titanic all the time.

Returning to the discussion of Affect Theory, the process of psychological
magnification creates governing scenes. Governing scenes are the major stories that
individuals hold in mind that help to create their experience of identity out of which they
live their lives. Affect is responsible for imprinting scenes in the mind, making
them memorable, and important to people. Psychological magnification is the blending
together of important memories that share similar affective tone as time passes; the end
product of which is the memory of a single scene called a governing scene.

According to Gershen Kaufman in psychological magnification there are four
types of governing scenes, affect-shame, drive-shame, interpersonal need-shame, and
purpose-shame scenes. These governing scenes arise when shame binds with the
other affects, drives, interpersonal needs, and purpose. The primary drives are sexuality
and hunger and the main interpersonal needs are relationship, touching/holding,
identification, differentiation, nurture, affirmation, and power. Purpose has to do
with dreams and goals, how people envision their futures, what they want to become and
accomplish. Purpose is a motivator of action. If a child’s daydreams, goals, and fantasies
are shamed when they are young, a shame-purpose bind is formed. This shame may
affect the child’s motivation and use of their imagination over time, limiting their
potential in many areas.

The shame-related aspects of the individual’s character are often based on governing scenes related to body issues, relationship issues, and competency. Kaufman calls the shame-related aspects of an individual’s character the *Shame Profile*. He uses the Shame Profile as a diagnostic tool in clinical work. An individual often presents in psychotherapy with body shame, relationship shame, competence shame, or identity shame. Identity shame is based on combinations of the first three. All of the affects are involved with the identity or sense of self, but shame is the affect most strongly linked with the experience of identity.

According to Affect Theory the development of identity and the experience of it are based on a critical interplay of affect, imagery, and language. Kaufman states that, “Affect amplifies scenes, imagery magnifies them, and language imprints scenes with personal and particular meaning.” Language affects how an individual feels about themselves and what they believe about themselves. Language is involved in creating the distinguishable shame states like self-doubt, inferiority, rejection, alienation, loneliness, worthlessness and any beliefs that make people feel deficient, unlovable or like they are a failure. Affect, imagery, and language create the experience of identity and the stories about the self that define an individual to themselves. In Affect Theory these are called identity scripts. Identity scripts can also be influenced by genetic factors such as the innate intensity of affects, drives, or needs. Genetic factors also influence the basic innate temperament of a person and their sexual orientation.

The specific identity scripts of self-blame, self-contempt and comparison with others can lead to the disowning of aspects of the self. These scripts are related to
the affects of dissmell, disgust, and contempt (anger and dissmell), turned against the self. As Tomkins explains this splitting, it as if one part of the self performs “psychic surgery on another part of itself, so that the self which feels ashamed is totally and permanently spilt off and rejected by a judging self.” This pattern is essentially intrapsychic shaming of one part of the self by another; this is how shame causes the splitting off of self-fragments. This is where Affect Theory contributes to the understanding of the role of shame in multiplicity.

Internal shaming voices or gatekeepers are involved with Nathanson’s compass of shame. The compass of shame is a tool to assess whether there is shame involved with a person’s actions. Nathanson notes that shame is involved whenever any of the four points of the compass of shame are observed. The four compass points are attack self, attack others, withdrawal, and avoidance. Internal shaming voices are clearly an example of attack self. Attacking the self is an old idea in depth psychology and in the history of human beings. Freud theorized that internal shaming voices are an archaic phenomenon related to taboo that predated the human relationship with the divine. He wrote:

> The punishment for the violation of a taboo was no doubt originally left to an original, automatic agency: the violated taboo itself took vengeance. When, at a later stage, ideas of gods and spirits arose, with whom the taboo became associated, the penalty was expected to follow automatically from the divine power.

Exaggerated forms of dependency can also lead to feelings of shame and gatekeeping voices. Dependence and independence are both necessary for a healthy life. If an individual is overly dependent or too independent it is a sign of unhealthy dependency. With excessive dependency, the individual is prone to feeling powerless and shame results. With too much independence, the individual is often narcissistic. Highly
exaggerated independence can be a narcissistic false self that hides the underlying feelings of inadequacy, powerlessness, shame, and dependency.

The concepts of narcissism and guilt have been intertwined throughout the history of depth psychology. Awareness of shame as a separate issue from guilt came later. Freud’s early paper *On Narcissism* outlined the concepts of primary and secondary narcissism. In primary narcissism the infant and child has its libidinal energy focused on its own ego. Freud felt that the early infant was involved with self-love. As the child matures, some of the libidinal energy is redirected to others and the baby is able to love objects, primarily their mother. As object libido or love for others increases, narcissistic libido, or love directed at the self, decreases proportionately. If there remains an over investment of libido in one’s own ego at the expense of relationships to others, the individual is considered to have secondary narcissism.

Freud, Kohut, Robert Stolorow and others consider narcissism with its grandiosity and omnipotency to be a normal part of development. The concept of primary narcissism has created controversy, leading psychoanalysts to ask if normal infants are truly narcissistic. Otto Kernberg for instance sees all narcissism as fundamentally pathological in origin and believes that it is never part of normal development.

Michael Balint addressed this issue with his concept of primary object love, which is a primitive state of passive object relationship that is not narcissistic in his view. Balint, like Kernberg, felt that all narcissism is secondary and reactive to narcissistic injury and that true narcissism always develops later than the phase associated with primary narcissism. Alexander Lowen and others currently agree with this premise.

Mahler retained and refined Freud’s concept of primary narcissism. She
conceptualized that primary narcissism was actually best conceptualized as two phases in
the infant, normal autism and then normal symbiosis. These terms, like primary
narcissism, still pathologize the normal development of infants. Daniel Stern developed a
set of non-pathologizing stages of normal infant development by direct observation of
infants and mother/infant relationships. His equivalent phase to early primary narcissism
is called the sense of the emergent self. Stern’s work validated the experience of
theorists and observers of infants alike, that babies are not narcissistic or autistic and are
involved in interpersonal relationships very early in development. Affect theory also
holds that infants are capable of affective attunement at a very young age, which also
supports the idea that infants do not have a normal narcissistic or autistic phase.

All of these theories are an attempt to describe what is happening in babies before
the I and a separate sense of identity emerge. Eric Neumann, a Jungian, calls the
symbiotic aspect of this phase, unitary reality. The phrase, unitary reality, perhaps best
captures the adult sense of what it was like to be an early infant in undifferentiated fusion
between, infant and mother, self and object, ego and Self and the experience of inner and
outer, without pathologizing it. The unitary reality or normal symbiotic phase is
personified as the Mother in the Modes of Experience model. This phase has been
likened to an archetypal experience of paradise for infants that have good enough
mothering. The archetypal experience of longing for this phase, for paradise lost, is seen
when adults encounter the pain and complexity of adulthood. The discussion of
development will also be revisited in the next section as it relates to regression and
dependency, and also how it relates to the concepts of narcissistic maturation.

Turning back to secondary narcissism and how it relates to shame, Freud
introduced the concept of the *ego ideal* in the same paper that introduced his concepts on narcissism. The narcissist, unable to maintain the feelings of infantile perfection, projects his libido onto an ego ideal. The ego ideal is a psychic agency that houses ideals and was a precursor of the superego that would be elaborated in Freud’s structural model later on. Morrison points out that the ego ideal is intimately involved with shame, a point that Freud did not discuss. He also notes that when Freud developed his structural model, Freud placed guilt where shame would have been more appropriate.

The ego psychologists Hartmann and Rudolph Lowenstein elaborated the idea of the ego ideal in relationship to the superego but did not separate shame from guilt. The concepts of ego ideal and the ideal self helped to set the stage for shame to be recognized as a primary affective experience. Hartmann expanded the definition of narcissism from the libidinal cathexis of the ego to the broader concept of libidinal cathexis of the self. This focus on the self served to begin to orient psychoanalysis back towards interest in narcissism.

Tomkins re-conceptualized the place of affect in the post-Freudian era. He placed shame in a very prominent place and defined guilt as a variation of the shame affect. Tomkins’ work influenced the work of the object relations therapists, Edith Jacobson and Annie Reich who did deal with shame. It is striking that many object relations theorists, with their emphasis on interpersonal relationships, did not delve extensively into shame. Shame has so much to do with feelings that arise in relationship to others.

Gerhart Piers was actually the first psychoanalyst to clearly separate shame and
guilt. He also linked the concept of ego ideal with narcissism. In his view, the main attribute of the ego ideal was its sense of narcissistic omnipotence and over inflated, perfectionist ideals that created tension for the ego. At this point, the concept of shame began to be differentiated from the concept of guilt in psychoanalysis. Shame was seen as an internal event relative to failing to live up to an ego ideal or an interpersonal event relating to a sense of feeling inadequate in relationship to an object.

Erik Erikson was another psychoanalytic pioneer that did separate shame from guilt. Erikson refined the Freudian concept of ego development. The ego in his model developed in psychosocial stages. Starting with Freud’s phases, the oral, anal, phallic, and oedipal, he went on to add additional stages that emerged later in the life cycle. As each stage was negotiated, a specific basic strength emerged in the individual. The first phase is basic trust vs. mistrust. The next two phases relate directly to shame and guilt. The second phase is autonomy vs. shame and doubt. This phase is analogous to Freud’s anal phase. If a child successfully negotiates this phase, the capacity of will is developed. Erikson’s third phase is initiative vs. guilt. The third phase is analogous to the phallic phase of Freud. If it is negotiated well, a sense of purpose develops in the child. Erikson separated the concepts of shame and guilt and they both played a major role in the formation of the ego in his model. The later phases were industry vs. inferiority, identity vs. role confusion, intimacy vs. isolation, generativity vs. stagnation, and the last was integrity vs. despair. These too can be related to shame in that inferiority, identity, isolation, and stagnation are all potential sources of shame. The final phase, integrity vs. despair can also be related to shame in that working through shame issues leads to dignity, a state of integrity that is the opposite of a shame based
According to Morrison, shame can be viewed in two ways in its relationship to narcissism. First, shame can be considered as a feeling of flaw, inferiority, or failure that the narcissistic self feels about its own imperfection. Secondly, because shame is so painful, the self may develop the narcissistic constructs of grandiosity, perfection and self-sufficiency to avoid feeling shame. Morrison considers the relationship between shame and narcissism to be a dialectic between these two scenarios. He states that:

there is an ongoing tension-generating dialectic between narcissistic grandiosity and desire for perfection, and the archaic sense of self as flawed, inadequate, and inferior following realization of separateness from, and dependence on, objects. Similarly, a metaphorical dialectic exists between the wish for absolute autonomy and uniqueness and the wish for perfect merger and reunion with the projected fantasy of the ideal. Thus shame and narcissism inform each other, as the self is experienced, first, alone, separate, and small, and, again, grandiosely, striving to be perfect and reunited with its ideal.

No discussion of the history of shame and narcissism would be complete without a brief exploration of the works of Heinz Kohut. Using empathy and introspection as his investigative tools with narcissistic individuals, he developed his theories of normal and abnormal development. The results of normal narcissistic maturation or the transformation of clinical narcissism are an ego that has the capacity to be creative, empathic, humorous, and wise. Jacoby notes that the Jungian process of individuation has many parallels with Kohut’s views on narcissistic maturation.

As discussed earlier, in classic psychoanalytic thought, development occurred as primary narcissism or love of the self, was replaced by love of an object. The investment of libido shifts from the ego to another person. Kohut called the object in this scenario a self-object, a subjective extension of the self that functioned to allow the development of
Kohut’s construct of the self was bipolar. One pole was the narcissistic self, based on grandiose and omnipotent images of the self and the other was the idealizing self, based on idealized images of the parents. Both poles are narcissistic but under optimal developmental conditions, both contribute to a healthy cohesive experience of identity.

The narcissistic or grandiose/exhibitionistic self is formed in cohesive way if the parental figure is an “empathically responding merging-mirroring/approving self-object.” This pole has to do with ambition. Kohut’s other pole of the self, the child’s idealized parental imago self, forms “via his relation to the empathically responding self-object parent who permits and indeed enjoys the child’s idealization of him and merger with him.” This pole has to do with ideals. Kohut believed that it is through the internalization of the idealized parental imago, that values and ideals are formed in the child. The grandiose self comes first developmentally but it is not necessarily more primitive than the idealizing self in that there is a parallel narcissistic development of both.

Good enough parenting during maturation normally allows a child to see that they are not perfect and all powerful and neither are their parents. As mentioned earlier, Kohut called this process the optimal frustration of narcissism and it allowed for the development of a realistic experience of identity without the grandiosity or the fragility of a narcissist. This realistic experience of identity has been called healthy narcissism, which is synonymous with self-esteem. In this state, there is a healthy tension between an individual’s ambitions and goals and their values.

In Kohut’s view, when there is less than optimal frustration by the parental figures
there is self-object failure. In this situation a cohesive self does not develop in the child and the compensatory and defensive structures of narcissism develop. If the grandiose pole was not mirrored well enough, the ego may be overwhelmed by the grandiosity and the ideals of the narcissistic self. Underneath this grandiosity, the person then feels shame and may see themselves as a failure. The individual may compensate with their parental imago pole by attempting to build self-esteem through achieving ideals. The grandiose pole may defend against the feelings of shame around a deep sense of worthlessness by manifesting grandiose pseudo-vitality. According to Kohut, this depletion of the self because there is no authentic vitality is one of the characteristic self-deficits seen in narcissism.

Morrison has expanded upon Kohut’s ideas about shame. He feels that shame reflects a depleted sense of self that is seen when an idealized self-object, usually a parent, is not responsive enough. He also feels that shame results from self-object failure to adequately meet the child’s age appropriate needs of the self. Shame is thus the result of both inadequate amounts of mirroring or inappropriate mirroring, in children and shame prone adults.

The benefits of embracing shame and learning from it now become obvious. Shame can teach individuals where their childhood narcissistic wounds are located. Working through shame can make people feel better about themselves and have empathy for others. Working with shame and narcissism can lead to trust and interdependency.

The existing literature has vast amounts of data that relates trauma to dissociation and multiplicity but few references relating shame to dissociation and multiplicity. This study brings shame issues to the forefront in problematic multiplicity. Longer term work
using the principals of treating shame with individuals and their encapsulated
subjectivities in therapy gives therapists another option in dealing with the suffering of
their clients. Signs of grandiosity are a way into the individual’s underlying shame issues
if the therapist watches for them. Looking for grandiosity and underlying shame allowed
the research to address the Research Problem. The last section takes a closer look at
grandiosity, inflation, and dependency.

Grandiosity, Inflation, and Dependency

As noted earlier, grandiosity has been closely linked with narcissism in the
literature. Narcissism was partially discussed in the shame section because of the intimate
relationship between shame and narcissism during the development of the identity. In this
section, the discussion of narcissism is expanded because of the close link between
grandiosity and narcissism. This discussion will not cover the entire breadth of the
literature on narcissism, its treatment or history; it will focus on grandiosity and inflation.
Both overt grandiosity and inflation are covered as well as the more subtle forms of
covert grandiosity and negative inflation. This section begins with a brief discussion of
grandiosity and inflation before moving deeper into those topics and the related issues of
entitlement, inflation, regression, and dependency. This section outlines concepts that are
critical for the understanding of the research that involves grandiose subjectivities in the
exploration of problematic multiplicity.
When one thinks of grandiosity, images of ostentation, pomposity, and showiness come to mind. Along these lines, Eugene Gauron and Wayne Bowers very simply define grandiosity as an inflated impression of the self, but the phenomenon of grandiosity is more complex than this.\textsuperscript{cdvi} Arthur Robbins states that grandiosity is the propensity to rebel against the effort demanded by life and the responsibility to lead an independent and productive life.\textsuperscript{cdvii} These definitions are quite divergent and don’t hold the subtly that is necessary for this research. As quoted earlier, Price states that grandiosity is an exaggerated claim of an individual’s own importance and an entitled sense of feeling special.\textsuperscript{cdviii} This definition will allow the discussion of grandiosity to cover the overt aspects of grandiosity and the more subtle forms of grandiosity as reflected in exaggerated feelings of being special and entitled.

The concept of inflation is closely related to grandiosity. Sylvia Perera states simply that inflation manifests as an unrealistically high sense of identity.\textsuperscript{cdix} Jung links inflation to an individual identifying with an archetype.\textsuperscript{cdx} Edward Edinger defines inflation specifically as identifying with the archetype of the Self.\textsuperscript{cdxi} This identification results in an inflated state because the individual identifies with the emergent contents contained within the transpersonal and numinous archetypal energies, which are always bigger than any individual.\textsuperscript{cdxii} Negative inflation, as opposed to inflation in the normal sense, is the state in which a person has an unrealistically low sense of identity.\textsuperscript{cdxiii}

All individuals have subjectivities that can at times become inflated. An inflated subjectivity would be a normally non-grandiose subjectivity that is temporarily inflated. An example would be a normally humble good student part that led someone to boast about an academic achievement due to a temporary inflation. As mentioned earlier, this
dissertation focuses on grandiose subjectivities rather than inflated subjectivities that are normally not grandiose. A discussion of inflation is warranted because it is important to distinguish between subjectivities that are temporarily inflated and those that are truly grandiose when working with grandiose subjectivities.

Grandiose subjectivities are parts of a person that are consistently grandiose over time. Steven Hibbard describes the phenomena of grandiose subjectivities and their related grandiose enactments very well in a general article about grandiosity that does not directly address multiplicity. Hibbard states he has observed “circumscribed manifestations of grandiosity” in neurotic individuals that can cause grandiose acting out of an underlying conflict in an attempt to bolster feelings of self-esteem. Edinger notes that inflation is a part of normal repetitive life cycle. Heroic inflation leads individuals out of the state of the ego-Self identity and into the world. They then meet rejection from those around them, which is inevitable because of their heroic inflation. This rejection leads to a state of alienation from the Self and humility, repentance, or a sacrificial attitude. This change in behavior and attitude leads individuals back to acceptance by the world and a reconnection with the Self. People are then in a passive state of inflation which completes the cycle until inflation again builds and the cycle starts over again. The cycle brings maturity as it continues over and over again. The power of this principle, viewed through the lens of problematic multiplicity, is that it may be grandiose encapsulated subjectivities that are acting out but these enactments are viewed as acts of inflation when...
looking at the individual as a whole. In this sense, grandiose encapsulated subjectivities have the potential to drive individuals towards maturity through their enactments.

The Genesis chapter of the Bible is also related to inflation, specifically to a fall from an inflated place. The story holds psychological importance both individually and culturally. This story of the Fall is an ancillary guiding myth of this dissertation. The fall from the grace of God is a form of the lost paradise mythology that is seen in all cultures in some fashion. The story holds psychological importance both individually and culturally. This story of the Fall is an ancillary guiding myth of this dissertation. The fall from the grace of God is a form of the lost paradise mythology that is seen in all cultures in some fashion. Culturally, the myth is about the awakening of consciousness in the evolution of human beings. Individually, the myth is about the ego crystallizing out of the preverbal state of unity consciousness. As the child’s consciousness develops and the psyche begins a separation from the symbiotic state with the mother, the child becomes aware that they are separate and that they will someday die. Eden was experienced as paradise for Adam and Eve until they ate the apple from the Tree of Knowledge of good and evil. Adam and Eve would have had everlasting life in Eden, the bliss of symbiosis, if they had not eaten the apple in order to know what God knew. Eating the apple represents the sin of hubris that led to their eyes being opened, meaning their awareness grew, but it also led to the Fall from the grace of God. When Adam and Eve realized that they were naked, they covered their genitalia with fig leaves, which represents shame becoming an important force in the development of the identity. Outside of Eden, Adam and Eve suffered and felt shame for the first time.

Another aspect of the myth of the Fall that relates to this dissertation is the longing for Paradise. This longing is an archetypal experience; all individuals long for a trouble free life. This longing can take the form of the grandiose desire to regress back to Eden, or to the desire to find heaven on earth, or even the hunger to transcend the earthly
realm altogether for a better place. The healthiest expression of the longing for paradise archetype is when it is seen as the longing to individuate or to progress to higher levels of consciousness.

The word narcissism came from the character of Narcissus from the Greek myth. The story of Narcissus and Echo tells much about grandiosity in its many forms. This story is another ancillary guiding myth of this dissertation. These two characters are complementary in nature and reflect the polarity between the overt and covert forms of narcissism, grandiosity, and entitlement. Perhaps this polarity can be best stated in a simple way as the polarity between being very self-absorbed and being very self-effacing. These two ways of being parallel Kohut’s bipolar self; the self-absorbed grandiose self is like Narcissus and the self-effacing, idealizing-the-other self, is like Echo. Both poles can be considered grandiose in that Narcissus is overtly grandiose and Echo is covertly grandiose.

Narcissus was a beautiful young man that would not accept the loving advances from any of his admirers. Because he grandiosely rejects the love of others, the god Nemesis, the goddess of just punishment, puts a curse on him, which makes him fall in love with his own reflection on the surface of a pond. He pines away, starving and keeps staring at his beloved image in the water, but is not able to touch it or hold it. At first he does not realize that the image he sees is his own reflection. Eventually he realizes that the image is his own reflection and he laments his predicament and eventually dies. A narcissus flower blooms on the spot of his death and he is taken to Hades. As he crosses the River Styx, his gaze is still transfixed on his own reflection in the river.
Narcissus finds transformation only in death and even then, he does not lose his preoccupation with his own image. At first Narcissus finds pleasure in the outer world, including his own physical beauty, but he grandiosely rejects the love of others. When he first stares at the pond, it is the false, superficial, self-image that preoccupies him. He still thinks the image is outside of his self; he is still imagining that he yearns for a perfect other. The image is not real, not able to be held, which causes him suffering.

When Narcissus, through his suffering, eventually realizes that the image he sees in the reflection is his own face, he begins to become more conscious of his inner world. Jacoby notes that this aspect of the story does not fit the normal view of narcissism and grandiosity, which focuses on self-centeredness or vanity rather than self-reflection. According to Jacoby, Narcissus ultimately represents:

the human drive for self-knowledge and self-realization, with the admonition ‘Become who you are!’ – and thus it implies the possibility of transcending the narrower forms of narcissistic problems.

Something flowers when grandiosity and narcissism die; it is the loss of superficiality, as one gets further into the exploration of self. Both individuation and narcissism involve focusing on the self. Jacoby makes the distinction between individuation and narcissism based on the sense of specialness felt by the individual who is gripped by narcissism.

It may be the quality of the sense of ‘specialness’ that makes the difference. A sense of being special may mean: ‘I am especially beautiful, intelligent, good, clever, powerful, etc.’ It may also mean: ‘My sense of my own world depends on whether this fact is seen and acknowledged by others; if that is not the case, then I am totally worthless, nothing. My very existence depends on whether my specialness is admiringly acknowledged or not.’

It is this sense of specialness in narcissism that is important to this dissertation because it is the sense of specialness that points to grandiosity. Narcissus in the context of this
dissertation only represents grandiose parts of the self, parts that if integrated with other parts can lead to a reflexive identity. Echo like Narcissus represents the possibility of something positive, the focus of energy on others.

Echo has been cursed to only be able to speak the words that others have said. She can only tell Narcissus of her love for him by repeating what he says. She represents the classic dependent or codependent personality. This aspect of the story is very telling, Narcissus sees the love of another as giving up his power and Echo is too willing to give her power away. He is too independent and she is too dependent. Narcissus and Echo represent the human qualities of unhealthy dependency.

Anita Tenzer expresses the polarity symbolized by Narcissus and Echo very well in relationship to entitlement. She calls the poles grandiosity and subservience.

While entitlement is usually discussed in terms of narcissistic and borderline patients, I believe disorders of entitlement are a matter of degree and cut across diagnostic categories. In grandiosity, there is an overabundance of entitlement and overt anger that frequently masks an intolerable feeling of shame, a fear of being exposed as vulnerable and needy. In subservience, a paucity of entitlement often masks self righteous rage and envy. In grandiosity there is self-idealization at the expense of others who are depreciated. In subservience there is idealization of others and denigration of oneself.

Subservience could be called negative grandiosity using similar phraseology as is used with the concept of negative inflation. The Echoistic pole of grandiosity can be also be linked with other terms in the literature such as vulnerable narcissism, unconscious grandiosity, unhealthy dependence, and codependence.

Along similar lines, the Narcissus/Echo polarity is seen in overt and covert forms of narcissism. Both types of narcissism have a common core of conceit, self-indulgence, and disregard for others according to Paul Wink. The overt form is associated with grandiosity and exhibitionism and is characterized by extroversion, self-assurance, and
aggression. The covert form has features related to vulnerability and sensitivity, such as introversion, defensiveness, anxiety, and vulnerability to life’s traumas. In a similar vein, narcissism can be considered either grandiose or vulnerable according to Kelly Dickinson and Aaron Pincus. John O’Leary and Fred Wright note that entitlement can also be either overt or covert as well.

According to Lowen, grandiosity has to do with a mismatch between the actual self and one’s self image. It is grandiosity in this sense that defines narcissism and in narcissistic disorders, it is the degree of grandiosity that determines the severity of the narcissistic disturbance. Both overt and covert narcissism are defense mechanisms that have to do with an inadequate sense of identity related to a mismatch between the real self and the image of the self. This mismatch about the self is essentially a distortion of the self-representation. It has been noted by Frank Lachmann and Robert Stolorow that individuals with narcissistic pathology tend to distort their object representations of other people as well. These distortions can take the form of idealizing or devaluing.

The characteristics of grandiosity in narcissism have been outlined well by Dragan Svrakic. Narcissists are prone to free floating grandiosity that includes faking of reality, insatiable hunger for acclaim, pathological ambitiousness, omnipotence, and sensationalism. He calls it free floating because the narcissist can attach them to any feeling, thought, or action at any moment. Grandiosity becomes the primary criterion of value for narcissists and yet something has to be perfect to be valued.

Narcissists also need to be mirrored, given enough attention and emotional attunement in their grandiosity to maintain their propped up self-esteem. Narcissists are also unable to feel pleasure in communication unless it is primarily made up of approval.
and they have very little capacity to empathize with others or even recognize the feelings of others.  Grandiosity can also be used as a buffer from others. Relating to grandiose individuals can be difficult and alienating because they relate to others from the false self and therefore do not feel totally authentic.

Joel Bernstein notes a grandiose character style that is not narcissism, created by parents that spoil the child with “majestic attendance.” Primary grandiose characters have little tolerance of anxiety and depression and are naturally demanding. Primary grandiosity is the character that grows out of special treatment by parents that see their child as special as reflected in Freud’s statement, “His Majesty, the Baby.” A primary grandiose style develops when the individual retains some of the grandiosity of the normal primary narcissistic stage of development. Bernstein feels this developmental stage would have been more accurately called primary grandiosity rather than primary narcissism. Bernstein’s second type of grandiose character style is the reactive type, which is the same as the typical view of grandiosity in the literature. Reactive grandiosity is created by feelings of shame resulting from an inadequate sense of self. Grandiosity has been considered a type of false self that forms when the real self fails to live up to the expectation of the ego ideals. In this situation, the real self that feels inferior remains sheltered, and grandiosity results to bolster up the experience of identity.

The false self develops with failure of parenting, as was discussed earlier. In the literature on narcissism, this failure is called the narcissistic injury, disturbance, or wounding. According to Alice Miller this wounding prevents the development of normal self-esteem that results from normal narcissistic development. Narcissistic injury is
essentially a deep wounding to the real self of a child that happens when the child is
required to be substantially different than he or she really is.\textsuperscript{cdlii} It is as if the child is told
by its caregivers to not be who they really are and they have to be who the parents need
them to be.\textsuperscript{cdliii} Narcissistic injury is about the parent controlling the child in a way that
tends to be humiliating.\textsuperscript{cdliv} Steven Johnson summarizes it by saying, “the narcissistic
injury exists in the parents inability to accept, understand and love the child with all of
his real conflicts, vulnerabilities and magnificence.”\textsuperscript{cdlv} The child then develops a false
self based on the caregiver’s needs instead of what he or she really needs.\textsuperscript{cdlvi} The child
effectively rejects the real self because it is unacceptable to the parent. This rejection of
self leads to intense feelings of worthlessness and humiliation, both forms of shame.\textsuperscript{cdlvii}

Developmentally, the presence of grandeur is always accompanied by feelings of
inferiority.\textsuperscript{cdlviii} In adult narcissists, the split between the feelings of grandeur and
inferiority is too great. The true narcissist manages these conflicting feelings by
defensively splitting them off to prevent conscious awareness of this internal conflict.\textsuperscript{cdlix}
In children, if the narcissistic wounding is bad enough, the child will develop narcissism
as a major part of their personality. The child will follow the most adaptive path and tend
towards either grandeur or inferiority and overt or covert narcissism results. If the
narcissistic disturbance is severe, narcissistic personality disorder will result, if less
severe, an overt or covert narcissistic character style will develop.\textsuperscript{cdlx}

Many people have narcissistic elements to their personalities even if they do not
have a narcissistic personality character style or a personality disorder. These traits form
as adaptive responses to narcissistic wounding that is not severe. If the environment is
supportive enough throughout childhood, an individual will develop an appropriate sense
of feeling special around their strengths and an objective appreciation of their weaknesses. This supportive environment results in an identity with healthy levels of entitlement, pride, interdependency, and an integrated multiplicity. With good enough parenting, shame and guilt can be felt when appropriate then moved through without the excessive grandiosity, entitlement or unhealthy dependency that come with the narcissistic disorders.

Serious narcissistic injury tends to be passed from generation to generation because narcissistically wounded parents are often unable to effectively raise their children without narcissistically injuring them. A narcissistically injured caregiver cannot accurately mirror a child and hold the child’s age appropriate narcissistic needs well enough, even if they are loving and attentive. Grandiosity is only one of the responses to narcissistic disturbance. Depression is, according to Miller, the reverse of grandiosity and is also related to narcissistic injury and a form of narcissistic collapse. Svrakic makes the point that chronic pessimism can also be a form of narcissistic decompensation. Another common form of narcissistic decompensation is manifested by feelings of rage. Kohut relates this to a reaction of feelings of helplessness. Tenzer notes that in grandiosity there is often anger that defends against intolerable feelings of shame. This is similar to narcissistic rage.

The term omnipotence is sometimes used almost synonymously with grandiosity, but the literature often uses omnipotence to describe grandiose fantasies of having unlimited power. Infantile omnipotence, relates to the developmental stage in which some theorists imagine that the infant feels totally powerful. In Melanie Klein’s view the baby felt that its impulses were all powerful, it created the “good breast” that brought
nourishment and it annihilated the “bad breast” that was not there when it was hungry. Winnicott who thought that the baby experienced itself as “the all-powerful center of all being” called this phase subjective omnipotence. In adults omnipotence could simply be said to be a specific form of grandiosity seen in narcissistic disturbances.

Treatment of narcissism, which will not be reviewed extensively, includes encouragement of narcissistic maturation. In Self Psychology the therapist accepts transference from the narcissistic client much as the parent ideally would have during the development of the individual. Specifically, as treatment relates to the bipolar self, the therapist mirrors the grandiose aspects of the client and the parts of the client that need to idealize parental figures are allowed to idealize the therapist. In doing this, the therapist allows for mirroring transference and idealizing transference to take place. After this has happened, Morrison suggests that addressing the underlying shame rather than addressing grandiosity or inferiority directly is the best way to proceed.

In Kohut’s model, creativity is one of the results of narcissistic maturation. This concept suggests that narcissism interferes with true creativity, yet grandiose traits have been linked with creative people. Peter Wolson posits the existence of an adaptive form of grandiosity that facilitates creativity. He defines adaptive grandiosity as the creative person’s:

- exhilarating conviction of potential for greatness, the extremely high value that is placed on the uniqueness of feelings, perceptions, sensations, memories, thoughts, and experiences, and on the importance of publicly exhibiting the content of the inner world through the creative medium.

It takes more than self-confidence to create something out of nothing. Creating something out of nothing is in essence the psychological equivalent to facing the void or the state of non-being. Adaptive grandiosity has elements that come from primary and
secondary narcissism that can facilitate creativity as long as the individuals are identified with their creative work. In Wolson’s thinking, if this energy becomes invested in maladaptive grandiosity, or elements of unhealthy omnipotence, it will interfere with creativity.\textsuperscript{cdlxxv}

Similar to the way that Wolson sees some grandiosity as an adaptive phenomenon, Revella Levin posits that omnipotence can also be a positive capacity. To Levin, grandiosity is related more to identity than omnipotence, and grandiosity tends to be hostile and competitive.\textsuperscript{edlxxvi} In the discussion of grandiosity, most authors use the term omnipotence as a grandiose fantasy of absolute power that occurs in grandiosity and narcissism. For Levin, retention of some omnipotence from infancy is necessary for mental health, whereas she sees grandiosity as pathological. Levin sees grandiosity as a defense, which is in agreement with the general consensus, but she sees omnipotence as related more to capacities than to identity. Omnipotence in clients is represented by statements like “I can do anything,” and failure of omnipotence is represented by statements like “I cannot defend myself.”\textsuperscript{cdlxxvii}

Roy Calogeras, in discussing the neurotic context of grandiosity, writes “intensive treatment often brings forth early narcissistic vestiges of early childhood which have managed to retain, in some encapsulated fashion, a predominant place in the patient’s personality.”\textsuperscript{cdlxxviii} Calogeras’ description of these encapsulated narcissistic vestiges of the personality describe grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. He also speaks of regression in the process of working with grandiosity.\textsuperscript{cdlxxix} Through the lens of narcissistic development, when a grandiose enactment is seen in problematic multiplicity, it could be viewed as a form of regression to these early stages.
Regression is a temporary suspension of the normal ego function, in favor of a more primitive one. Regression is a reverting to an earlier or more childlike pattern of behavior. The concept of regression goes back to Freud but this short discussion will focus on the contributions of Balint. Balint originated the term *basic fault* to represent the preverbal level of experience in which there is a disturbance of *primary object love* between the mother and infant. Regression to this level causes a great deal of anxiety and neediness. The basic fault is not experienced as conflict but rather as a defect that must be rectified.

According to Balint, regression as an interpersonal event is primarily aimed at getting recognition from another person. This behavior is not usually done on purpose. Regression can however be a therapeutic ally in the therapy room if the therapist responds with tolerance and understanding but not action. The therapist can be especially helpful by providing a specific form of object relationship that the client needs without positively reinforcing the regression by gratifying them. When the client is ready, Balint advises giving an interpretation of the dynamic at work. Of course, interpersonal regression outside of therapy is a form of acting out that is more problematic. Regression can also be an intrapsychic phenomenon, which can happen in the therapy room with the therapist present but the intent of the regression is not easily recognized.

Regression can provide an individual with fresh insights on an issue. This new beginning would be considered benign regression, but regression is often malignant. With malignant regression there is no new insight or beginning; there is usually even deeper dependency and more demands for external action to help what must ultimately be
accomplished internally. With malignant regression there is also often the demand for results that cannot be provided for by the object involved. Benign regression serves the ego, strengthening it whereas malignant regression tends to overwhelm the ego. Malignant regression is the most common form of regression outside of the therapy room and often involves unhealthy dependency.

Dependency has been linked with grandiosity. Omer states “grandiosity is the illusion that we are not interdependent.” In terms of the Modes of Experience, individuals are all dependent on mother, father, and peer support interpersonally and intrapsychically if they are to find the Friend, the voice of compassionate objectivity. Timmen Cermak also links dependency with grandiosity in his discussion of the poles of Kohut’s bipolar self. He suggests that the grandiose, exhibitionistic pole of Kohut’s bipolar self is the dependent pole and the idealized parental imago self is the codependent pole. Cermak who is an expert in the chemical dependency field, calls the dependent pole narcissistic and the codependent pole the echoistic pole. The dependent pole is chemically dependent in addicts. In non-addicts this pole is dependent on the things the grandiose false self does to prop up the experience of identity. Both poles have unhealthy dependence.

Cermak notes that the term codependency does not have to be strictly defined as an individual that is caught in the web of dependency with someone who is chemically dependent. He relates that the concept codependency is a psychological idea that can be valuable and useful much like other psychological abstractions such as defense mechanisms and enmeshment. Codependency as a concept that is unrelated to chemical dependency is how the general populace and many therapists like Marion Solomon use
Solomon defines codependency as the state in which an individual is dependent upon a dysfunctional relationship that has unhealthy dependency issues characterized by the individual giving too much of themselves away in relationship. The opposite pole from codependent, in the general sense, is someone that is too independent or isolated. This form of unhealthy independence has been called counter-dependency. Counter-dependent traits have been associated with narcissism. This pole of the dependency spectrum is just as problematic as codependency. Solomon outlines the characteristics of this type of dependency as well. Counter-dependents have a tendency to prefer being separate and experience little togetherness. Counter-dependents have driving need to prove self-sufficiency, a fear of dependency, and a lack of connection to significant others.

Albert Memmi’s seminal book *Dependence* discusses a large range of issues dealing with dependency without using the terms codependency or counter-dependency. Memmi makes the point that everyone is dependent on a wide variety of people and things and that dependency is “an operational concept so efficacious that it furnishes an invaluable key to the understanding of people and groups and of their various works, forms of expression, and patterns of behavior.” Memmi defines dependence as “a relationship with a real or ideal being, object, group, or institution that involves more or less accepted compulsion and that is connection with the satisfaction of a need.” To him dependence is not normally an illness, it is a necessary aspect of human life, but it can get problematic. He does of course allow for pathological forms of dependency, when individuals are either excessively dependent or markedly independent.
Memmi points out that when someone needs another person it means that they are dependent upon the other to be a provider and they also hope to get something from them.\textsuperscript{d} The result is that dependent people usually do not want to terminate dependency relationships.\textsuperscript{di} A provider in this sense is something or someone that responds to the expectations of a dependent. He also points out that in amorous relationships the least dependent partner is not always the dominant one. Dependency does not always equal subjugation.\textsuperscript{dii} A dominant person can be dependent on the dominated person for many of their needs as well. Memmi calls this reciprocal dependence.\textsuperscript{diii} This reciprocity explains the “tenacity, continuity, and stability of the human duet.”\textsuperscript{div}

There are three aspects of dependency, a person who hopes to gain something from being dependent, an object the individual covets, and a provider of the object.\textsuperscript{dv} He is using the term object, in the psychological sense. An object can be a person, thing, a value, or even a spiritual concept, like God. All individuals tend to idealize their providers.\textsuperscript{dvi} When people are too dependent, they are more interested in the relationship with the provider than in the provider’s real character.\textsuperscript{dvii} The dependent is actually waiting for a messiah, a provider that will alleviate all of their anxiety and meet all of their needs.\textsuperscript{dviib} This degree of providing is impossible for any human to totally provide.

Idealization of providers can also spill over on to imaginary providers. God of course, is the ideal provider in the mind of a true believer. God is seen as an omnipotent person that will never abandon believers, loves absolutely, is moral, beautiful, unlimited, and omnipotent, and does not need people at all.\textsuperscript{dix} Dependency on the sacred creates religion, which engenders very intense beliefs because humans have strong anxieties.\textsuperscript{dx}
Memmi says, “Religion may not have the legitimacy of truth, but it does have the legitimacy of need.”

Dependency always deals with needs and there is always a price that in some way must be paid for what is provided. Paying the price often involves both the dependent’s consent and resentment. Dependency is thus a double-edged experience engendering both resentment and gratitude. Resentment usually results in reactions like disappointment, frustration, the fear of frustration, or humiliation due to feelings of weakness. These feelings make an individual want to terminate the dependent relationship but then the dependent person would have to give up what made them grateful in the relationship! Sometimes an imaginary termination helps. Imagining leaving the dependent relationship helps individuals to tolerate the downsides of it.

According to Memmi, a provider has two characteristics from the dependent’s point of view; they are unique and yet interchangeable. The provider is special and unique as long as they are providing what the dependent needs, but with any hint of abandonment, the dependent will often find another provider. The provider does get a positive return from providing, usually pleasure or feelings of importance. Ultimately, providing is also a form of dependency. Usually the duet between dependent and provider is somewhat inharmonious because the dependent tends to demand too much and the provider is unable to completely satisfy the dependent.

The whole issue of dependency seems fairly negative in this culture but no individual can ever be totally independent. Dependency has a role in life; it keeps people from isolation, allows them to play, gather, enjoy each other’s company, and protect each other from anguish. Dependency is involved in many emotional, survival,
and economic needs of human beings. Both partners in a relationship can have “consensual reciprocal dependence” that is based on the needs of both without force or deception. Others call this healthy state of reciprocal dependence, interdependence.

Memmi advises that one try to be neither too dependent nor too independent, with the caveat that perfection is impossible. He suggests that individuals try to manage their dependencies, not suppress them. The first way to manage dependence is for an individual to pursue their needs but to try to lessen their desires because “the more desires we have, the more dependent we will be.” He suggests developing austerity and self-mastery as advocated by many philosophies and religions. He notes that there is often conflict between dependencies and these must be worked out by asking oneself which desires and needs are most important. Another way to deal with dependency is substitution, that is, switching providers when that is an appropriate thing to do. For example, Memmi notes the important role the group provides in Alcoholics Anonymous as a substitute for alcohol in the dependent addict.

Ritualization is another avenue of dealing with dependency. Ritualization allows the dependency to be satisfied periodically in a safe and community condoned way so that the dependency does not take over the dependent’s life. Memmi gives two examples of ritual that satisfy dependencies safely, drinking alcohol at a gathering to mildly loosen the normal behavioral constraints of society and a carnival in which there is an “intense but temporary relaxation of the moral code.”

While there is no easy cure for dependency and no perfect substitutes, dependency can be managed. Total elimination of dependency would eliminate much
enjoyment as well. He suggests that individuals strive for as much self-sufficiency as possible while accepting help from others when it is appropriate. People should accept the dependencies for which no substitutes are available. Dependency is ultimately part of being human.

Another influential work on dependency is *The Anatomy of Dependence* by Takeo Doi. His work started as an analysis of Japanese behavior but Doi soon saw the relevance of his work to western individuals and groups. His focus on dependency has to do with a specific form of dependency described by the Japanese word, *amae*. There is no corresponding word in general use for this concept in western languages. Amae: refers initially to the feelings that all normal infants at the breast harbor toward the mother—dependence, the desire to be passively loved, the unwillingness to be separated from the warm mother-child circle and cast into a world of objective ‘reality.’

Doi likens amae to Balint’s concept of passive object love. He also relates amae to Freud’s use of the term *identification* as it applies to early infants. Freud said, “identification is the earliest and original form of emotional tie.”

Memmi also notes a similar form of dependency or the expectation of passive love when he says “what the younger generation is really looking for, more or less confusedly, is an absolute gift given strictly out of love.” Amae is an emotional state, the feeling of being totally loved and held by another. To act out of this place of feeling totally loved and held is to *amaeru* in the Japanese vernacular. In the child, *amaeru-ing* is acting childishly with the total certainty that the parent will indulge you. In the adult, amaeru-ing is also a vertical relationship, akin to the parent/child relationship, where the individual acts self-indulgently and expects it to be tolerated by the other in the relationship.
In the Japanese language there are many other words that describe the nuances of dependency that can give individuals deeper insights. These nuances of dependency reflect how dependency is more openly a part of the Japanese culture than it is in the West where independence is so prized. The Japanese have a greater tolerance for dependency than individuals do in the West, but they too recognize the problems of being too dependent and too independent. Having too much amae or not enough, both result in a lack of concern for others.\(^{dxxxviii}\)

The word amae also relates to the concepts of sweetness and naïve optimism. The adjective *amae* can literally mean sweet taste but it is also used when is a person is considered to be sweet. Amai in this sense, means the individuals are sweet because they allow another to amaeru, behave self-indulgently, because of their special relationship.\(^{dxxxix}\) Amai is also used when a person’s view of a situation is excessively optimistic and self-indulgent wishful thinking gets in the way of good judgment.\(^{dxl}\) Amai relates to grandiosity when an individual is overly optimistic about his or her own situation. Also related to grandiosity, amae has the connotation that an individual can be forgiven for any sin, a feeling that one is entitled to act out and that others should accept their behavior no matter what.

Doi considers amae to be the central emotion in *ninjo*, which is defined as spontaneously arising human emotion.\(^{dxi}\) Both Doi and Memmi place dependency at the center of the human experience. Doi notes that Western psychology does not consider dependency to be a central issue in psychology or the culture. Western languages do not even have a general word that captures the essence of amae.\(^{dxii}\)
Western psychoanalysts discuss dependency primarily in terms of orality and passive object love in normal development and in psychopathology. Orality is one of the early stages of maturation according to Freud. In the adult, the word primarily refers to extreme neediness. Dependency is often viewed as chemical dependency in the broader field of psychology. The work of Memmi, Doi, and others has shown that dependency is a much broader psychological concept than just chemical dependency.

Narcissism and grandiosity can also be seen at the cultural level. Christopher Lasch was one of the first to explore the concept of psychological narcissism on the cultural level in the West in his book The Culture of Narcissism. It has also been noted by Ken Wilber that the Babyboom generation in the United States has a problematic mix of creativity, pluralistic relativism, and pervasive low-grade narcissism. This mixture results in a particularly destructive pattern in which attempts to create a postconventional culture are viewed by this generation as creative transgression of the previous generation’s patriarchal hierarchy, but these transgressions are often actually preconventional regressive narcissistic behaviors. One example Wilber gives is the Vietnam era college war protest. For many of the protesters the essence of “Hell no, we won’t go!” could be more accurately stated as “You can’t tell me what to do! So take your war and shove it!” The protests were more of a preconventional egocentric act of narcissistic rebellion than a postconventional sociocentric act of higher consciousness.

The main guiding myth behind this dissertation is The Wizard of Oz. It has the necessary symbolic elements that represent the aspects of multiplicity, shame, grandiosity, dependency, and the capacities necessary to move towards integrated
multiplicity and a reflexive identity. The Wizard of Oz story is a classic hero’s journey with Dorothy, the I, leaving home, having challenges in far off places in the inner world of Oz, and returning home with newly earned wisdom. She accomplishes this with the help of various characters representing various aspects of the self. Glinda the Good Witch is a guiding spirit, offering protection and safety. The Wicked Witch represents the shadow, the dark energy that does not fit an individual’s ideas about themselves that they deny and repress into the unconscious, or split off into the preconscious. The ruby slippers, once the magic belonging to the other Wicked Witch, represent Dorothy’s inner spark, which is symbolic of the core identity.

The yellow brick road represents the path of initiation that supplies all the challenges that Dorothy and all individuals need to individuate, narcissistically mature or develop integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity. The spiral nature of the tornado in the beginning of the story represents the chaos and suffering that propels individuals on the psychic journey inward and the spiral nature of the yellow brick road represents the outward journey of psychic creativity and learning that follows. Along the road, Dorothy meets and is joined by the three main allies of her adventure, the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion. The Scarecrow wants a brain, the Tin Man yearns for a heart, and the Cowardly Lion wants courage. According to Jesse Stewart these represent the major functions of the self, thinking, feeling, and the will that must be developed to negotiate the initiatory path.

The Wizard of Oz is a complex character. On the one hand he is a Wizard, a trickster that provides the Wizards Test, an archetypal challenge that fosters psychological maturity, and on the other hand, he is a fake, a humbug. The test is that
Dorothy must get the broomstick from the Wicked Witch, which symbolizes that she must incorporate some shadow energy to earn the right to go home, to find a reflexive identity. Dorothy also exposes the grandiosity of the Wizard, his inauthentic nature, by seeing the old man behind the curtain. She does this with the help of Toto the dog who keeps the story moving at key points; Toto represents our animal nature, intuition, or instinctual energy. Dorothy does find her way home, using the power of her ruby slippers, her inner spark or core identity. She had to develop the capacities learned on the path to access the inner authority that she had all along. A discussion of how this myth and the other guiding myths informed the learnings in this dissertation can be found in the Reflections Chapter.

This cluster discussed grandiosity, inflation, and dependency. Grandiosity was covered in enough depth such that the research on grandiose subjectivities can be readily understood. The related topic of inflation was also reviewed. This is important because grandiose enactments by subjectivities can create inflated like behavior in the individual as a whole. This research dealt with persistently grandiose encapsulated subjectivities that are part of the adaptive identities of the participants, not just temporarily inflated parts. Understanding the difference between inflation and grandiosity was necessary to choose appropriate subjectivities to work with. Finally, dependency was discussed because grandiosity is often expressed interpersonally by unhealthy dependency. A basic knowledge of dependency is critical to understanding the roles the grandiose subjectivities played in the participants’ lives. This discussion on grandiosity, inflation, and dependency added to the material from the previous clusters so that the Research Problem can now be understood and addressed.
The Research Problem asked, when grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers? The first cluster of the Literature Review covered multiplicity, normal psychological development, and the homeostasis of the psyche. This provided a background for our exploration of problematic multiplicity and an understanding of integrated multiplicity. Exploring a way to move towards integrated multiplicity is the goal of the research in this dissertation. A brief review of normal development and the homeostasis of the psyche helped explain what goes wrong in abnormal development that leads to the formation of encapsulated subjectivities in problematic multiplicity, the topic of the next section.

The next cluster covered the continuum of multiplicity and degrees of dissociation. Dissociation is the main cause of multiplicity turning problematic in the continuum of multiplicity from problematic multiplicity to DID. Covering these topics allowed appropriate selection of problematic subjectivities for the research and helped to create the methodology to explore the Research Problem.

The third cluster covered shame and the experience of identity. It covered basic Affect Theory with an emphasis on shame. Shame is the most critical affect in creating our experience of identity. Shame is very important in answering the question asked by the Research Problem because of the fact that grandiosity is often a reaction to shame. Understanding how shame is created and identifying shame is critical to this research. Also, the basics of how to address shame that are used in the research methodology were reviewed.
The final cluster of the Literature Review was on grandiosity, inflation, and dependency. The distinction between reactive grandiosity and adaptive grandiosity was made in this section, which is important to the learnings of this dissertation. Inflation and dependency were also reviewed. This section added the final pieces of knowledge necessary to create the methodology that is discussed in the next chapter and to answer the question posed by the Research Problem and other questions that arose during the research. This Literature Review has covered related material in adequate depth to allow the creation of the research methodology, and an exploration of the challenges of multiplicity in the Learnings and Reflections chapters.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction and Overview

The research topic of this dissertation is psychological multiplicity. More specifically, the dissertation explores the roles of grandiosity and shame in psychological multiplicity. Imaginal Inquiry, an aspect of Imaginal Transformation Praxis (ITP), guided this exploration. ITP, the theory-in-use at Meridian University, consists of concepts, principles, and practices that constitute an integrative approach to personal and cultural transformation. ITP has three distinct components:

1. Imaginal Process: an approach to transformative learning, understood as the emergence and cultivation of capacities by individuals, organizations, communities, and societies.

2. Imaginal Inquiry: a methodology for participatory research that weaves together both inquiry and transformation.

3. Cultural Leadership Praxis: a creative and collaborative approach to fostering cultural transformation within organizations, communities, and societies.

Imaginal Inquiry is a form of participatory research in which the researcher explores his or her experience along with the experience of the research participants leading to the opportunity for the transformation of all parties as well as the acquisition of knowledge. The participatory nature of Imaginal Inquiry grounds the researcher into the research findings in ways that typical empirical research generally does not because the resulting data includes how the researcher is affected and what is learned about the topic from the researcher’s experience. Imaginal Inquiry focuses on image, the basic form of
expression of the psyche. Image is primarily preverbal and is based on the senses. Image can take the form of the visual, auditory, kinesthetic, olfactory, and taste.

This dissertation used Imaginal Inquiry to explore the relationship between the grandiose nature of some encapsulated subjectivities and shame using Imaginal Inquiry. There are four phases of Imaginal Inquiry: evoking experience, expressing experience, interpreting experience, and integrating experience. This research gathered the experience of individuals who have actively worked with their own multiplicity. This previous experience with multiplicity was critical to foster working deeply with encapsulated subjectivities in a very short time frame. Specifically, the research gathered the research participants’ experience of one or two grandiose subjectivities that had been problematic for the participants by creating issues for themselves or others. The selection process was detailed enough to make sure that the subjectivities were actually creating issues in each participant’s experience. This insured that we were working with problematic multiplicity, the level of pathology seen with most clients that pursue psychotherapy. The selection process was structured such that all of the subjectivities chosen were judged by the participants and the researcher to have the promise of interesting and rewarding results for both parties. Allowing the participants to speak as their subjectivities and hearing their own stories from the perspective of these parts of the self allowed the participants to have an experience of and learn more about areas of their personalities that can be grandiose.
Research Problem, Hypothesis, and Design

The primary Research Problem asked: when grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers? It was expected to find shame associated with grandiosity in multiplicity because of the strong link between shame and grandiosity in the psychological literature. The specific exploration of shame in problematic multiplicity has not been done before. The following hypothesis underlies the Research Problem. The opportunity to express grandiosity can help shift problematic multiplicity to integrated multiplicity if done with self-awareness. Exploring a method for developing a more integrated multiplicity, a more reflexive relationship between the I and encapsulated subjectivities, is the goal of this dissertation.

This methodology section discusses how the four phases of Imaginal Inquiry were used to generate experiences that led to meaningful data. The researcher and participants sought out and found grandiose encapsulated subjectivities that have led the participants towards problematic experiences in their lives. Looking for grandiose subjectivities that created issues on an ongoing basis excluded non-grandiose subjectivities that may have appeared grandiose by temporary inflation. This exclusion was important because the goal was to work with subjectivities that created grandiosity in individuals that were not pervasively narcissistic, grandiose, or merely prone to occasional inflation, as all individuals can be. An assumption here was that all people have some grandiose encapsulated subjectivities, because every individual has some narcissistic wounding, grandiosity, and shame. There are no perfect parents or caregivers and no perfect upbringing.
The first phase of Imaginal Inquiry is evoking experience. Film clips from major motion pictures of characters acting grandiosely were shown to the participants in an attempt to evoke an experience of grandiose subjectivities in the participants. The participants were able to see if the characters depicted in the film clips were similar to any grandiose parts of themselves. In this case, image on film was used to stimulate internal images, memories, identifications, and affect. The level of emotional reactivity to the characters and the recognition of similarities in the characters’ behavior to their own were used to select a potent subjectivity to work with. This process set up the later work in which the role of shame in that subjectivity’s formation and encapsulation was explored. Ultimately the goal was to see what effect working with those shame issues might be on beginning to develop a more integrated multiplicity in the participants.

The research protocol planned to focus on at least one grandiose subjectivity that was creating problematic issues for the participants but when the participants were asked, it became clear that these subjectivities came in pairs for most of the participants. This pairing was expected because of the bipolar nature of archetypes. Specifically, Voice Dialogue always works with pairs of subjectivities, so finding archetypal pairs in this research was not surprising. Specific examples of the archetypal splitting that occur in grandiosity are seen in Kohut’s model of the bipolar self and the myth of Narcissus and Echo. As predicted, an overtly grandiose subjectivity (Narcissus-like energy) often had a polar opposite that was grandiose but in a covert way (Echo-like energy). The converse was also true; a covertly grandiose subjectivity had a polar opposite that was overtly grandiose. Both poles were addressed when they came up in the research sessions.
The research was conducted in two 60-minute individual meetings in the participant’s home, in offices where they worked, or in the therapy office in which I was working at the time. The settings were chosen based on what was most convenient and comfortable for each participant. This level of comfort and convenience was critical to facilitate the depth of participation that happened during the research. The first meeting began with an introduction and orientation to the project. This part of the process went quickly because the participants had a history of working with their own multiplicity and also because a general discussion of multiplicity and the intention to study the relationship between the affects and the encapsulation of subjective states was given to them before the participants signed up for the study (Appendix 6). A consent form was reviewed and signed by the participants before the research began (Appendix 4).

The rest of the first hour was devoted to finding encapsulated subjectivities to work with on the second day of research. After finding grandiose subjectivities that each participant related to in the films, the participants were asked to have a written reflective dialogue between themselves and their chosen encapsulated subjectivity. The main purpose of this reflective dialogue was to begin to differentiate and personify the subjectivity before they would actually dialogue with me verbally in the second session. Dialoguing in writing was considered to be safer and easier to start with than spoken dialoguing. Written reflective dialoguing at the end of this session accomplished clarifying the essence of the energy bound in the encapsulated subjectivities quite well.

The second purpose of the written dialogues was that they were used to customize questions that were adapted for use in session number two. Reactivity to the film characters was also used to craft questions for the second session. The intention of these
questions was to explore the stories of the participants and their encapsulated subjectivities.

In the spoken dialogues with the subjectivities on both days, signs of underlying shame, shame-based identity scripts, shame-based governing scenes, and affect-shame binds were watched for and noted. The research was intended to work with existing grandiosity and underlying shame. As such, it evoked experiences of existing grandiose subjectivities. Care was taken to not evoke a grandiose enactment or to create shame in the participants during the sessions.

The first part of the second day was spent exploring the stories of each individual as they related to their encapsulated subjectivities. This was essentially a search for affects that were related to the subjectivities that we had chosen to work with. All affects were noted, with a specific focus on shame. This exploration was followed by a very brief intervention working with the shame issues involving each encapsulated subjectivity in the process of gathering their governing scenes. The intent of the second meeting was not only to explore the subjectivity but also to begin the integration of these subjectivities by making them more known and available to the participants via reflective dialoguing.

Co-researchers

Co-researchers were used to evaluate the key moments from the data analysis. Rebecca Evert and Jenna Moon were my co-researchers and they helped in the initial analysis of the data. The co-researchers were chosen based on their capacities to access their own affect and multiplicity. Rebecca and Jenna also have extensive experience as students and teaching assistants at Meridian University using Transformative Learning
Practices. Integrated multiplicity involves collaboration between subjectivities within ourselves and collaboration with the multiplicity of others. As co-researchers their areas of interest and their personal capacities added to the depth of the learnings in this work.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The most basic limitation of the study was the potential that the experience of shame itself may have been evoked. An experience of shame in a participant during the research may have limited the depth of participation and impeded the study of the shame experience that underlies the grandiose subjectivities we worked with. Shame is often experienced during disclosure of sensitive material and individuals commonly feel shame about having an experience of shame. This study asked the participants to be open in a ways that exposed very personal areas of shame. The participants may have held some material back, but they were also very open and willing to share sensitive and potentially shameful material. Videotaping for gathering data was not used because it may also have kept individuals from fully opening up. Audio recording was the primary data-gathering tool. Nonverbal cues of shame such as body posture, facial expressions, and tone of voice were noted as they occurred during the sessions. The tapes were reviewed promptly after each session and memories of these nonverbal cues were noted and recorded in writing.

Another limitation of the study involves the depth at which the work with encapsulated subjectivities was able to go in such a short study. My experience with therapy clients is that one has to build a great deal of trust over a matter of months to enable people to come out of adaptive identity and personify their images and dialogue from their subjective places. This experience spoke to the necessity of having highly
functional, imaginative, and psychologically sophisticated participants. These capacities were necessary for them to access deep levels of affect, especially shame, in front of a person that they did not know well. Working with such a sophisticated group did not seem to be a limitation or make the results less able to be generalized to the broader population because shame, grandiosity, and problematic multiplicity are such universal phenomena.

Another limitation to the study was the ability to assess the development of integrated multiplicity. At best, the participants were able to begin to make a move towards integrated multiplicity based on the participants’ deepening relationship to their encapsulated subjectivities. It would take a long-term longitudinal study to assess the development of a broader integrated multiplicity. Changes apparent during the second session and follow up questions were used to assess the beginning of a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. The study was also unable to assess the development of a more reflexive identity in the participants for the same reasons. It is assumed in this work that a more integrated multiplicity will result in a more reflexive identity because this has already been established.

The major delimitation of the study, a restriction that I purposely imposed on the study’s design, was not trying to assess the development of deeper psychological capacities in the participants as a result of a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. It was beyond the scope of this study to explore a move towards deeper capacities after this brief work. The importance of developing integrated multiplicity is to broaden and deepen psychological capacities. The potential development of capacities was the ultimate reason to pursue the Research Problem about addressing the shame that
grandiosity covers in problematic multiplicity, but it was beyond the scope of this study to look for anything other than a hint of deeper capacities. Assessing the development of capacities, like integrated multiplicity and reflexive identity, would also take a long-term longitudinal study to adequately explore.

Another delimitation of this study was that the research focused on the affect of shame-humiliation. The relationship of the other affects, besides shame, on the encapsulation of subjectivities was a basic area of interest and line of questioning that was not purposely addressed in this study. The protocol was to note other affects if they came up, but not to pursue an exploration of them. Fear-terror, is the basic affect focused on in the trauma literature that has been linked with the more severe forms of problematic multiplicity and Dissociative Identity Disorder. Other strong affects, even the positive ones like extreme enjoyment-joy and interest-excitement, potentially can contribute to the formation of subjectivities as well. While other affects were noted in this research, shame predominated. It was beyond the scope of the work to study all of the affects in relationship to grandiosity and multiplicity. The focus of this research would have had to been shifted had shame not been found to be the predominate affect in the findings.

On the second day with each participant, when I interviewed and dialogued with the grandiose subjectivities using Kaufman’s steps for treating shame as a general framework, the intent was to look for the beginning of a shift in the relationship of the encapsulated subjectivity to the I of the participant and other subjectivities. The principles of treating shame in individuals were theorized to be useful in working with the internal community of subjectivities in multiplicity. This concept of applying interpersonal principles to work with encapsulated subjectivities is similar to the basic
concept in Internal Family Systems Therapy, which uses the principles of family therapy
to work with intrapsychic parts.\textsuperscript{dixiii}

The concepts used in the reflective dialogue working with shame issues on day
two of the research came from a modified version of Kaufman’s steps that was developed
for use in this research working with encapsulated subjectivities. The following are the
modified steps for treating shame involved with problematic multiplicity in this project:

1. Restoring a bridge between the encapsulated subjectivity and an empathic other.

2. Returning the responsibility for the shame that binds an encapsulated subjectivity
to the other in the original shame scenes in which it originated.

3. Allowing the identity of the subjectivity to join the community of figures and
subjectivities in psyche and to contribute to this community.

4. Developing appropriate amounts of power in the community of figures and
subjectivities in psyche.

Kaufman’s original steps for treating shame are summarized in an endnote in Chapter
1.\textsuperscript{dlxiv}

It was beyond the scope of this work to fully integrate the subjectivities that were
studied into the personality of the participants or heal the shame issues that involve them.
Further integration could be accomplished in ongoing therapy or work in psychological
groups.

\textbf{Participants}

Participants that had already worked with multiplicity as therapy clients or had
been in a specific training related to multiplicity were sought. Participants had to be
adults that have worked with their own multiplicity in therapy, school, or some other sort
of psychological training related to multiplicity. They were solicited by mailing letters to
therapists that were known to work with multiplicity and teachers of systems involving multiplicity. These letters included information about the study and a flyer (Appendix 5 and 8). Because the response to these solicitations for participants was very limited, individuals who work in the mental health field, or were studying to do so, were approached directly to participate. Referrals were accepted from my fellow students and my committee at Meridian University. These individuals were solicited by phone and mailed information about the project.

Prospective participants were able to reach the researcher by email or phone for further information. Respondents were mailed a questionnaire and a statement describing the study, including information on confidentiality (Appendices 6 & 7). The setting, number of planned meetings, general criteria for participant selection, and an outline of the study was included with this material. A stamped return envelope was included.

In this outline, the topic of multiplicity was shared with the participants (Appendix 6). Trauma and the resulting affective response of fear leading to dissociation was discussed as the commonly noted affect connected with multiplicity. The concept that other strong affects may lead to dissociation and multiplicity was also discussed as the focus of the research. The desire to focus on shame was not shared with the participants at that time so that they did not know ahead of time that the focus of the study was looking for shame underneath grandiosity. The participants were told that the methodology would use film clips, written and spoken reflective dialogues to get to know encapsulated subjectivities. The participants were also told that audiotaping would be used to collect data.
Seven appropriate participants were found. Both genders were represented; there were four women and three men. Diversity was encouraged as far as race and socio-economic status to broaden the ability to generalize the data, but only middle class white individuals responded. The participants included one licensed psychotherapist, one lawyer who was referred by this therapist, and five individuals that were post-coursework psychology students. Some were single and others were partnered. The ages ranged from the mid-thirties to the mid-fifties. They all had worked with multiplicity; the one participant who was not a therapist or student studying psychology, had worked with Voice Dialogue for several years in self-exploration.

After the questionnaires were returned, those chosen participants were interviewed briefly by phone. This allowed follow up on any issues from the questionnaires that the researcher had concerns about. It also allowed the prospective participants to ask any questions that they may have had before committing to participate. Participants with a dissociative disorder or a history of severe trauma were not included in the study. These individuals may have had problematic multiplicity more related to trauma than shame. One therapy client that did respond to the flyer was excluded due to a previous diagnosis of Dissociative Disorder, Not Otherwise Specified. Also, individuals with severe shame-based syndromes like serious substance abuse would also have been excluded, but none actually responded to the flyer. Other obvious signs of immaturity or instability would have excluded respondents, but this did not occur either. Informed consent forms were mailed after the participants were accepted (Appendix 4). This form was reviewed, signed and collected on day one of the research project.
The primary motivational factor for the participants to become involved with this study was the opportunity to work with one or two grandiose subjectivities that could deepen their psychological exploration. The final group of participants worked very well for this project because each participant was able to easily access grandiose aspects of themselves. They were also able to differentiate and personify these grandiose subjectivities and have them engage in reflective dialogue with me in the research room. The participants were also all able work comfortably with strong affects including shame, which was critical to the success of the research.

**Four Phases of Imaginal Inquiry**

**Evoking Experience**

The goal of the first session was to find a grandiose encapsulated subjectivity for us to work with during the second session. Finding at least one grandiose encapsulated subjectivity in each participant was crucial to this study. The objective was to evoke the experience of a grandiose subjectivity during the first session, without actually provoking that subjectivity into a grandiose enactment, or a shame reaction. To do this, I showed film clips depicting grandiose enactments. As it turned out, each participant found a primary subjectivity to work with and when asked, a subjectivity holding an opposite energy was easily found as well.

Film clips were chosen from popular contemporary films that contained grandiose enactments that were congruent with the working definition of grandiosity used in this study, namely grandiosity is an exaggerated claim of an individual’s own importance and an entitled sense of feeling special. My intention was to show scenes of grandiose
behaviors that ranged from quite overtly grandiose to the more subtle forms of covert grandiosity. I started the process by thinking of actual grandiose enactments that I had been part of or others that I had witnessed. Most of these were overtly grandiose but some were more subtle. An example of a more subtle or covertly grandiose enactment was from my own life. I sometimes wall off emotionally, feeling as if I do not need anybody. The film clip from About a Boy, which is described shortly, had a character that felt he did not need others emotionally. After developing a list of such type of enactments, I began to look for similar images in film clips.

I also went online to search for movies that represented certain psychological diagnoses. I then thought about potential film characters that might work as examples of the type of grandiosity I wanted to represent. A list of film clips was gradually created. There were many film characters that were too narcissistic or too dependent. I choose more subtle examples that expressed grandiosity and dependency issues without being too extremely overtly or covertly narcissistic.

The film clip characters varied in how they expressed their grandiosity and in the intensity of grandiosity they showed. Several of the clips had characters that represented the complimentary poles of overt and covert grandiosity. Prior to showing each scene, I gave the participants a brief description of the story in the film to set up the viewing of the clip. After showing each clip, I asked the participants to express any reactivity about the characters depicted in each scene and asked if the participants had a part of them that related to the character or was like the character. A brief discussion of the scenes shown and what I was intending to evoke with each film clip follows; a more detailed discussion of all of the clips is found in the appendix (Appendix 12).
The first film clip came from *About a Boy* with Hugh Grant. Grant plays a handsome, young, wealthy playboy that is very arrogant and self absorbed. The clip is from the beginning of the movie where he basically describes his counter-dependent philosophy of life. I intended this clip to represent subjectivities that feel special enough to not need other people in any real deep and meaningful way.

The second scene has two characters that relate to grandiosity. This clip was from *Once Around* with Richard Dreyfus and Holly Hunter. In this film, Dreyfus plays a character, Sam Sharp, that is an overtly grandiose and very successful salesman. Hunter plays a character named Renata that is covertly grandiose. He represents a classically narcissistic individual with overt grandiosity and she is classically codependent, exhibiting covert grandiosity. Neither of these characters was so narcissistic that they were totally unlikable however. The Richard Dreyfus character relates to the experience of subjectivities that feel special because they are successful or just feel better than other people because of a grandiose personality structure. The Holly Hunter character was meant to see if the participant has an encapsulated aspect that felt special by being around somebody else that was special in some way and to ask if the participant felt special in a subtly grandiose way by being noticed or favored by someone that truly is extraordinary.

The next two film clips shown were from different scenes from *As Good as it Gets*, with Jack Nicholson and Helen Hunt. The first clip shows the grandiosity that comes up when parts of individuals think, feel, and act like they are special because they suffer more than other people. Melvin, the Nicholson character really does suffer because he has Obsessive Compulsive Disorder, but his treatment of other people reflects this type of grandiosity. The Jack Nicholson character represents the pattern of feeling special
because of being a suffering victim or a martyr. The next clip, from the same film, is a scene where Carol, played by Helen Hunt, is overreacting with suspicion to Melvin’s generosity. From observing Carol earlier in the film it is apparent that she is very kind but I imagined she also feels special because she is the only one that can put up with Melvin. I meant this scene to depict the grandiosity that is reflected with feeling special because one is able to put up with or work with someone that is very challenging to deal with that others do not want to deal with. The scene specifically depicts what happens when the lack of boundary setting early on in a problematic relationship leads to acting out later on. As it turned out, this scene did not evoke the response that I wanted, the participants did not get the sense of her feeling special. After this became evident to me, I simply told the participants what I was trying to evoke and they understood the type of specialness that I was trying to evoke. Several of the participants personally related to what I was trying to evoke.

The final clip was from *Big Fish* with Albert Finney. This clip depicts feeling special enough to jump in, grab control, and take center stage, even when it is not socially appropriate. There is also the sense that this character feels his story is more much important and special than other peoples’ stories. This clip was meant to trigger the aspects of people that feel they are more interesting than other individuals, that they have the best stories, and that they need to be the center of attention. This character represented a classical form of overt grandiosity but is more likable than the Dreyfus character in *Once Around*.

After viewing all of the clips it was fairly easy for both the participants and me to pick a grandiose subjectivity to work with during the second meeting. The participants
were all clear after watching the clips which part of them would be the most interesting for us to work with based on the level of reactivity and identification with the characters shown. I did guide the participants towards the subjectivity that I thought was the most grandiose and they all readily agreed to work with these subjectivities.

The second evoking experience was giving the individuals a chance to speak as their subjectivity in reflective dialogue with me during the second session. This reflective dialogue gave them the chance to experience this part of themselves first hand. I asked them questions that emphasized an exploration of the affective experience of the subjectivities (Appendix 9). The questions focused on looking for shame. Issues around competency, relationships and power, body image and identity were explored. These categories are the basic areas involved in Kaufman’s shame profile. He uses the shame profile as a starting point to work from present shame manifestations to explore backwards in time until the original shame-related governing scenes are found. In this research I looked for governing scenes related to the encapsulated subjectivities.

Nathanson’s compass of shame was also be used to identify areas where shame may be influencing the subjectivities. The four compass points are attack self, attack other, withdrawal, and avoidance. I also watched for shame-based identity scripts or affect-shame binds that arose around the subjectivities. I was looking for shame but was open to any data that arose in relationship to encapsulated subjectivities and the other affects. During the reflective dialogue besides using Kaufman’s modified steps for treating shame, Omer’s Modes of Experience were also used as a general framework in the interactions with the encapsulated subjectivities.
Expressing Experience

The first expression of experience on day one was allowing the participants to express their reactions, reactivity, and thoughts about each of the film clip characters and how those might relate to parts of themselves. This reactivity not only helped us pick subjectivities to work with, it showed which type of grandiosity was likely to be present in the subjectivity, covert or overt. The next expression of experience at the end of the first session was a written reflective dialogue between themselves and the subjectivity each participant chose to work with. This written reflective dialogue helped them to differentiate and personify the subjectivity and helped me to write specific questions to use during the reflective dialogue for the next session. At the end of the first session the participants were also allowed to verbally share their reflections and reactions to the day’s work.

At the beginning of the second meeting, the participants were asked to share any reactions that had arisen since the previous meeting. At the end of the second session the participants verbally shared their reactions to the reflective dialogue. Finally, the participants shared their reactions to any initial interpretations I had shared with them based on the reflective dialogue.

All interviews and verbal reflective dialogues were audio taped for data collection. I also watched for non-verbal signs of shame and noted them during the expression of experience. The audio data was later transcribed and my recollections of non-verbal signs of shame were also written down while they were fresh in my memory.
Interpreting Experience

The primary data analysis tool was Narrative Analysis based on the recordings of the reflective dialoguing and interviews. Narrative Analysis uses the story told by the participants as the object of investigation. Narrative Analysis is based on the natural way that people create order out the flow of events and actions that they experience in their lives. It is an especially relevant way for psychology graduate students to collect and analyze data because it is very similar to how the verbal aspects of psychotherapy work. As Catherine Riessman says, “Psychotherapists encounter narratives of personal experience every day and use them to change lives by retelling and constructing new and more fulfilling ones.”

The steps Narrative Analysis uses to represent primary experience are, attending to experience, the telling of experience by the participants, transcribing the actual dialogue of the experience, analyzing the dialogue, and finally presenting it in written form to be read. When conducting the interviews and reflective dialoguing the verbal interaction took the form of an active interview.

An active interview as defined by James Holstein and Jaber Gubrium, involves both parties in the discussion such that the interview fundamentally shapes the form and content of what is said. In an active interview, both the researcher and the participant are unavoidably active and involved in the meaning making that happens in the interview and analysis of the data. This is not how empirical research interviews are commonly viewed. In empirical research, data is usually mined only from the words of the participant about their experience. The participatory nature of the active interview is
based on the way in which meaning is made and reality is constructed when individuals ask one another about their experiences. An active interview is not meant to be a separate research tool that is different from the way individuals normally converse with one another in order to access their experience.\textsuperscript{dlxxiv}

The interviews involved asking open-ended questions or making statements that elicited narrative, essentially story telling, from the participants without leading them. For instance, I never said, “Did you feel shame when that happened?” Instead I would say things like, “That must have been difficult.” Often the participants would follow with further narrative in which shame was often evident in their words or body postures. Also non-verbal ways of communicating empathy that came naturally from me was enough to keep the narrative going. Examples of these would be vocalizations such as “uhm” or even a silent nod. The richness of the data came through the stories of the participants and their subjectivities. I was looking for a validation or a refutation of the Research Problem and hypothesis while staying open to any other patterns in the data that might have arisen.

I looked for key moments that came up in the narrative. Many of these were apparent during the actual research sessions and others became apparent listening to the recordings or during transcription. Intuitive identification was used for moments that seem important to me during the research and upon reading the transcribed data later. My co-researchers were very helpful in the initial data analysis and identification of key moments. Kaufman’s shame profile, Nathanson’s compass of shame, and bodily signs of shame were used as the lens through which shame was identified in these key moments.
After key moments were identified, reoccurring themes were noted and condensed. The Learnings chapter was then written based upon the condensed material.

The primary theory behind this dissertation is that the psyche is a multiplicity of subjective states. These states ideally have permeable and flexible boundaries. These subjectivities become problematic when they become encapsulated, that is, their boundaries become too rigid. It is the inflexibility in an individual’s subjective states that leads to the formation of encapsulated subjectivities. Narrative Analysis and Active Interviewing fit well with this primary theory involving subjective states because both methods acknowledge the subjective nature of experience and meaning making.

The guiding theory that carries this dissertation is that shame can create the encapsulation of subjectivities leading to problematic multiplicity and that grandiosity will often be found associated with these subjectivities as a reaction to that shame. This theory is based on the widely accepted concept in psychology that grandiosity forms in reaction to shame. Grandiose enactments are essentially a form of regression. Grandiose enactments can serve the maturation of the individual if shame surrounding the grandiose encapsulated subjectivities is worked with in therapy or groups.

Three myths aided in the general conceptualization of multiplicity, shame, and grandiosity that helped to guide the interpretation of the data. The main guiding myth behind the dissertation was The Wizard of Oz. This story has the necessary elements that symbolize aspects of multiplicity, shame, and grandiosity. There were two ancillary guiding myths, the myth of Narcissus and Echo, and the Bible story of the Fall of Adam and Eve from the Book of Genesis. A brief discussion of these myths follows directly as each relates to this dissertation. The Reflections Chapter discusses how the myths
informed the learnings and the back matter material contains a deeper discussion of the guiding myths. (Appendix 13)

The Wizard of Oz is a story that fits the theme of multiplicity well. This story is a classic hero’s journey with Dorothy leaving home, having challenges in far off places, and returning home with newly earned wisdom. Dorothy represents the adaptive identity that must find its way home to a more integrated multiplicity and reflexive identity. Along the road, Dorothy meets and is joined by the three main allies of her adventure, the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion. In the story, the Scarecrow seeks a brain, the Tin Man seeks a heart, and the Cowardly Lion seeks courage. For this analysis, the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion represent related and important psychological capacities, reflexivity, empathy, and the courage to take the next right action. Along the initiatory journey, Dorothy’s new friends will learn that the Wizard, who represents grandiose subjectivities, cannot give them the authentic power of the capacities they seek.

The Wizard does send Dorothy on her quest to capture the Wicked Witch’s broomstick, which is the main trial that leads to most of her learnings on the journey. This represents the fact that grandiosity can lead to important learnings. But it also turns out that the Wizard is a fake, a humbug. The Wizard controls the Emerald City by controlling his image, his false grandiose self; he has become the powerful, wonderful, and mysterious Wizard of Oz but these qualities are not based on his authentic self. Grandiose subjectivities are humbugs too; they have no real power. The floating blustering head seen in the movie floating over a throne, tries to generate power and control with smoke and mirrors. Authentic power comes from an integrated multiplicity
and a reflexive identity. The throne represents the seat of the self, the core identity, and the rightful place from which the I can access the multiplicity of self. Note that the head floats over the throne, only an I that has developed a reflexive identity can truly sit on the throne, gain access to the core identity that guides its unfoldment.

The story also reveals that grandiosity does not have to be cured to develop capacities. The Wizard is not transformed in the story; he is just exposed. Grandiosity has to be integrated however. The Wizard does go back to his more human adaptive identity and tries to help Dorothy. This speaks to the fact that grandiose subjectivities have positive intent towards the individual, but only the I, in touch with the core identity, can find the way home to a reflexive identity.

The story also shows that individuals always know the way home inside of themselves, as show when Glinda tells Dorothy to click the heels of her ruby slippers to get home. This internal knowing of the road to an integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity symbolizes the relationship between the I and the core identity, which is a parallel concept to the Jungian concept of the Ego-Self axis. If one follows the images in psyche with self-awareness, narcissistic maturation, and individuation are possible.

Dorothy getting home also represents the authentic power that can be obtained by passing each initiatory threshold to get home in contrast to the inauthentic power of grandiosity. At the beginning of the story Dorothy thinks the Wizard or the grandeur and magic he represents, is the answer to her quest much like grandiosity seems powerful to us because it keeps us away from feelings of shame. Her trials on the initiatory path teach her the difference between inauthentic grandiose power and true authentic power. Each initiatory threshold that Dorothy passes brings with it a new capacity, symbolizing the I
building a more integrated multiplicity. The ancillary myths that also serve this
dissertation are discussed next.

The images of the Wizard of Oz and The Cowardly Lion are grandiose, but do not
hold all the nuances of grandiosity that are seen in the myth of Narcissus and Echo.
Narcissus and Echo represent parts of the immature self that if integrated become healthy,
but if not integrated, can form encapsulated areas of grandiosity in problematic
multiplicity. Both Narcissus and Echo are cursed by the gods and do not integrate into
integrated multiplicity. Narcissus is too overtly grandiose and Echo is too covertly
grandiose. Narcissus and Echo reflect images that represent many of the subtle forms of
feeling special that relate to the grandiosity studied in this dissertation. In the myth both
of their earthly forms waste away and die. Narcissus leaves behind a narcissus flower and
Echo leaves behind her echoing voice. This part of the myth is a warning to individuals to
integrate these grandiose energies in themselves, so that they can lead full human lives
and not waste away like Narcissus and Echo.

The myth of the Fall, from the Genesis chapter of the Bible, holds psychological
importance both culturally and individually. The fall is a form of the lost Paradise
mythology that is seen in all cultures in some fashion. The fall also has elements
that are related to the importance of shame and to the multiplicity of the psyche, but the
most important aspects of the story relate to the Fall from grace of Adam and Eve. Adam
and Eve knew no shame and were totally happy until they were cast out of Eden for
eating from the Tree of Knowledge. Adam and Eve left the symbiosis of paradise to face
the harsh reality of growing up in the real world. The myth holds both the longing to
regress and the longing to progress that are important to this dissertation. The relevance of these myths in context of the Learnings is discussed in the Reflections chapter.

**Integrating Experience**

The first integrating experience was at the end of session one allowing the participants to share their reactions and reflections about how they were affected by watching the film clips, accessing, differentiating, and personifying their encapsulated subjectivities. A similar opportunity was taken to integrate experience at the end of the second session. The next integrating experience was intended to be a guided imagery session welcoming the subjectivities into the community of soul at the end of the second session. The objective of the guided imagery session was to integrate any feelings of shame or fear around energies that the participants may have accessed during the session. After the first two participants, the guided imagery session was dropped from the research protocol because it became clear that the multiplicity work was not destabilizing the participants. The opportunity to share their reactions and reflections to the work seemed to provide enough integration after our meetings. As the final integrating experience, once the data was analyzed and the dissertation was accepted, a written summary of the research learnings was mailed to the participants. (Appendix 11)

I will carry my experience and learnings of shame and multiplicity forward into therapy with my clients as a way of helping them to work with their encapsulated subjectivities. This project could be expanded to a one-day seminar or be incorporated into a graduate psychology class. Helping individuals to find the shame that underlies
grandiosity in problematic multiplicity can help them to explore dependency issues that affect how they bring their personal power forward into the world.

This research methodology using the four phases of Imaginal Inquiry allowed the Research Problem and primary research hypothesis to be addressed in sufficient depth to explore the grandiosity that underlies shame in problematic multiplicity. What was learned during this exploration is presented in the next chapter in which grandiosity is in a sense redeemed due to the psychological changes that are possible by meeting the challenge of multiplicity though the awareness of shame.
CHAPTER 4

LEARNINGS

Introduction and Overview

The Research Problem of this dissertation is: When grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers? The primary research hypothesis is that the opportunity to express grandiosity can help shift problematic multiplicity to integrated multiplicity if done with self-awareness.

Learning One states that when caregivers are not consistently dependable, childhood shame leads to grandiosity in multiplicity. Children are dependent on their caregivers to meet their emotional and physical needs. It was found that unmet emotional needs in childhood results in shame and the formation of grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. Each of the participants told stories, related to their grandiose subjectivities, which revealed examples of their interpersonal needs not being met in their families of origin. These failures resulted in shame reactions, and grandiosity developed as a reaction to this shame.

Learning Two claims that differentiating and personifying grandiose encapsulated subjectivities and engaging them in reflective dialogues about their origins was an effective way to mirror them and engage the shame that underlies their grandiosity. Grandiose subjectivities point to places where individuals have unhealthy dependency and entitlement issues that conceal shame. Addressing the shame underlying the
grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities was empowering for the participants by releasing assertive energy and healing intrapsychic colonization in ways that will allow the development of a more reflexive identity and a more integrated multiplicity. Exploring and discussing stories that were related to the encapsulated subjectivities that we worked with accomplished the beginning of this shift towards a more integrated multiplicity.

Dialoguing with grandiose subjectivities led to a decrease in the power of the adaptive subjectivities and an increase of power of the dissociated subjectivities intrapsychically. The dissociated subjectivities became less dissociated and more accepted by the participants for the energy each could offer them. These internal power shifts between adaptive and dissociated subjectivities definitely showed the potential to affect interpersonal relationships and power issues as well. This type of work has the potential to bring aspects of the split off personality forward that have not been a major part of one’s adaptive identity. Differentiating and personifying the grandiose aspects of the participants and discussing their stories around shame, entitlement, and grandiosity did in fact begin a shift towards a more integrated multiplicity. This learning answered the question asked by the Research Problem and confirms the primary research hypothesis.

Learning Three is that the grandiosity of some protective encapsulated subjectivities is an inauthentic form of power that is disempowering and may even be harmful to individuals as a whole. This learning found that some grandiose subjectivities acting as protectors are disempowering by preventing painful affects from surfacing into awareness, a form of intrapsychic colonization. This control by dominant adaptive
subjectivities prevents energy bound by the protected subjectivities from being released that could lead to a more flexible and integrated multiplicity. Two of the participants had very powerful subjectivities that in the guise of protecting fell into this self-limiting pattern. This learning also relates to the compulsive need to tell one’s story or to listen to other’s stories, staying close to their affect as a defense against feeling one’s own strong affect. This defensive pattern is disempowering by preventing these affects from being transmuted into capacities.

Learning Four was that in multiplicity, grandiosity may help therapists to work with challenging clients. It was specifically found that the grandiosity of some subjectivities, in an attempt to avoid the shame and feelings of inferiority of being inexperienced, allowed these participants to work with challenging clients until they actually realized that they could meet the challenge. Several of the participants worked with subjectivities that had capacities that not only led them into the profession of psychotherapy, but also helped them to become better therapists. This dynamic involved developing the capacity for deep empathy as well as the capacity to tolerate intense affect and suffering in themselves and others.

**Cumulative Learning: Meeting Grandiosity in Multiplicity Facilitates Empowerment**

It is well known that working with multiplicity is empowering. Working with multiplicity allows access to a broader range of human potentials as embodied in the ancient Greek concept of the mutual entailment of virtues. When multiple aspects of the self are allowed to express themselves positive changes can occur in the individuals involved, as did in this research. The cumulative learning that came from this research is
that actively differentiating, personifying, mirroring, and dialoguing with grandiose subjectivities can rapidly facilitate empowerment of individuals and begin a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. Empowerment is the bringing forth of authentic power as opposed to pseudo-power. Authentic power is “the spectrum of human capacities and qualities that are responsive to various domains of life experience in ways that engender truth, beauty, and justice.”

Pseudo-power is force, manipulation, or coercion that is controlling but does not engender truth, beauty, or justice.

The grandiosity seen in subjectivities in this study was either overt or covert; often participants had both an adaptive subjectivity and also a dissociated subjectivity. The grandiose subjectivities that we worked with that were very powerful in maintaining the normal adaptive identities of the participants are called adaptive subjectivities in this dissertation. These subjectivities would be called owned selves in Voice Dialogue. These subjectivities were major aspects of the participants’ adaptive identities that clearly controlled much of the imagination, thought, affect, and behavior of the participants. Dissociated subjectivities would be called disowned selves in Voice Dialogue. Disowned selves are subjectivities that in Jungian terms are shadow material; they are not acceptable to the ego and persona. In the terms used in this dissertation, dissociated subjectivities are not tolerable to the adaptive identity so they become dissociated from it.

Dissociated subjectivities were found to have tremendous potential power. The learnings showed that it is possible to release power and passion in individuals very quickly by working with their grandiose subjectivities. The pseudo-power embodied by adaptive grandiose subjectivities can be worked with to develop a more authentic power in an individual when they engage their grandiose subjectivities. A shift towards
authentic power was seen in this research. The term, integrated multiplicity reflects the result of this shift. There was a felt sense of power and passion in working with all of these subjectivities, which was reflected in each of the four major learnings. The participants seemed to sense that adaptive subjectivities whether overtly or covertly grandiose, were limiting them and eagerly let dissociated subjectivities speak. The results were very powerful. The participant names used here are pseudonyms. A summary of salient data is presented in Appendix 10.

**Learning One: When Caregivers Are not Consistently Dependable, Childhood Shame Leads to Grandiosity in Multiplicity**

This learning showed that shame is often the result of unmet emotional needs in childhood, the consequence of which is the formation of grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. Shame was a consistent theme throughout the participants’ stories. It is known that shame underlies grandiosity so it was not surprising to find grandiose subjectivities in individuals that have shame that resulted from unmet interpersonal needs as children. This learning bridges a general psychological concept to multiplicity work.

**What Happened**

During the research, each participant, speaking in reflective dialogue as their grandiose subjectivity, was asked if they remembered when they, the subjectivity, came into being. Asking about the subjectivities’ origins, elicited stories from all of the participants that reflected the roles these subjectivities play in the individual’s adaptive identity. The rest of the interview was a deeper exploration of these roles. The first two
participants have been trained in Voice Dialogue and the rest of the research participants have worked with multiplicity in graduate school studying psychology.

Susan is a practicing psychotherapist that works with multiplicity in herself and her clients using Voice Dialogue. Speaking about the Accommodator, a major subjectivity in her personality, she told a story from when she was about nine when she became aware that her brother and a friend were stealing alcohol from her parents. Her brother told her she was not going to tell on them. Susan reported feeling powerless in this situation where her brother had so much personal presence and she had so little. It hurt her that she was not treated like an equal. Her brother did not trust her to hold his secret without using his inauthentic power against her. He did not threaten her, he just told her the way it was going to be and she accommodated his demands. This compliant behavior was an example of the Accommodator taking control of her actions.

No earlier events associated to the Accommodator came to mind for Susan, but she talked about her place in the family as accommodating everyone else’s energy. For the Accommodator, being liked and not hurting others was paramount. Susan then gave several examples of how this pattern of accommodation has negatively impacted her as an adult. It was at this point in the research that it became apparent that shame related to accommodation was a prominent finding with Susan. Her words about feeling powerless, softer tone of voice, and bodily reactions such as her eyes drifting downward and shoulders slumping all revealed shame as she gave examples of this accommodating energy keeping her out of powerful positions in her life such as from confronting other people to protect herself and others.

Susan was able to easily imagine and access the opposite pole energy in herself
that she called the Albert Finney place, after the character in the film clip. She did not like the Albert Finney character, which was a generalized finding in that, the film clips of the overtly grandiose characters, Albert Finney and Richard Dreyfus, alienated all of the participants to some degree. Susan told me that the Accommodator was scared of the Albert Finney energy and worried that it would affect her connections with other people. When speaking as the Accommodator, Susan was fairly sweet and demure, but it was clearly evident that Susan was not happy with this accommodating aspect of herself. Her body position consistently revealed mild to moderate shame over the role in which the Accommodator had kept her.

Bill, the next participant had a turning point as a child that brought out a very controlling subjectivity that he calls the Pusher. Bill was normally a very good student in grade school and his parents were proud of him, but one time he received a failing grade. His parents got quite upset and made it totally clear to him that low grades were not acceptable. There was clearly shame around this early failure as seen by his body language. When speaking about this event, his head and eyes went down and the shame and displeasure in recounting the event was evident. This event changed his life.

Bill rarely, if ever, had to feel the shame of failure again because of the Pusher. The Pusher became a compulsively hard working aspect of him that has resulted in a successful law career. This subjectivity even helps him with relationships; he never forgets a birthday or anniversary or other details that are necessary for him to be competent in that part of his life because of the Pusher.

While not overtly or classically grandiose, the name Pusher reflects the grandiosity of this subjectivity. It is domineering and it feels special enough and entitled
enough to control Bill in many ways. This subjectivity, while responsible for much of his success, has kept him from enjoying many things in the moment and the slower, more aesthetic aspects of life. Bill recounted that the Pusher kept another part of him that enjoys these aspects of life, quite repressed until he began his work in Voice Dialogue.

Karen is a woman training to be a therapist. She had two subjectivities that came forward called the Attention-getter and the Sufferer. The Attention-getter is a compulsive storyteller that spoke about the Sufferer; the Sufferer did not seem to really speak for itself. Both seem to have been present since birth. Karen said about her parents, “They had twin girls already, so the only reason I was born was to be a boy. I have suffered all my life because nobody wanted me.” Karen’s father was very disappointed not to have a son. Karen’s stories were generally about adapting and being powerless in her life.

Katie, the next participant, was also a post coursework graduate student in psychology, working as a therapist. She had a subjectivity that had some overt grandiosity about being able to work with challenging individuals. A passive subjectivity holding opposite energy needing to stay still and quiet also came out. Katie’s subjectivities came to be in a family with an alcoholic father and passive mother, who was not in touch with her emotions. She tells of often being at the dinner table with a rage filled father and a mother who was struggling to protect herself and not able to protect Katie and her siblings. Shame, anger, and frustration over feeling powerless in several situations came out in the interview when Katie cried and related how long it took her to leave a bad marriage and to finally get angry with her father because of the influence of this powerless subjectivity. Katie related that as she got older she moved
away from this totally passive, powerless behavior and tried to play the role of peacemaker in the family. Katie’s subjectivity was similar to Susan’s in that it frequently accommodated to the needs of others.

Sarah is also a woman training to be a therapist that also had an accommodating subjectivity. This subjectivity felt like it had always been with Sarah, formed by the way she was treated by her “generally caring and compassionate” mother and a busy and somewhat distant father. She describes scenes in which her mother repeatedly, with “extreme compassion,” would tell her to put herself in the other kid’s shoes when these kids had wronged Sarah, until she took on the pattern of going quickly to the empathic place of seeing the other’s experience rather than being able to have her own experience.

Sarah’s mother would also turn her attention from the kids to the father when he was home, in a way that Sarah considered codependent, again leaving her needs unmet. Identifying with her mother’s example, even though it angered other parts of her, brought out Sarah’s codependent subjectivity. Her mother’s shaming admonitions to put other people’s feelings first, became more grandiose by having to do special things to very important her father’s attention. For example, she volunteered at a camp for crippled children. It was out of the subtle shaming by her mother and having to be special to her father that her grandiose part developed. As a therapist, she is drawn to working with challenging people out of compassion but there is also a clear edge of specialness, a subtle grandiosity about it. These parts really have control over Sarah and interfere with her ability to set boundaries. This subjectivity makes Sarah work very hard to try to
be seen as empathic all the time and the overtly grandiose subjectivity makes her feel special about it.

Mike has a subjectivity that is a large part of his adaptive identity, the Nice Guy, that feels special because he is very good to people. The problem comes when he shifts from being kind to being overly accommodating. At this point another subjectivity, the Authoritarian, comes out. He told a story about being shamed and ridiculed for getting mad during his birthday party as a child when one of the other kids broke his new toy gun. With outrage, he went to his mother, angrily demanding justice and ended up getting shamed. Out of experiences like this he learned to repress his anger and be the shame-bound Nice Guy most of the time, until a very assertive, angry and controlling subjectivity, the Authoritarian comes out.

The final participant, Steve, had a subjectivity that feels special when allied with people that truly are special. A major aspect of his adaptive identity is feeling most comfortable, safe, and natural when allied to someone who is gifted, intelligent, and effective out in the world. He discussed his relationship with his best friend in grade school. He felt very safe being associated with this popular, personable, ebullient child. He said, “It was fun because I didn’t feel like I needed to be the center of attention, but that I could step into that center and out of it, as I felt comfortable.” When asked if there was an earlier scene that may be related, he thought of an event in an earlier grade during which he called out an inappropriate response to something his teacher was saying, his classmates laughed and he felt totally embarrassed, even nauseated. As he told this story, his voice trailed off into silence, head and eyes turning down as if experiencing the shame and queasiness all over again.
There were earlier episodes like this in his family of origin that evoked shame, especially feeling powerless with his father and trying to protect his mother from him. Steve’s embarrassing story about his trying to take center stage as a child and experiences of powerlessness in his family of origin, have led him to feel more comfortable in a secondary leadership role.

**How I Was Affected**

As the participants shared scenes relating to their encapsulated subjectivities, I was touched by each of their stories, which had elements of suffering, shame, and often feelings of powerlessness. It was striking how these subjectivities have affected the entire lives of each of the participants. I was saddened to hear the stories of each participant, as a child, not feeling good enough, not being appreciated, nurtured, or affirmed enough. It was sad that child parts of the participants that felt small and were dependent were forced to assume inauthentic power in their adaptive identities, not allowing a mature psychological autonomy to develop.

My reactions to these stories reflect my multiplicity in that I was affected as a person, as a novice therapist, and as an inexperienced researcher. As a researcher, I was pleased and excited to so easily find shame underlying the grandiose subjectivities in the first two subjects. If the grandiosity seen in encapsulated subjectivities did not involve shame, because the narcissistic wounding was not severe enough, my whole dissertation would be about negative findings. My excitement and even pleasure at finding grandiosity and shame in the participants did not keep other parts of me from being affected by the sessions, all of which involved stories of real shame and suffering.
Imaginal Structures in Use

I have strong imaginal structures relating to unhealthy dependency issues that relate to this learning. I have traits that definitely could be called codependent or Echoistic, and others that are counter-dependent, or grandiose. I have a Nice Guy subjectivity that is much like Mike’s in this research, but also has elements that remind me of Susan’s Accommodator. This subjectivity cares too much what other individuals think of me and the result is my not doing what I want to do if I am afraid someone will think less of me or not like me. This dynamic has resulted in me not being very good at boundary setting in my job, relationships, and parenting. I have given too much energy and time away in order to be liked. On a deep level, the belief associated with this imaginal structure is that if I try hard enough and accommodate others enough, I will be accepted and even loved.

I also have grandiose tendencies that can be personified as subjectivities as well. I have a subjectivity that makes me expect to be liked and accepted despite negative behavior, usually because my intentions are good. An example would be doing something that hurts my wife’s feelings. I tend to want instant forgiveness and even tend to blame her for being critical of me in those situations. This desire is an example of classic regression and the desire to be passively loved, the desire to be held, without consequence no matter what one has done, amae. This subjectivity might say “just love me like I deserve and by the way… don’t criticize me or tell me what to do!” This behavior represents an overtly grandiose part of my self that is a dissociated subjectivity
that I do not like at all!

These imaginal structures most likely came out of similar situations of unmet emotional needs when I was a dependent child like the participants experienced. I vividly remember a time when I was about six, during which I said something disrespectful to my mother in front of some relatives. She took me into the next room and started yelling at me, telling me to “straighten up and fly right.” I felt crushed and humiliated by the severity of the reprimand, imagining that my relatives could hear all of it. This reaction is an example of a governing scene that represents the shame of not feeling good enough. I am sure that this is a psychological magnification of many similar scenes from much earlier in my life that caused subjectivities to form in me around dependency issues.

Theoretical Concepts

Grandiosity is an exaggerated claim of an individual’s own importance and an entitled sense of feeling special. The false self of a narcissist is not only unreal, it keeps the individual out of deep relationships with the other people. The same is true to a lesser degree when anyone is being grandiose. Grandiosity has been defined as the illusion that we are not interdependent.

Dependency is “a relationship with a real or ideal being, object, group, or institution that involves more or less accepted compulsion and that is connection with the satisfaction of a need.” Dependency pervades human experience; we need others to survive. For everything an individual is dependent upon, there is a provider of that need. Healthy dependence or interdependency involves an appropriate exchange of dependency between the parties or reciprocal dependence.
are not met, shame is often felt.\textsuperscript{dex}

Experiences of unmet emotional needs that relate to identity in children can create narcissistic wounding because the parent’s narcissistic needs are put before the child’s authentic needs.\textsuperscript{dexi} Narcissistic wounding or injury happens when the child is required to be substantially different than he or she really is for the sake of the parent.\textsuperscript{dexii} This deep wounding to the child’s self elicits shame and feelings of alienation and is often humiliating.\textsuperscript{dexiii} Grandiosity then develops as a defense against feelings of shame and humiliation.\textsuperscript{dexiv}

As noted earlier, feeling inferior was a common theme in the participant’s stories. I-factor feelings include inferiority, insecurity, incompetency, inadequacy, and indignity. I-factor feelings are related to shame about identity.\textsuperscript{dexv} I-factor related feelings result in grandiose subjectivities protectively coming forward to guard the individual’s defended experience of identity.

The main interpersonal need humans have is the need for relationships. The other interpersonal needs are the things that those relationships provide. According to Kaufman, the specific interpersonal needs are touching/holding, identification, differentiation, nurturing, affirmation, and power.\textsuperscript{dexvi} Identification related to shame, as used by Kaufman, has to do with the internalization of shame scenes.\textsuperscript{dexvii} Relationship shame is one of Kaufman’s other interpersonal need-shame bind categories. Relationship shame has to do with a child’s needs not being met in relationship such that when the child feels they need someone later in life, they feel shame for having that need.\textsuperscript{dexviii}

Differentiation has to do with developing a separate identity and affirmation has to do with having that identity recognized and supported by others.\textsuperscript{dexix} When a separate
identity does not fully form in a young person or a child’s true specialness is not affirmed, shame is felt. Lack of being nurtured by others can also lead to feelings of shame, as will not being able or allowed to nurture others. Also, feeling less than appropriate power in interpersonal relationships is also a major source of shame.

Several of the participants felt that their grandiose subjectivities had always been with them. When an internalized sense of shame starts very young and feels very pervasive, it would seem like the subjectivity has been with the participant since birth. This observation is supported by the concept of psychological magnification. Kaufman defines the phenomenon of psychological magnification and explains why every scene is not specifically remembered very well because our thinking continually remakes our memories of these important scenes. In psychological magnification, affect is responsible for imprinting scenes in the mind, making them memorable. Affect also amplifies scenes, making them more seem more important to individuals. As time passes, scenes with similar affective tone blend together in the memory forming a scene that is remembered. If a scene or fused group of scenes is important enough, they become governing scenes. Governing scenes help to form the experience of identity and how people react to the world. Governing scenes are the stories individuals hold about their past that affect present thoughts, feelings, and actions.

In Affect Theory, governing scenes can be based on any one of the affects. In this research, the governing scenes of grandiose subjectivities were found to be shame scenes. Internalized shame scenes become a principal source of a shame-based identity when a child internalizes self-images that are based on interactions with significant others that produce feelings of shame. Finding shame scenes in this research would be expected
because the investigation focused on grandiose subjectivities and grandiosity is always related to shame.

**Interpretations**

This learning found that unmet emotional needs in childhood results in shame and the formation of grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. The shame experience of each participant was a narcissistic wound that was harsh enough for grandiose subjectivities to develop, but not so traumatic that the wounds resulted in generalized narcissism. All of the participants had grandiose subjectivities, which speaks to how pervasive grandiosity is in non-narcissistic individuals.

Each participant also had some alienation towards the grandiose film clip characters, which is related to two factors. First, the grandiose individuals in the film clips felt inauthentic because their thoughts, feelings and actions come from the false self. It is hard to be with individuals when they are being grandiose because they are not in relationship with you with any authentic way. The second cause of this alienation is the fact that the grandiose subjectivities in these participants tended to be dissociated, essentially unacceptable to the participants’ adaptive identities. The participants rejected the characters, just like they reject these parts of themselves.

As expected, shame was found underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities in each participant. All of the participants, speaking as their grandiose subjectivities, related scenes that involved shame associated with interpersonal needs not being met in their families of origin. These subjectivities became major aspects of the participants’ adaptive identities that have resulted in grandiose enactments by them as
adults. Grandiose enactments in non-narcissistic individuals can be considered a form of regression and as such, were problematic for the participants.

Shame was observed and identified in the participants by noting what they said as well as their facial expressions and head and body postures as they spoke. Finding shame that was primarily related to interpersonal emotional need issues, led to the learning that grandiose subjectivities are often generated after experiences of unmet emotional needs. Kaufman calls the shame state that results from unmet emotional needs an interpersonal need-shame bind. The only shame related dependency need from Kaufman’s list that was not seen in the participants, was shame related to touching and holding.

Other types of shame were not seen prominently in the findings. None of the grandiose subjectivities were related to body shame, or shame primarily related to purpose in life, or shame related to drives such as sexuality and hunger. Mike’s grandiose subjectivity reflected a strong shame-anger bind but there was also evidence of an interpersonal need-shame bind related to this subjectivity as well. Shame binds involving the other affects were not found.

The common theme of inferiority and other I-factor feelings found in the findings meant that the participants have a partially shame based identity related to these encapsulated subjectivities. The event Susan recalled, with her intimidating brother was probably one of many earlier experiences that made the Accommodator become an important part of her adaptive identity and drove her Albert Finney energy to the background of her personality. Lack of parental affirmation and feelings of powerlessness were clearly evident in Susan’s story. The statement, “He wasn’t going to hit me or anything,” shows that this story involving her brother is not based on fear or trauma.
Clearly her feeling of smallness and powerlessness was shame based, relating to shameful feelings about her self. This story does not sound like a severely shaming scene but its power must come from the psychological magnification of earlier scenes that she does not remember because the Accommodator assumed a central position in her adaptive personality. This clearly codependent subjectivity felt small, wanted to please those around her, and did not want to confront others.

Bill’s failure was around competency. He let his parents down, felt shame, and the Pusher went on to profoundly affect his identity by taking control over much of his personality. His parents failed to affirm that he was a good enough child and normally a good student that could go on to be successful. Being identified by his parents as a potential failure prompted a crisis response in his psyche to avoid the stinging shame of similar scenes in the future. He hardly ever failed at all at anything after this. The Pusher is relatively counter-dependent, driving Bill to do things independently by himself and do them right.

Karen never felt good enough or wanted by her parents and did not receive the attention or nurturing she needed from them. Her parents also showed favoritism towards her older sisters. Not feeling wanted or good enough are feelings associated with shame about identity. Her gender was also a source of identity shame because her parents, especially her father, really wanted a boy. Karen was also not allowed to fully differentiate from her sisters. Her parents did not affirm her unique individual nature and shame-bound subjectivities resulted.

Lack of nurturing, which can lead to shame, was especially evident in Karen’s early life. She internalized all of this shame as a child keeping silent and suffering, but as
an adult this has turned into the need to compulsively tell her story. Yet repeatedly telling the story has not helped very much to alleviate the suffering and shame that the stories embody. The Sufferer is dependent upon the Attention-getter and the Attention-getter, while outgoing, is needy; it needs to tell the stories.

Katie was not affirmed for whom she was as a child, not allowed to express her feelings in such a chaotic family with a rage filled alcoholic father and codependent mother. Katie’s grandiose subjectivity sometimes feels special about being able to work with very wounded, challenging, and needy people. Underneath these occasional feelings of being special, there is an opposite pole subjectivity that is quiet and powerless. The control of this subjectivity and the pain and it caused her was evident when she was strongly affected telling the story about how long it took her to leave her bad marriage and confront her father because of this subjectivity. Having to play the peacemaker in her family was a codependent role. She had to be like a therapist with the group, taking care of them instead of being able to air her feelings about how crazy the family was to her, and get her own needs met.

Sarah was the participant whose subjectivity made her “put herself in the other kid’s shoes” with such apparent empathy. Sarah did not feel good enough and a major subjectivity resulted that was concerned with other individuals’ feelings and needs more than her own. Her story is one of shame around identity, inferiority, and a painful relationship with her parents. Ultimately she was not allowed to be in her own shoes. She idealized her mother, calling her supportive, extremely compassionate, and empathic but her mother was codependent and responsible for a narcissistically wounding situation. Sarah was not allowed to fully differentiate herself by expressing normal feelings about
other children. She was told to be empathic and was mainly affirmed when being special, not for whom she really was. She received praise from her father, only if it involved her doing something interesting, intellectual, and unique. Her normal way of being was not good enough to obtain attention from her busy father. Her unique nature as an individual was not affirmed and shame was the result. Trying to be so empathic and giving so much is also hard work. This subjectivity has led to her having trouble setting boundaries, which has led to overwhelm and depression.

This special part really has control of Sarah and it is not truly empathic. This subjectivity is more codependent, concerned about looking empathic in the eyes of her internalized mother and looking special in the eyes of her internalized father. Sarah’s capacity for empathy was apparent to me from our interactions, but it did not come from this subjectivity. If this subjectivity lets go of some control it will allow Sarah to be more authentic in her empathy and true specialness, and not to need it to bolster the false self, represented by the energy bound in this subjectivity.

Mike, who told the story of the broken toy gun and his mother’s reaction to his anger and frustration, also was not always seen or heard enough as a child. When a balanced response to his anger and frustration was needed from his mother, he was actively shamed. He was shamed for affirming his own needs because expressing his anger was not acceptable to his mother. The shaming of his anger generated an affect shame bind where anger and shame were joined in his mind. This story showed that feeling anger, then expressing it, and asserting the potential power that comes with it, was shamed in Mike. This experience of being shamed because of expressing his anger tended to link shame to his experience of anger in the future and led to the development of the
Nice Guy and the Authoritarian subjectivities that we worked with.

Steve, the participant who had the subjectivity that feels special when allied with special people, spoke of his family of origin, it was clear there were dependency failures. When he needed affirmation and was seeking differentiation as a child, he had to assume the role of protector to his mother and was unable to express his feelings towards his father. As a protector of his adult mother, he was a child trying to assume the role of the second man at home, the one who did not hurt his mother like his father did. With his special friend he could bask in reflected specialness that made him most comfortable when assuming secondary leadership roles.

Validity

I may tend to exaggerate the importance of shame, grandiosity, and unhealthy dependency issues because of the imaginal structures in me mentioned above. I have a fairly shame-bound personality, with adaptive subjectivities that tend towards codependency and counter-dependency and dissociated subjectivities that tend towards overt grandiosity. Also, because of the power of my adaptive subjectivities, I have less interpersonal power than would be healthy. These subjectivities may lead me to imagine that shame over dependency issues are at the root of most psychological issues, especially if the subjectivities involve overt or covert grandiosity. I need to develop a more reflexive identity around these subjectivities, essentially putting the findings of this research to use in my own problematic multiplicity.

As alluded to earlier, I find grandiosity off-putting and may see some of it that is not there or exaggerate it when it is there. This proclivity may explain why I am drawn to
the concept of plurality in integrated multiplicity and potentially might make me tend to label some acts of leadership in the individual psyche, or by a member of a group as grandiosity, because I would not be comfortable taking on that much leadership myself.

My co-researchers shared the negative reaction to grandiosity in some of the film clips, as did the participants. I suspect that being negatively affected by grandiosity is a pervasive trait that did not affect the validity of this learning. I have also worked on my own shame, dependency and grandiosity, so that I am aware of them, suggesting that the findings in this learning are valid.

Learning Two: Addressing Shame in Grandiose Encapsulated Subjectivities Can Be Empowering to Individuals

This learning answered the question asked by Research Problem showing that addressing the shame underneath grandiosity did start a movement towards integrated multiplicity by beginning a process of empowerment in the participants. This finding was posited in the main research hypothesis. This move towards empowerment by working with grandiose subjectivities has the potential to greatly impact the interpersonal lives of the participants if they continue to work with these subjectivities. What was not hypothesized ahead of time was the effect of merely differentiating, personifying and mirroring these subjectivities. Giving grandiose subjectivities autonomy in this way basically addressed the underlying shame by just asking questions and listening to their stories about shame based governing scenes. Allowing grandiose subjectivities to tell their stories did most of the work. Giving attention to areas involved with shame was empowering to the participants with very little direct attention given to addressing the shame.
What Happened

In Susan, the dissociated part of her that is overtly grandiose, the Albert Finney subjectivity, allowed her to be powerfully present and take up space in the research meeting room. After shifting to letting the Albert Finney subjectivity speak, it was clear that this subjectivity could be an important source of energy for her that was very different from that of the Accommodator. She said:

I can just feel energetically that I really like having the floor, getting to talk, and I’m not that concerned whether people like me or not. It is more important to me to be able to feel this power. I could even get into a physical fight.

Her body posture was erect, head and shoulders up, leaning forward, and she made an almost aggressive eye contact with me as the Albert Finney part spoke. She even asked me, “Am I making you uncomfortable?”

The Albert Finney part was not always this aggressive. Earlier it said, “I am also misunderstood. I actually take care of others with my ‘taking charge’ authority.” This subjectivity was alluding to the power that it has in being assertive, suggesting that if balanced with the Accommodator, good things would happen for Susan. Her follow up comments two weeks after the research meeting reflected this change.\textsuperscript{dxxviii}

Bill’s exploration into his multiplicity in our work was a deepening of his previous work in Voice Dialogue with two archetypal selves that are discussed in Voice Dialogue literature, the Pusher self and the Being self.\textsuperscript{dxxix} The Being self has qualities associated with the goddess Aphrodite, such as appreciating life in the moment, beauty, nature, relationships, and love. These traits are more associated with being aware of and
appreciating what is happening in the moment rather than doing something or accomplishing things like the Pusher has him do. Bill noted that by being aware of the Pusher limiting the pleasurable side of life, the Pusher relinquished some of its intrapsychic power and the Aphrodite energy was allowed to come even further forward. His follow up comment after the second session was, “The more I can remain in the tension of those two opposites, the more I will be aware and in control of my own actions.”

In our session, Sarah felt the shame and pain that her “putting herself in other people’s shoes” subjectivity has caused her over the years related to not being able to set boundaries or get her own needs met. Her follow up comments reflected how telling the shame-bound story helped her. Mike, the participant with the Nice Guy/Authoritarian subjectivities also had positive comments after the second session.

Steve was the participant that was shamed for speaking out in class and was laughed at. Steve had a controlling subjectivity that makes him feel special when allied with people that truly are special, I asked if his subjectivity held him hostage or just does what is best for him. His subjectivity said that it does really hold him down and admitted it had overstepped its bounds. Steve’s follow up comments two weeks after the second session were also positive, calling the work “a seed of healing.”

**How I Was Affected**

With all of the subjectivities mentioned it was interesting, exciting, and gratifying to see that grandiose parts, especially the overtly grandiose subjectivities can be
integrated into the identity and potentially bring empowerment with them so easily. This finding of empowerment was especially true when Susan seized the power of her previously split off Albert Finney energy in the research room. I was made apprehensive by the energy Susan embodied while speaking from her Albert Finney subjectivity. I had a somatic reaction, breathing faster with tightness in my chest, but relaxed, and became excited when she integrated this energy so quickly using reflective dialoguing.

**Imaginal Structures in Use**

The most important imaginal structure in me related to this learning on the surface is that I am uncomfortable with grandiosity. Advocating for myself and setting appropriate boundaries to protect myself is often hard for me because doing this sometimes feels grandiose to me. This feeling is obviously not reflective of healthy entitlement. Underneath my being uncomfortable with grandiosity there are feelings of inferiority, shame, and resentment towards those that are overtly grandiose. Grandiose people take up the space that I feel myself and others deserve. This imaginal structure can be personified as a dominant adaptive subjectivity in me related to the Nice Guy that I call the Accommodating/Codependent part, which is very similar to Susan’s subjectivity. I imagine finding an Albert Finney like part will help me as it seems to be helping Susan.

**Theoretical Concepts**

Authentic power has been defined by Omer as “the spectrum of human capacities and qualities that are responsive to various domains of life experience in ways that engender truth, beauty, and justice.” Relating to the pseudo-power that grandiose
subjectivities wield, is a concept that Stroud calls the independent will of the complex. Essentially a complex, or in this case a personified complex or encapsulated subjectivity, has a will of its own, separate from the I’s will. It is this independent willfulness that creates unilateral, thinking, feeling, and behavior in people that comes from encapsulated subjectivities.

The concepts of regression and infantile omnipotence explain some of the grandiosity that comes out when problematic subjectivities are trying to exercise more power. Infantile omnipotence refers to the normal grandiose behavior and thoughts of infants and young children in which they see themselves as all-powerful. When adults are stressed, one defensive reaction is to regress, or go back to thought and behavior patterns that worked at a very young age. In multiplicity, regression causes immature subjectivities to take control. These subjectivities grab control and power by acting out in a way that worked in childhood.

Besides regressing, grandiose subjectivities may result in individuals acting out in other ways. There was some evidence that grandiose subjectivities can collapse similar to the way narcissists do. Narcissists collapse by going into depression, chronic pessimism, or even rage. Mike’s covertly grandiose Nice Guy subjectivity collapsed to a state of rage is similar to narcissistic rage when the Authoritarian came out. In problematic multiplicity, when the adaptive identity strategies of grandiosity do not work to bolster the false self, states similar to narcissistic rage or a narcissistic collapse into depression may result. This pattern was evident with Sarah whose overwhelm and then depression was related to her grandiose subjectivity making it hard for her to set boundaries.
Intrapsychically, there can be power issues between subjectivities, just as between individuals. Anytime there is not an appropriate amount of power between individuals or between parts of an individual there is the potential for shame. Appropriate does not mean equal, but rather power that is based on real capacities. For instance Susan’s Accommodator can access empathy which helps her to be a good therapist, but her adaptive identity must learn to let her big Albert Finney energy come out more for her to do things requiring more autonomy, like teaching psychology, which is one of her goals.

The essence of colonization as described by Memmi is domination and subjugation of the colonized by the colonizer. Many of the subjectivities that I observed as part of the adaptive identity of the participants are agencies that are responsible for a form of intrapsychic colonization. This idea is counter-intuitive because this form of colonization is an intrapsychic power move that sometimes results in a person having less power interpersonally. Again, consider Susan’s case where the Accommodator did not seem powerful out in the world, yet it was very dominant or powerful in her adaptive identity, keeping the Albert Finney energy effectively subjugated. Intrapsychic colonization is an internal grandiose enactment that affects external interpersonal relationships. In integrated multiplicity the most appropriate part of the self assumes leadership given the situation at hand, under the guidance of a reflexive identity.

Discussing leadership, Omer has used the following analogy; leader is to group as the I is to soul. He is referring to the I that leads, acting with authentic power that comes from a reflexive identity. In multiplicity, the I that leads does not dominate or subjugate the other subjectivities. An I that leads with authentic power is called the aware
A similar state has been called the imaginal ego by Mary Watkins. There is a sense of psychological autonomy that comes with an I that is able to use authentic power inherent in integrated multiplicity.

Basically, integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity develop in two ways. The first way is through good enough mothering, fathering, and peer support during the formative years. This results in an I that can lead. The I in this individual has appropriate access to their capacities, including courage, reflexivity, and empathy. In integrated multiplicity, individuals have appropriate power in interpersonal situations and a healthy sense of self-esteem and entitlement. The other way to develop psychological autonomy is to supplement an individual’s early mothering, fathering, and peer support by doing deep psychological work in individual therapy, groups, and in intimate relationships.

**Interpretations**

The Research Problem of this dissertation asked what would be the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers in problematic multiplicity? The findings of this learning answered this question. This learning found that differentiating and personifying grandiose encapsulated subjectivities and engaging them in reflective dialogues about their origins was an effective way to mirror them and engage the shame that underlies their grandiosity, which led to empowerment. Grandiose subjectivities point to places where individuals have unhealthy dependency and entitlement issues that conceal shame. The mirroring of the subjectivities was important because giving grandiose subjectivities attention and emotional support allowed the participants to access the shame underneath the grandiosity. Addressing the
shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities was empowering for the participants by releasing assertive energy and healing intrapsychic colonization in ways that will allow the development of a more integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity.

The data suggests that differentiating and personifying the participant’s subjectivities was actually a form of mirroring that allowed them to be accepted in their grandiosity. This observation was true for overtly grandiose and covertly grandiose subjectivities. This mirroring in turn allowed us to discuss underlying shame in a way that was very natural and comfortable. Merely asking questions about their stories with a focus that was looking for shame, started to loosen shame-related imaginal structures. The interviews in this research began a process of moving towards a more integrated multiplicity as stated in the Research Problem.

Part of the reason it was easy to work with the participants’ shame was because of their psychological sophistication, but there was also safety and trust was built into the structure of the research methodology. Specifically, both Kaufman’s basic steps of the treatment of shame, as adapted for problematic multiplicity, and the positive aspects of Omer’s Modes of Experience, were built into the research methodology.

The adaptive grandiose subjectivities are aspects of the participants that were forced into major power positions in the adaptive identities as protective responses to early shame experiences. These subjectivities assumed positions of pseudo-leadership in the psyche, attempting to act with true power or autonomy that they can never have because they are young parts of the adaptive identity wounded by shame. One could interpret the pseudo-leadership position of adaptive grandiose subjectivities as the domination of many parts by few. In the participants as adults, even though these
adaptive subjectivities wield lots of power and control intrapsychically, the tended to make the individuals less authentically powerful and less well rounded interpersonally.

In this study the adaptive subjectivities were often covertly grandiose making the individual less powerful interpersonally but these subjectivities were very controlling and powerful intrapsychically. Dissociated subjectivities are inherently less powerful than adaptive ones in the psyche because they are split off. If dissociated subjectivities can gain more power intrapsychically, they can help individuals interpersonally to express capacities that are not normally present in the adaptive identity.

The data that lead to these concepts was most clearly seen with the first participant, Susan. Her Albert Finney energy is powerful, and allowing some of it to come into her day-to-day life will really help Susan. Her comments at the end clearly reflect how much she appreciated the power shifts that were already happening.

By incorporating the Aphrodite energy into his life, Bill has seen power shifts that have made him more of a well-rounded individual. Most of these shifts occurred before this project, but addressing the residual shame in his story caused by how much the Pusher limited his pleasure seeking side, moved the process forward.

Mike’s affect-shame bind as a child gave the Nice Guy subjectivity more power to his adaptive identity and less power to the angry Authoritarian subjectivity that sometimes was more in touch with his emotional life. Both poles bring shame to Mike as an adult. Discussing the roles of these subjectivities and the shame they may cause, began a balancing of the power between these two subjectivities. There is a middle ground that he can reach that would represent appropriate interdependency and power between these subjectivities. This middle ground would be about not caring so much about being liked,
and being able to express appropriate anger and assertiveness in his interpersonal life. Working with these parts will allow him to take better care of himself and still care about other people’s feelings.

Steve was the participant that was shamed for yelling out in class and being laughed at. This event triggered severe embarrassment, a form of shame, and made him much more careful about assuming the center stage role. Steve also felt shame at not being able to protect his mother, take care of her and stand up to his father. As a result of these dynamics, Steve’s subjectivity protects him by keeping him in a second place position behind individuals who have authentic power. He feels safer augmenting the power of others rather than asserting his own. And yet, he feels passionately and wants to be able to stand up for himself and his convictions but this subjectivity holds him back. The work with grandiosity and shame started to shift this. He said the insight gained was “busting his chops,” in other words, he realized how much his subjectivity had overstepped its bounds and has held him back. Steve’s follow up comments noted that a seed of healing began in this work, showed that empowerment was beginning to occur.

Many of the stories told by the participants in these learnings were about a child who feels small in some way who is trying to be big, assume center stage, or develop power in some way. Instead of meeting the world with a grounded, centered sense of being, a sense of psychological autonomy that comes from an integrated multiplicity, a reflexive identity, and interdependency, they met the world with grandiose subjectivities. Overtly grandiose subjectivities are trying to make them feel big enough, and result in grandiose enactments trying to bring their power forward. The covertly grandiose subjectivities keep them small until the shame of feeling small and powerless creates
enough psychic pressure that the individuals have an overtly grandiose enactment, again trying to be big. These findings suggest that grandiose enactments reflect the subjectivities trying to find their own power, sense of specialness, healthy entitlement, and ultimately, their psychological autonomy.

Allowing grandiose subjectivities to dialogue with autonomy and addressing the shame underlying grandiosity did indeed begin a process that could facilitate integrated multiplicity. The dialogues also brought up gatekeeping in the participants. For instance, in Mike’s follow-up comments, I could feel the self critical Nice Guy energy come up when discussing how collaboration between subjectivities might make him more powerful, but potentially less likable. Gatekeeping always arises at initiatory thresholds, and it is clear that most of the participants were brought to this threshold by this work aimed at uncovering shame underneath grandiosity.dcxlv

Differentiating and personifying grandiose encapsulated subjectivities and engaging them in reflective dialogues about their origins was an effective way to engage the shame and power issues that underly their grandiosity. The positive response of the participants to the work and the intent to engage these subjectivities further, definitely suggests that this type of work can facilitate a more integrated multiplicity.

Validity

Because I was so impressed with Susan’s results after accessing her powerful Albert Finney energy and the outcome regarding her empowerment, my interpretations of the results in the other participants may have been colored. She was the first participant I worked with. The other participants also had signs of empowerment but not nearly as
strongly as Susan’s. The strong follow up statements from the participants support the
validity of these results but I would have liked to have more participants react as strongly
as Susan did. My co-researchers also found the data held a sense of empowerment, which
was compelling support of these findings.

**Learning Three: The Grandiosity of Some Protective Encapsulated Subjectivities**

*Is an Inauthentic Form of Power That Is Disempowering and Harmful to Individuals as a Whole*

This learning found that some grandiose subjectivities acting as protectors are
disempowering by preventing painful affects from surfacing into awareness. This
protectiveness was disempowering because it prevented energy bound by the protected
subjectivity from being released that could lead to a more flexible and integrated
multiplicity. The protection in this case is actually intrapsychic colonization. This
learning also relates to the compulsive need to tell one’s story or to listen to other’s
stories, staying close to their painful affect as a defense against feeling one’s own strong
affect. This defensive pattern prevents these affects from being transmuted into
capacities.

**What Happened**

Karen and Katie are both women training to become therapists. Karen’s intention
was to work with an aspect of herself that makes her feel special because it has suffered
so much. In the first session when we were trying to differentiate the subjectivities we
were going to work with, she came up with two subjectivities, one needy one that suffers
and another one that gets attention by telling stories about the suffering. These
subjectivities seemed to be fused, so I asked her if it would seem beneficial to
differentiate these parts more fully so that the sufferer could just be with the suffering and
keep the storyteller quiet for a little while. Karen, speaking as herself said,

Therapeutically, just to really just be with the suffering, probably is the way out, rather than telling the story, because telling the story hasn’t been satisfying for me, it’s been my coping mechanism.

But then she just started telling the next compelling story about a lover who had died of
cancer. She reflected upon how telling that story to many people at the time, even
embellishing it, did not help much with the suffering.

Katie started out with the intention of working with a subjectivity that feels
special about being able to work with challenging people in therapy. This part of her
needs to be around craziness, she said, “I don’t know if I can’t, not be around craziness.”

In exploring where this voice came from, first a covertly grandiose subjectivity came up,
followed by the overtly grandiose one that can work with difficult people. The covertly
grandiose part keeps her still, close to the emotion and suffering of challenging people,
but it keeps her listening rather than talking. She referred to this still, small, powerless
aspect of herself that the more grandiose subjectivity protects. When asked what would
happen if the still part moved she said, “I’d die… annihilation.”

Saying more about this she said:

It’s as if your very life depended on doing the right thing and you can’t do the right thing. Specialness is not the right word, entitled is the right word, it has this sovereign nature; there is a degree of ‘your highness-ness’ to it. It’s like being royalty, having a line. It feels very much like a holy place, a majestic place, the purity, and the true intention maybe, the truth of intention. That’s kind of what I boil this all down to, from that place of majesty it feels like it is the one that is running the show.

Speaking as her subjectivity, Katie shifted the tone of this narrative from a shameful state
of total smallness and powerlessness in the first sentence to grandiosity and trying to be
big in the following sentences. Her whole body position and tone of voice switched from a shameful slumped over position with a quiet voice to an erect, prideful posture and more powerful tone of voice when she shifted from being “small” to being “big.”

Katie’s reactivity to the Albert Finney character in the film clip also relates to feelings of being small. Referring to his grandiosity, his energy clearly bothered her. In Katie’s follow up comments she noted that after the second session, she is more able to realize when this small, still part lets her know she is uncomfortable and she is beginning to be able to choose another path. She can react to her discomfort without having the grandiose response that glorifies the stillness and the ability to tolerate suffering.

How I Was Affected

I was especially saddened by the painful experiences of Karen and Katie. I was deeply moved by Karen’s willingness to share her stories of repeated shaming that she endured at the hands of her parents and of the pain and loss she endured when she lost her lover to cancer. I felt a little sting of rejection and even irritation that Karen, influenced by the storytelling Attention-getter, would accept my interpretation about the blending of these parts intellectually, but not allow the Sufferer who carries the painful affects, to come forward in the room as I suggested. These feelings in me shifted to sadness and interest when I noted just how much control and power the storytelling Attention-getter subjectivity had over Karen. The sadness was about realizing that the Sufferer would not be able to really come out and speak about the suffering or feel it fully with me, or maybe with anyone at this point, because of the Attention-getter’s storytelling.
I was also deeply affected and moved by the depth of sharing by Katie. She was vulnerable and open from the start. She let the overt and covert grandiosity of her subjectivities come into the room with me immediately and dropped deeply into her emotion and was willing to stay there with me.

**Imaginal Structures in Use**

Like Karen, I have a grandiose part that loves to tell my story and make conversations be about me, even if it means interrupting someone else’s story. I used to try to show empathy, by identifying with someone’s story and then telling a similar one of my own. I still occasionally fall into this trap in my personal life making the conversation about my own wounding rather than just empathically listening. It is easier for me to control this subjectivity from the therapist’s chair.

I also have a subjectivity that likes to be close to suffering like Katie’s, listening to the story of other people’s suffering, but the dynamic is less self-protective. Some of this is voyeurism; this part of me likes the vicarious thrill of other people’s strong affect, which makes me feel more alive. Some of this is a bit sadistic, as in the subjectivity I call the Grandiose Boy. It is as if this young part has a “better-you-than-me” attitude and feels relief when hearing about the suffering of others.

**Theoretical Concepts**

These strongly protective parts like those seen in Katie and Karen are called firefighters in Internal Family Systems Therapy. Firefighters keep emotional things from getting out of control but may also keep the individual from doing what is necessary
in therapy for healing to take place. Subjectivities like firefighters keep the individuals from going down into negative affective states that Hollis calls the swamplands of the soul. Unfortunately, all individuals must go through the swamplands, the depression, the shame, the grief, etc. to make meaning out of what has happened to them. Listening to other people’s stories or compulsively telling their own, may get individuals some vicarious experience or sympathy but they may also keep people out of the experience and the meaning making that can come out of going deeply into experiences with awareness and reflexivity.

Also at play here may be the archetypal phenomenon that Kalsched refers to in his archetypal self-care system when the protector turns persecutor. There is a selfdestructive element in the protection of the subjectivities discussed above. These subjectivities may not be as intense as the severely demonic figures that Kalsched mentions in his book, but they are self-destructive nonetheless.

Karen’s storytelling Attention-getter and Katie’s grandiose subjectivity, both embody the grandiose tendency towards being outgoing and talking excessively. This pattern was obvious in all of the Attention-getters stories and came out in the grandiose majesty speech of Katie’s subjectivity. This verbalization is a means to keep strong affect away from experience. Compulsive talking is one of the common ways that the shame of inferiority is kept under control in grandiose behaviors of narcissists. This was depicted in the Albert Finney film clip. This character was a grandiose storyteller that used his imagination to embellish his stories, just as Karen’s Attention-getter did.

Katie’s description of the primary place that was close to her vulnerable core, the place of majesty that both embodied purity and also a terror of annihilation, was probably
Balint originated the term basic fault to represent the preverbal level of experience in which there is a disturbance of primary object love between the mother and infant. Regression to the level of the basic fault is not experienced as conflict but rather as a defect that must be rectified involving a great deal of anxiety and neediness.

**Interpretations**

The Attention-getter in Karen was going to keep it at the level of the story, no matter what. The mocking tone Karen used when speaking about the needy part, the Sufferer, showed that this part is a dissociated subjectivity and that the Attention-getter is an adaptive subjectivity. This tone indicated that there was shame over her neediness and the fact that she was suffering. The compensatory grandiosity of the story telling Attention-getter keeps her out of the messy affective territory of the Sufferer. Talking about suffering is easier than feeling it and it often elicits sympathy from the listener.

The grandiosity of the Attention-getter clearly came out with the admission that there was embellishment of the stories to obtain more attention. The level of control that this subjectivity has over Karen also reflects grandiosity. The goal of this subjectivity seems to primarily to be to receive attention and sympathy, rather than to help alleviate the suffering that Karen has. This subjectivity just kept telling stories, even after admitting that letting the Sufferer feel the suffering, might be the best course of action. Compulsive storytelling is a coping mechanism or strategy as she said, that protects her adaptive identity by keeping her from having to feel the depth of suffering inside. In this case, grandiosity was not only a defense against shame, but also a defense against any
strong affect or suffering. This defense ultimately prevents her from releasing some of the hold the past has on her. It felt like the storyteller was using some projective identification, the phenomenon during which an individual projects feelings outwards that they are not totally in touch with, such that the listener identifies with and feels the affect being projected. The listener feels just enough of the Attention-getter’s pain so that she gets attention and sympathy but does not have to feel the full depth of it herself.

Katie said that her subjectivity keeps her still and listening. This subjectivity also kept her away from something and then shifted again to talking about stillness. Her body posture as she spoke these words and the trailing off of her voice, suggests that there is underlying shame and sadness that the still, receiving, and listening behaviors is protecting her from. Katie said this subjectivity’s job was to be still and be with whatever pain was in the room. She used the word annihilation referring to what would happen if she moved. Annihilation is a strong word that suggests the stillness is protecting something very close to her core. By keeping still in these situations, listening, this subjectivity keeps her close to the suffering of others and seems to keep her away from feeling her own vulnerability. I imagine there is underlying shame, anger, and chaos beneath this fear of annihilation, that this complex subjectivity protects Katie from. This subjectivity reflects the smallness of the still, covertly grandiose part that can endure the suffering of challenging clients close to her vulnerable core, while protecting her from feeling affect at a very vulnerable place. It protects her by accessing overtly grandiose energy, which was reflected in her words about majesty, purity of intention, and autonomy. This story is an example of a small vulnerable covertly grandiose part switching to an overtly grandiose one to protect the individual’s vulnerability.
vulnerability is probably close to Katie’s basic fault. Katie’s grandiose subjectivity started talking when she was trying to describe the vulnerability at that level of regression. This grandiosity is however, denying Katie access to whatever is underneath this dynamic and the healing that might result by exploring it.

Both participants went deeply into their experience in our work together. When these subjectivities were active however, they protected vulnerable areas by either talking or by staying quiet. These subjectivities seem to keep them close to their own suffering, but also keep them above it, not able to plunge all the way into it, which may be the only way for them to move through it. It was also found that the protective and protected subjectivities in this learning tended to be fused or symbiotic. Perhaps this is related to the strength of intrapsychic colonization. The adaptive subjectivities in these participants, the Attention-getter of Karen and Katie’s grandiose subjectivity, both protect weaker parts but seem to be preventing deeper work in areas of marked wounding.

Validity

I reacted strongly in a negative way to the overtly grandiose aspects of Karen’s and Katie’s subjectivities. Some of this is because I am primarily covertly grandiose in my personality structures and do not like overt grandiosity. I also however, strongly identify with the subjectivities in this learning and do not especially like those parts of myself. I may be attributing more persecuting to their protection and exaggerating their role in preventing psychological growth than is valid because of this reactivity. As in Learning One, I shared these reactions and identifications patterns with the co-researchers and participants, who confirmed that the interpretations were valid.
Learning Four: Grandiosity May Help Therapists to Work with Challenging Clients

Learning Four found that grandiosity may help novice therapists to work with challenging clients. It was specifically found that the grandiosity of some subjectivities allowed these participants to work with challenging therapy clients until they actually realized that they could meet that challenge. The other aspect of this learning is that novice therapists can sometimes work with challenging clients due to the ability of grandiose subjectivities to help them tolerate suffering and strong affect.

What Happened

Katie and Sarah chose to explore grandiose subjectivities that made them feel special because they, as therapists, are able to work with challenging people. These subjectivities were both evoked by watching the Helen Hunt film clip character that was good at putting up with the very difficult Jack Nicholson character. The Helen Hunt character was not good at setting boundaries however. Karen choose to work a needy part that felt special because it suffered so much, like the Jack Nicholson character, and an overtly grandiose part like the Albert Finney character, that grabs attention by telling stories. All of these subjectivities are related to these participants working as therapists.

Katie and Sarah openly discussed how their subjectivities helped them to work with challenging clients and all three participants referred to giving away too much of themselves, related to their subjectivities. Katie said:
This part of me works really well with and does have a sense of entitlement around being able to work with problem, difficult people. At my field placement site, I am the one who can relate to the borderline person and doesn’t get triggered by them. When everybody would be irritated at the Richard Dreyfus character, including myself, I would be able to see his beauty. (Laughs) I’m why she can do this work. Where I’m having difficulty with it, is this part feels special, the part that feels that only she can do the service, has gotten me in trouble. I stayed in a marriage way too long. I also didn’t get mad at my father for a really long time.

Sarah said:

I worked in a psychiatric hospital for years and I do feel special for it. I can really relate to the aspect of putting up with hard to deal with people with too much patience until it is detrimental to me. This is definitely related to my first job as a teacher with disabled kids. It was just give, give, give, with very little awareness of what this giving was doing to me.

Karen, referring to her mother said,

And I think, for some reason, I somehow learned really early that she was overwhelmed. It feels like I needed to take care of her so that she could take care of me. So, I was quiet. I would pretend I was taking naps. I would hardly talk. An uncle nicknamed me Silent Sam, because I just wouldn’t talk.

The previously presented data about Karen’s subjectivities, the Attention-getter and the Sufferer, is important for this learning, but won’t be duplicated here.

Katie, who had an alcoholic father that was prone to raging, shared how this influenced the formation of her subjectivity and her career choice as a therapist.\footnote{dclvii} The members of her family didn’t own their craziness, which makes her distrust others who disown their craziness. She said, “I think it is a gift, to be able to see what motivates people, and see what’s going on with people, their craziness. I don’t know if I can’t, not be around craziness!”\footnote{dclviii} When asked about boundaries and this subjectivity, Katie said,

This part doesn’t really work with boundaries. This part can sit and understand a lot of really intense things that she has no business sitting and understanding. It would be better if it were this part’s job to get me out of there.\footnote{delix}
Katie said the following about recently having to leave her field placement.

It is so hard to give away my clients, to pass them on to other therapists. I have had to do quite a bit of work with that. I had three clients with personality disorders that could only attach to me.

In her follow up comments, Katie related that this subjectivity felt special and victimized by being able to hold so much of other people’s suffering. Sarah’s subjectivity also puts her in less than totally safe situations and has trouble setting boundaries.

How I Was Affected

I was saddened to hear what these three participants had to put up with in their early lives. I was put off by the overt grandiosity that came out of these subjectivities, especially Katie’s when she said she was the only psychotherapist those hard to work with clients could attach to. I was happy to see how empathic these individuals were despite the grandiosity of their subjectivities.

Imaginal Structures in Use

Like Katie and Sarah, I can work with challenging people and have a subjectivity that sometimes makes me feels special about it. In my field placement a few years ago I had a woman client who wanted to switch to a female therapist, because she felt she could open up more with a woman. She was sent back to me because the woman therapist she transferred to could not work with her. After hearing the stories the therapist had to tell about my ex-client in group supervision, nobody else at that clinic wanted to work with her either. She was called a borderline for the way she acted, and I was called a saint for putting up with her. Both of these apppellations were very exaggerated but I did have
moments of feeling special because I was willing and able to work with her. The subjectivity in me that felt special likes to think that I can work with anyone, although I know I cannot. This client did come back to work with me, and it was a significant and rewarding learning experience for me as a novice therapist.

I also have had the experience of feeling most fully alive when deeply grieving or in deep affect. I have an aspect of my personality that likes sitting with people who are deeply talking about their suffering, because it makes me feel more alive. I see this as very similar to Katie’s need to be near craziness or suffering. These aspects allow both of us to be with people that are really suffering. I also have the dissociated subjectivity that I spoke of in the last learning, the Grandiose Boy that actually feels better hearing these stories. I must be aware that there are parts of me that are perhaps feeling better about my life because others suffer more than me. I imagine that if I stay aware of these subjectivities, they will make me a better therapist. I too have to watch my boundaries as Katie, Karen, and Sarah have done. This is especially important when working as a psychotherapist.

Theoretical Concepts

The fact that these participants felt special and had some codependent issues is not unique. Health professionals often feel special because the work they do helps others, but this special relationship also makes them more prone to psychopathology. Anxiety, depression, suicide, drug and alcohol abuse, and burnout have been seen in health professionals related to work related stress and unhealthy dependency issues. Dependent and narcissistic personality traits increase the risk of these problems.
Grandiosity has also been linked to novice therapists. This pattern is a reaction related to not knowing what to do and an inability to tolerate uncertainty. The intense stories of shame that these participants told relates to the archetype of the wounded healer. That is, individuals who have suffered often are drawn to help others who have suffered, and are good at it, providing they do not get caught in power issues inherent in the poles of this archetype.

**Interpretations**

Katie and Sarah both had some feelings of being special because they can work with difficult or challenging individuals. This pattern of individuals in the helping professions feeling special is not uncommon as was noted earlier. Being able to imagine oneself as able to work with difficult people, even if there is some feelings of being special around it, may actually help to allow a novice therapist to work with challenging clients. This is the essence of this learning. Katie and Sarah both had this pattern. I got the sense that their grandiose subjectivities allowed them to be with challenging clients as novice therapists, but that both of them eventually realized that they had the necessary capacities to work with these individuals. Grandiosity in novice therapist may be a reaction to feelings of inferiority and shame in novice therapists. Their feeling special or grandiose about their abilities actually helped them to take the risks of working with challenging clients and probably allowed them to become better therapists. This stretching of capacities through grandiosity seems to be a creative form of grandiosity similar to adaptive grandiosity, a grandiosity that allows the creativity of artists to come out.
It makes sense that beginning psychotherapists are prone to codependency in that they are giving individuals. Katie and Sarah’s subjectivities were both obviously codependent as was the Silent Sam subjectivity of Karen. The storytelling Attention-getter was not very active in Karen that early. Perhaps Silent Sam is actually the Sufferer in a younger stage and the shame she felt brought out the story telling Attention-getter to protect her over time. Katie and Sarah both mentioned being able to work with difficult people, but also could give too much and become depleted or get depressed. Being able to work with difficult people is a dynamic in which grandiose subjectivities may push individuals into giving too much and a state of burnout results. Being a giving person makes becoming a therapist a worthwhile vocation. However this type of individual, especially one with codependent subjectivities must work to keep them in balance, and keep boundaries with their clients or else problems like burnout and even ethical issues may arise.

Katie’s subjectivity clearly reflects how being codependent in the family of origin can lead one into the field of therapy and be good at it, if the therapist deals with their issues and develops healthy boundaries. The grandiose subjectivity we worked with has given her an ability to recognize psychopathology and tolerate it. It seems that grandiosity starts the process, allowing her to take on and effectively work with challenging clients, but boundaries need to be set by other parts of her.

Sarah did not have to play the role of therapist in her family but had the role of unhealthy helper modeled to her by her mother. She notes being infuriated with the role her mother played while she was adapting it as part of herself, putting herself in other people’s shoes. Like Katie’s subjectivity, this part allows her to work with difficult
people, but also has had boundary issues that she has to keep under control. This subjectivity leads her towards situations with adventure but also uncertainty. This subjectivity has also gotten her into trouble when she experienced burnout, depression, and overwhelm as a teacher.

Both Katie and Sarah get something positive by living close to the edge of strong affect in their clients. Being able to tolerate this intensity could be called an experience of vicarious deep feelings, mild ecstasy, or just an adventurous experience. This ability to tolerate strong affect is a gift from their subjectivities as long as boundaries are maintained. This is similar to Karen’s subjectivities that also can tolerate intense affects in clients.

The data suggests that grandiose subjectivities like Karen’s might allow individuals to be close to the suffering of people and listen effectively without dissociating; this subjectivity can tolerate and is used to suffering and also enjoys a good story about suffering. Karen’s story telling subjectivity was quite grandiose and was protective of the suffering part but did not show much empathy for its plight. This makes sense, as narcissists are unable to very empathic and the Attention-getter was clearly a grandiose subjectivity.

It was clear from interacting with Karen and listening to her stories, that the Attention-getter does not preclude her as a whole, from having empathy for the suffering parts of her self or others however. With Katie and Sarah, the grandiosity of their subjectivities also allowed them to stay close to the suffering and work with challenging clients without grandiosity getting in the way of empathy.
The subjectivities we worked with were not empathetic; they were too steeped in their own codependence and grandiosity. The participants were quite empathic however. Empathy was evident in the participants’ reactions to the grandiose characters on film. In the participants’ stories, it was also evident that they had empathy for themselves and other family members who were affected by grandiose behavior of their narcissistic family members. It is easy to see why these participants have empathy for their therapy clients.

It was apparent from my experience of these participants as novice therapists that their grandiose subjectivities did allow them to work with challenging clients and tolerate intense affect and suffering in others without interfering with the capacity of empathy. It was also noted that grandiosity within multiplicity does not necessarily preclude empathy as it often does with pervasive narcissism.

Validity

I strongly identified with the subjectivities discussed in this segment and I want to believe that this type of subjectivity will make me a better therapist, an effective wounded healer. I want to be a great listener. I want to work with challenging people, and help them. I might be seeing these participants as having the potential to be great therapists and may be inflating the flawed subjectivities I see in them that because I identify with those subjectivities. As in previous learnings, my co-researchers also identified with these subjectivities suggesting that my personal reactivity did not affect the validity of this learning either.

Conclusion
Learning One showed that experiences of unmet emotional needs in childhood causes shame and often creates grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. The second learning addressed the Research Problem. It was shown that addressing the shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities leads to helpful empowerment that will allow the development of a more integrated multiplicity and reflexive identity. This was accomplished by differentiating and personifying grandiose encapsulated subjectivities and then engaging them in reflective dialogues about their origins. Reflective dialoguing was an effective way to mirror these subjectivities, give them the attention and emotional attunement that allowed fairly easily engagement of the shame that underlies their grandiosity.

The experiences of unmet emotional needs in Learning One were often involved with power and control issues in the participants’ families, which resulted in subjectivities that were either covertly or overtly grandiose. Learning Two shows that working with the grandiose subjectivities by differentiating them, personifying them and dialoguing with them about shame issues was enough to begin to see a shift towards empowerment. In the short time spent with the participants, it was clear that if they continued to work with their subjectivities, a more integrated multiplicity would result.

It was also surmised, that related to these power issues, that grandiose enactments by subjectivities may be the individual trying to find their own power, their authentic specialness, or ultimately their psychological autonomy. Intentionally working with grandiose subjectivities can allow their energy to come forward in a creative way rather than having the energy emerge as a grandiose enactment.
The third learning was an example of the destructive potential of grandiosity. The learning was that the grandiosity of some protective encapsulated subjectivities is an inauthentic form of power that is disempowering and harmful to individuals as a whole. Protection in this case turned out to be intrapsychic colonization. These adaptive subjectivities did protect the dissociated subjectivities but they were also controlling and subjugating. These grandiose subjectivities acting as protectors, were disempowering because they prevented painful affects from surfacing into awareness that kept energy bound by the protected subjectivities from being released that could lead to a more flexible and integrated multiplicity. In children this protection is adaptive, but if individuals are to grow into psychologically mature adults, they must transmute much of their grandiosity. Therapists especially need to explore those areas in themselves to be most effective in their work, in order to help others to do the same.

The final learning was that grandiosity may help novice therapists to work with challenging clients. The grandiosity of some subjectivities allowed these participants to work with challenging clients until they actually realized that they could meet the challenge. An additional aspect of this learning is that novice therapists can sometimes work with challenging clients due to the ability of grandiose subjectivities to help them tolerate strong affect and suffering. This finding related primarily to codependent subjectivities leading people into becoming therapists and grandiose subjectivities allowing individuals to do the work until competency comes with experience and mentoring. This learning also has to do with boundaries. Boundaries allow the novice therapist to mature and must be developed to prevent burnout in experienced therapists.
The cumulative learning that came from this research is that actively personifying, differentiating, mirroring, and dialoguing with grandiose subjectivities can rapidly facilitate empowerment of individuals and begin a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. Intrapsychic colonization of dissociated subjectivities was seen by adaptive subjectivities. The adaptive subjectivities dominated and subjugated the dissociated ones. It was through differentiating, mirroring, and then dialoguing with these subjectivities around shame issues that empowerment started to emerge. Empowerment began to happen as the rigidity of intrapsychic colonization began to loosen. This empowerment was most true in learnings one, two, and four. The protective subjectivities in Learning Three did not rapidly shift; the intrapsychic colonization was just too strong in these individuals. Working with these subjectivities more deeply for a longer period might shift this dynamic.

The data showed that individuals without a grandiose personality style can have subjectivities that embody grandiosity. Grandiose enactments by these subjectivities in essence are behaviors telling therapists where shame is hidden and where psychological work is needed. Covert grandiosity was more common in the participants studied. This finding was related to the finding that overtly grandiose subjectivities tend to be dissociated. Covertly grandiose subjectivities can be as problematic as overtly grandiose ones; both are part of the adaptive identity that tends to interfere with authentic relating and interdependency.

The data from these learnings suggests that personifying and differentiating grandiose subjectivities and dialoguing with them does seem to help to begin a shift from problematic multiplicity to a more integrated multiplicity because it can help reflexivity
to develop around exaggerated claims of importance and the entitled sense of feeling special that is seen in grandiosity. This reflexivity in turn will help individuals to develop more interdependency, psychological autonomy, integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity. These capacities can make individuals better suited to leadership roles, which can have important implications for themselves, their communities, and the broader culture. These implications are discussed in the final chapter.
CHAPTER 5

REFLECTIONS

Introduction

This chapter reflects on what was learned in this research. First, the significance of the learnings is discussed. Mythic and archetypal reflections follow next. The implications of what was learned for me personally, for Imaginal Psychology, Psychology in general, and the broader culture completes the discussion.

Significance of the Learnings

The Research Problem asked when grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that grandiosity covers? The primary research hypothesis was that the opportunity to express grandiosity can help shift problematic multiplicity to integrated multiplicity if done with self-awareness. The cumulative learning that came from this research is that actively personifying, differentiating, mirroring, and dialoguing with grandiose subjectivities can rapidly facilitate empowerment of individuals and begin a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. Each of the following specific learnings contributed to the cumulative learning.

The first learning states that when caregivers are not consistently dependable, childhood shame leads to grandiosity in multiplicity. More specifically, it posits that unmet emotional needs in childhood results in shame and the formation of grandiose
encapsulated subjectivities. The second learning was that addressing the shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities can be empowering by releasing assertive energy in ways that will allow the development of a more integrated multiplicity and reflexive identity. The data in the second learning answered the question asked by the Research Problem and confirmed that the primary research hypothesis was true. It was found that differentiating and personifying grandiose encapsulated subjectivities and engaging them in reflective dialogues about their origins was an effective way to give them enough mirroring to begin to engage the shame that underlies their grandiosity. Grandiose subjectivities point to places where individuals have unhealthy dependency and entitlement issues that conceal shame. Addressing the shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities was empowering for the participants by releasing assertive energy and healing intrapsychic colonization in ways that will allow the development of a more integrated multiplicity and a more reflexive identity. The third learning was that the grandiosity of some protective encapsulated subjectivities is an inauthentic form of power that is disempowering and harmful to individuals as a whole. Some grandiose subjectivities acting as protectors are disempowering by preventing painful affects from surfacing into awareness, a form of intrapsychic colonization, which prevents energy bound by the protected subjectivity from being released that could lead to a more flexible and integrated multiplicity. The final learning was that grandiosity may help novice therapists to work with challenging clients. It was found that the grandiosity of some subjectivities allowed these participants to work with challenging clients until they actually realized that they could meet the challenge. A related finding in this
learning is that novice therapists can sometimes work with challenging clients due to the ability of grandiose subjectivities to help them tolerate strong affect and suffering.

This research explored stories from the participants’ past. All of the grandiose subjectivities worked with in this study came into existence because of failed experiences of emotional need. This data led to the first learning that unmet emotional needs in childhood results in shame and the formation of grandiose encapsulated subjectivities in multiplicity. This pattern was true whether the subjectivities were overtly or covertly grandiose.

Shame was found underlying the grandiosity in problematic multiplicity as was assumed in the primary hypothesis and the Research Problem. It was also found that mirroring the grandiosity of the subjectivities, giving them appropriate attention and emotional attunement, in the process of exploring these stories allowed working with shame underlying the subjectivities in an easy and natural way. Mirroring the encapsulated subjectivities happened at each step during the course of differentiating them, personifying them, and engaging them in reflective dialoguing. Mirroring was probably the most critical aspect of the process that allowed us to work comfortably with the shame underlying grandiosity.

There was not time to extensively work with the shame issues of the participants in two sessions. However, in follow up communications with the participants, there was a positive response from each participant. The positive responses of the participants show that addressing shame that is underlying the grandiosity in problematic multiplicity simply by empathically asking questions related to shame scenes, with appropriate responses, begins a process of moving towards a more reflexive identity and an integrated
multiplicity. The results of briefly addressing the shame related to grandiose subjectivities led to the findings in the second learning.

The second learning was that addressing the shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities can be empowering, by releasing assertive energy in ways that will allow the development of a more reflexive identity and a more integrated multiplicity. Dialoguing around shame issues resulted in a move towards the balancing of power between subjectivities. The subjectivities that were part of the adaptive identity relinquished some power and the dissociated subjectivities were able to come forward with more power and begin to join the adaptive identity of the participants. This more balanced form of power has the potential to result in a more integrated multiplicity and a more reflexive identity.

A more reflexive identity can become self-aware and notice when covertly grandiose adaptive subjectivities take control of behavior resulting in the individual acting with codependence. At this point, the reflexive identity can call on the capacities of the dissociated subjectivities, those that are normally unacceptable to the adaptive identity, to bring more creatively grandiose, potentially powerful energy forward, allowing interdependency to develop interpersonally. The same could be said regarding entitlement. The adaptive subjectivities that tended not to feel entitled can let the more entitled energy come forward, again under the influence of the reflexive identity. The opposite dynamic should also be true, when an adaptive subjectivity is overtly grandiose or too independent, feeling overly entitled or special, a reflexive identity can call upon the dissociated subjectivity to tone down the grandiosity by accessing less entitled and more dependent energies, resulting in healthier entitlement and interdependency.
The data in this learning also suggested that grandiosity manifested under the influence of a grandiose subjectivity is often an individual trying to find their psychological autonomy or authentic power by feeling special. In multiplicity, real autonomy can only be found by accessing a more healthy form of power intrapsychically. Exploring the shame that is underneath grandiosity can begin to heal intrapsychic colonization, the forceful domination and subjugation of dissociated subjectivities by adaptive subjectivities with inauthentic power, and authentic empowerment can result. This intrapsychic empowerment can also lead to a more authentic interpersonal power. The third learning showed marked examples of intrapsychic colonization that was detrimental to the participants.

Stated simply, the third learning was that protective yet grandiose aspects of the psyche can be disempowering. It was found that dominant grandiose subjectivities acting as protectors, actually serve to prevent painful affects from surfacing into awareness. This protection prevents intrapsychic empowerment that was described in learning two that could lead to a more integrated multiplicity. The data in this learning relates to the compulsive need to tell one’s story or to listen to the stories of others as a defense against feeling strong affect. There are probably many other strategies of defense that dominant adaptive subjectivities use as well. The protection provided by these subjectivities actually protects the individual from suffering in the moment but potentially may keep the individual from healing the underlying shame which could help with power issues as shown in learning two. Failing to find this empowerment will most likely lead to more suffering in the future. In this case, subjectivities acting as protectors, are actually preventing integrated multiplicity from developing by their intrapsychic colonization.
The final learning was that grandiosity may help novice therapists to work with challenging clients. The grandiosity of some subjectivities allowed these participants to work with challenging clients until they actually realized that they could meet the challenge. An additional aspect of this learning is that novice therapists can sometimes work with challenging clients due to the ability of grandiose subjectivities to help them tolerate strong affect and suffering. It was also noted that grandiosity within multiplicity does not necessarily preclude empathy as it often does with pervasive narcissism.

It was not expected that feeling special around being able to work with challenging people might facilitate psychological work with them. I thought going into this study that feeling special about being able to work with difficult people would be more likely to lead to novice therapists becoming overwhelmed by working with people that they could not handle. It turned out that the container of therapy, and the broader capacities of the participants helped them to maintain boundaries that kept their grandiose subjectivities from acting out in the therapy room and allowed them to indeed work well with challenging clients.

The cumulative learning of this research is that actively personifying, differentiating, mirroring, and dialoguing with grandiose subjectivities can rapidly facilitate empowerment of individuals and begin a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. This empowerment was seen within the data of three of the learnings. Only in learning three did the adaptive subjectivities maintain their rigid domination and subjugation of the dissociated subjectivities. The cumulative learning was true with both overtly and covertly grandiose subjectivities. The move towards empowerment resulting
from such a brief imaginal intervention suggests that it is definitely worth engaging
grandiose subjectivities in individuals and groups.

**Mythic and Archetypal Reflections**

This section will discuss mythic and archetypal reflections related to the specific learnings from the last chapter as they relate to the topics of multiplicity, shame, grandiosity, and dependency.

The image of Narcissus staring at his reflection in the pond and then in the River Styx, even after his death, focused my exploration towards the narcissistic aspects of multiplicity. There was something in this image about the soul’s persistent necessity for self-reflection that struck a chord in me. This deep necessity for self-reflection was evident in the participants. True self-reflection has to do with meaning making and the desire to transform rather than only looking for mirroring of the false self as seen in narcissism. In this research it was easy to find grandiose subjectivities and the participants were deeply interested in them. The retelling of familiar stories using the voice of their encapsulated subjectivities fascinated the participants.

Grandiosity is an illusory defense against the suffering of shame that can only bolster the false self up to a point. When Narcissus died, a beautiful flower grew at the site of his reflection. Narcissus represents grandiose parts of the self that with persistent self-reflection can transform into something beautiful, an integrated multiplicity, a reflexive identity, and authentic empowerment. The parts of the self that feel inappropriately special are areas of grandiosity in the psyche that may slow maturation, and the development of integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity. This research
showed that accessing the shame underneath grandiosity began this process of
transformation in most of the subjectivities we worked with the exception of the
protective subjectivities in Learning Three. These protective subjectivities blocked the
deep self-reflection and the potential for transformation that was seen in the other
learnings.

It was interesting that the most Narcissus-like subjectivities, the overtly grandiose
ones tended to be dissociated subjectivities. Many people do not like grandiosity in
others, so in the participants and myself, overt grandiosity tended to be shadow material,
seen as dissociated subjectivities. Echo symbolizes many of the nuances of covert
grandiosity that was seen in many of the subjectivities worked with in this research. The
Echoistic energy in the participants was primarily seen as adaptive subjectivities.

Finding empowerment by working with these controlling Echo-like adaptive
subjectivities that were keeping dissociated Narcissus-like subjectivities from coming
forward was one of the major learnings of this study. Narcissus-like subjectivities, while
grandiose, hold tremendous amounts of potential energy if the grandiosity does not
emerge as a grandiose enactment. Moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity
could be considered a form of narcissistic maturation that involves both the Narcissus and
Echo-like parts of ourselves assuming more appropriate amounts of power in the psyche.
If such a shift takes place, the dissociated subjectivities are allowed to contribute more of
their energy and the adaptive subjectivities would be less controlling. This happened in
this study when the controlling Echo-like subjectivities would let some of the energy of
the overtly grandiose Narcissus-like subjectivities come forward. The adaptive identity of
the participants would then loosen somewhat, becoming more reflexive, by letting some
overt grandiosity come forward while maintaining some control so that full blown
grandiosity did not ensue. In this way, due to the collaboration of subjectivities, the
expressed grandiosity became a positive force, rather than a negative one.

The story of the Fall from Genesis, is primarily about a fall from grace and the
resulting shame. Grandiose enactments can lead to a fall from grace and result in feelings
of shame and humiliation. The importance of suffering shame after these enactments is
that shame can lead individuals to look more honestly at who they are, which in turn can
lead to opportunities for broadening and deepening their capacities. Working with both
adaptive and dissociated grandiose encapsulated subjectivities should lessen grandiose
enactments in the future. Individuals will carry these encapsulated subjectivities with
them until they fall again and again, until they transmute the underlying shame with self-
awareness and develop a more integrated multiplicity and reflexive identity.

The other aspect of this story that relates is the longing for paradise that came
after Adam and Eve were cast out of Eden. In a negative sense, this longing has to do
with the desire to regress or go back to more idyllic times or the longing to bypass all of
the hard work and just get to a future paradise. This is the normal state with grandiosity,
including grandiose subjectivities in multiplicity. Paradise represents the idyllic state of
no suffering where everything is optimal. In moments of grandiosity or feeling special,
individuals feel a temporary paradise, avoid the feelings of inferiority and shame; they
avoid the pain of experiencing the I-factor.

The positive aspect of this longing for paradise is that the archetype can be a goal
that stimulates the desire to individuate, mature, and move forward. The image is
positive as long as it is not grandiose or naively optimistic. This was seen in the
participants in this study. They chose to look deeply at their grandiose subjectivities and in doing so, explored the shame underneath them. People can choose to start this inward exploration through self-awareness or be pushed into it as Dorothy was in the *Wizard of Oz* story.

Dorothy’s story started with a dream of a far away idyllic place over the rainbow that would solve her problems, but psychologically the story is about looking inside and engaging images from the psyche. Jung said, “Who looks outside, dreams. Who looks inside awakens.” Dorothy was forced inside, by a bump on the head during the tornado. Shame after a grandiose enactment can do the same thing. Dorothy was forced into a state of self-reflection just as Narcissus was, but once there, she made the most of it.

I first considered the Oz story in relationship to this dissertation when reading a book called *The Wizard of Oz and Other Narcissists* by Eleanor D. Payson. I disagree with her that the Wizard is a narcissist. The Wizard is a better symbol of grandiosity than narcissism; when challenged by Dorothy, the Wizard did not exhibit the defenses of a true narcissist, depression, rage, or denial. When Dorothy realized he was a sham and called him a bad man he replied that he was a good man just a bad wizard. The Wizard then proceeds to try to help her to get home.

I began to look at the Wizard as representing grandiosity, and the other characters as other parts of the self that related to this research. Grandiose subjectivities are not bad parts of us and they are not good wizards either. Overtly grandiose subjectivities are pretending, faking authentic power; they are bad wizards. It is interesting that the Wizard, after he is found out, is unable to help Dorothy. He inadvertently takes off without
Dorothy in the balloon that he cannot control. This image suggests that we cannot easily control grandiose enactments. A grandiose subjectivity ultimately cannot help the individual either, but addressing the underlying shame can.

Individuals have much to gain by embracing their grandiose subjectivities. For this analysis, the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion represent the potential to develop important the psychological capacities of reflexivity, empathy, and the courage to take the next right action. These capacities are important for negotiating initiatory thresholds as Dorothy did in the story. The participants used these capacities in this research when they began to explore their grandiosity.

Just like the Scarecrow, Tin Man, and Lion, who started out feeling inferior and only longing for the above capacities, grandiose subjectivities are places where individuals are suffering from the I-factor. I-factor feelings of inadequacy, inferiority, and insecurity lead individuals to feel, think, and act from places of the false self, an adaptive identity with grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. Coming from the view of a false self, individuals either exaggerate their self worth or devalue it, which makes them hard to be in relationship with. This pattern was seen in the overtly and covertly grandiose subjectivities in this study. The Scarecrow, Tin Man, and Lion had aspects of overt and covert grandiosity. The three eventually found positive capacities that were latent inside them. Grandiose subjectivities point to places where individuals have shame. Working with that shame can lead the way towards developing a more integrated multiplicity and access to more latent capacities. Like the Scarecrow, Tin Man, and Lion, we all have the wisdom, heart, and courage we seek inside of us.
Along the journey, people must use reflexivity, empathy and, courage to confront the subjectivities that try to stop them on the path towards integrated multiplicity. The Wicked Witch represents this powerful self-destructive energy that tries to protect the adaptive identity and stop a reflexive identity from developing. The protective but self-destructive subjectivities in Learning Three had this type of energy. The Wicked Witch is the personification of the adaptive subjectivities that resist a move towards integrated multiplicity. The potential power of split off shadow energy is symbolized by the Witch’s broomstick that Dorothy had to bring to the Wizard as her task.

Obtaining the Witch’s broomstick represents integrating shadow material or owning the responsibility for dissociated parts. This benefit of owning dissociated parts was especially evident in Learning Two. To move towards an integrated multiplicity, individuals must find their dissociated parts. These subjectivities do not need to be destroyed; rather they just need to have some of their grandiosity melted away so that some of their potential energy is released. Fortunately energy like Glinda, the Good Witch is available to help along the way.

Glinda, a bit of a trickster, guided the Oz travelers to find what they needed without telling them exactly what to do. Glinda helped Dorothy and her friends find the Friend. Like Glinda, the Friend does not directly tell people what to do, but by embracing its energy they can find their way home. Similarly, the research design did not tell the participants they must find the shame underneath their grandiosity and work with it, this unfolded naturally by exploring their stories. It could be said that the Friend facilitated the move towards empowerment in this study because the capacities of the Mother,
Father, and Peer were built into the research design. These capacities combined to create the compassionate objectivity and authentic power of the Friend in this research.

Covertly grandiose subjectivities are those aspect of psyche that tend not to be powerful interpersonally because they may codependently avoid or withdraw from conflict like the Scarecrow. Covertly grandiose subjectivities make individuals need others to fill out their sense of self. This was the pattern seen most commonly in the adaptive subjectivities in the research participants. A reflexive identity can facilitate the relinquishing of some of the power that covertly grandiose subjectivities do wield intrapsychically as was seen in this research. These covertly grandiose subjectivities can give up controlling, avoidant, and withdrawing behaviors. An individual’s overtly grandiose subjectivities may hold some energy with which individuals can meet these avoidant and withdrawing places inside which will help them interpersonally as well.

An individual’s overtly grandiose parts, like the blustery Cowardly Lion, have more obvious energy than their covertly grandiose counterparts. Individuals must recognize that these parts are often the ones that the adaptive identity finds unacceptable. By finding and embracing dissociated subjectivities, individuals may gain access to energies inside that are necessary to find their authentic power, their psychological autonomy, and their leadership capacities. Once the Oz travelers retrieved the broomstick from the Wicked Witch they were able to access their own inherent empowerment without any magic from the Wizard; the grandiosity in the system had been met. With the help of the Friend, all grandiose subjectivities can be worked with to help foster empowerment.
Omer has said the best way to find the Friend is to be a friend. When one actively seeks to support others by providing, mother, father, and peer energy, it helps them to find the same. Dorothy did this in the story. Each character had times of strength and times of weakness, but together in collaboration, they succeeded. Dorothy found her inherent capacities symbolized by the Lion, Tin Man, and Scarecrow, and then found her way home to the authentic empowerment of integrated multiplicity. She did this by finding the Friend, confronting the shadow, and exposing the grandiose Wizard. She became a leader within the context of her own multiplicity. The lesson of the Wizard of Oz is that all individuals can get home to an integrated multiplicity. This research points to how that can be done; find an individual’s grandiose subjectivities, including the dissociated ones, explore the shame underneath them and then begin to transform their grandiosity which will facilitate empowerment.

The main theme of the Wizard of Oz is the maturation of the naïve Dorothy through her ordeals. Pan is the Greek god that deals with naiveté. Pan sexually ravished nymphs, which symbolizes that the maturation out of our naiveté is often forced upon us. We are all forced to mature by the trials of life, if we accept these initiatory experiences with self-awareness. Some other images from Greek mythology also pertain to these reflections. Proteus has been called the god of shape shifting and multiplicity, but I would say Hermes is the true god of multiplicity. Hermes, as the trickster, the god of the roads, and ruler of the borderlines of the psyche, is the god of psychic movement and connection. Hermes is present at each initiatory threshold. The empowerment found in this dissertation, the balancing of power between Echo and Narcissus is a hermaphroditic psychic move, related to the blending of energies from Hermes and
Aphrodite, a conflict of opposites that can lead to new awareness. Hermes connects our various encapsulated subjectivities and as the trickster, pushes us into grandiose enactments that initiate our actions that lead to a fall and to shame. The fall is a Dionysian event, involving madness, symbolic death, and psychic rebirth.

Hermes’ son Priapus has an unrelenting erect phallus that is the reminder that grandiosity will persist despite repetitive calls to redeem it and transmute it into more positive capacities. All individuals have some inferiority and therefore grandiosity, no matter how much psychological work they do. We all carry some Hephaestus energy with us; Hephaestus with his flawed body and creativity is the most human of the Greek gods.

Implications of the Study

Personal Implications

The first layer of implications of these learnings is related to what I learned about myself. The second layer relates to Imaginal Psychology and multiplicity. The last implication is how I imagine the findings will be useful to therapists in the future.

This work has put multiplicity, grandiosity, and shame in the center of my personal psychological work. The first thing I learned about myself in the process of writing this dissertation is that I tend to get stuck in the choices and possibilities inherent in multiplicity and then slide back into the norm of my adaptive identity. Having no center, no I that leads, can be the trap of multiplicity. My nice and accommodating parts often control my thoughts, feelings, and behaviors without much leadership from me. I have known about these subjectivities for years, but learned about their opposites in the
process of writing this dissertation. These nice and accommodating parts generally serve me well but these parts do create problems for me. I have had trouble finding the places inside that do not care what others think of me, especially when I have had to be assertive and set boundaries. These aspects of my personality can be personified as dissociated subjectivities that are the opposite of the nice and adaptive aspects. This relative inability to set boundaries has led to periods of resentment and even burnout in my personal life and at work. I fall into the category of health workers that have a special relationship with their work, as mentioned in the Learnings Chapter.

These issues around lack of boundaries and assertiveness bring out the importance of working with dissociated subjectivities. I have not done as much work with these subjectivities as I feel I need to do. In my own multiplicity work, I was hoping to find an overtly grandiose, powerful but basically likable part like the Albert Finney character in the film or the one that Susan found in the research. What I found was not like this at all; I found a mean counter-dependent part of my self. This subjectivity is very dissociated. I am not often mean, although when I am, it is often when I have been too nice and accommodating for too long. Unlike Mike’s Authoritarian, this part of me does not take charge with overt anger and order people around. This subjectivity operates covertly, sniping at people, becoming very irritable, withdrawing, withholding affection, and being very cold. This subjectivity withdraws specifically to hurt another person, usually my wife. I feel victimized and hateful when this subjectivity takes over. This part of me feels very young and keeps me from being accountable for my role in the situation that led to this subjectivity coming forward. I am also guilty of longing for amae in this situation,
the desire to be loved and accepted no matter what I have done. This is clearly an example of regression.

The mean counter-dependent subjectivity is emotionally destructive and very irrational. I have trouble controlling it when it comes. The mean counter-dependent part does not care what others think of me. Caring less about what people think of me is an attitude that I need to bring forward more. I need to work more deeply with this part so that some of its power can come out as assertiveness to protect the nice guy and the accommodating/codependent subjectivities before they get pushed so far that I act out in such an emotionally destructive manner. Perhaps by working with it, I can find more Albert Finney like energy and find some benefits like Susan did.

I especially did not like finding the Grandiose Boy, but working with that subjectivity is critical for me to continue to grow. If I feel vulnerable around someone else’s suffering, the Grandiose Boy is liable to come out. I first accessed the Grandiose Boy, after feedback from my committee in which I expressed excitement about finding that there was shame underlying grandiosity in my participants. My committee suggested that I explore the aspect of me that was able to feel excitement and even joy as I was listening to stories of shame and suffering. The Grandiose Boy is a dissociated subjectivity and he is part of why I can tolerate intense suffering in others, similar to Katie’s subjectivity. At his worst, it even allows me to enjoy suffering in others when I am feeling alienated from them. The problem is that this subjectivity represents a counter-dependent aspect of me that keeps me from getting close to people when I am activated by their suffering. It causes me to dissociate when I really care about someone and they are at their most vulnerable. Getting to know this subjectivity better is critical.
for me in my personal and professional lives. I need to access dependency and entitlement in a more healthy way. Right now, I spend too much time in the codependent Nice Guy/Accommodating mode or in a mildly dissociated counter-dependent mode that is related to the Grandiose Boy when it is not angry. By exploring the shame surrounding the Grandiose Boy and nurturing this counter-dependent subjectivity, I feel that I will be able bring forth healthier forms of entitlement and interdependency.

I found it very easy to relate to the grandiose subjectivities that came up in this research. Seeing those aspects of myself, I am able to access empathy. This is similar to the storytelling Attention-getter from the participant Karen. My subjectivity, like hers, can use similarities in others to find empathy, but I must be careful to not shift the interaction towards me, and allow it to be about the person I am listening to.

I have also found that I have a subjectivity that assumes that if I have a specific subjectivity, others do too. This is a grandiose subjectivity that is related to the desire to be liked. I will tend to see similar energy in them even if they do not have it in a prominent way. An example of this assuming on my part was evident in my choice of the Helen Hunt film clip. In the film clip she is clearly clumsy and somewhat harsh in setting boundaries, but feeling special about her relationship with the Jack Nicholson character is not really evident in this clip. In my interpretation and use of the clip, I would have felt special in that situation, so I projected the energy of feeling special onto the character. The clip was effective in the research only after my explanation of what I was trying to evoke, feeling special around being able to work with challenging people. My projections onto this film character show that I am too quick to imagine my patterns in
others. I have learned that I have to be careful with this subjectivity because it can minimize the suffering in others by assuming that their subjectivities are just like mine.

Perhaps assuming others have subjectivities just like mine is related to a problematic mix of pervasive pluralism mixed with low-grade narcissism that is seen in many members of the Baby Boom generation as noted by Wilber. Wilber likens this phenomenon to a lack of verticality where differences are all tolerated and not judged by members of the Baby Boom generation. Tolerance and acceptance are good things but in radical pluralism, there is no verticality; no one person, idea, political system is better or more deserving than any other. On a basic human level this is true, all individuals are “created equal,” but we all have strengths and weaknesses and without verticality, there can be no leadership. In multiplicity, there must be leadership, as in the culture. The I that leads, must lead in psyche just as leaders must lead in the culture. I must be careful in my eagerness to be liked and watch the tendency to finding similarities in the encapsulated subjectivities in my self and others. All encapsulated subjectivities may deserve to be seen and heard but they are not equal. Verticality in multiplicity must exist.

With the help of compassionate objectivity, the Friend, the individual must work with those encapsulated subjectivities that facilitate capacities of leadership without denying that others exist. The energies in those other subjectivities must be recognized and utilized when appropriate and necessary.

**Implications for Imaginal Psychology and the Work of Multiplicity**

This work has contributed to Imaginal Psychology in several ways. First the concepts of integrated multiplicity, problematic multiplicity, adaptive subjectivities,
dissociated subjectivities, and intrapsychic colonization were delineated. These are useful in working with multiplicity and add to the literature dealing with multiplicity. Each should make the concepts in the field of multiplicity more accessible and understandable. Problematic multiplicity is especially useful because it differentiates between normal or integrated multiplicity and the more pathological states of multiplicity seen in the dissociative disorders. Intrapsychic colonization is a new concept introduced in this dissertation.

Intrapsychic colonization conceptualizes power issues within all levels of pathological multiplicity. It is useful in describing dynamics between encapsulated subjective states in Dissociative Identity Disorder and problematic multiplicity. It is easy to conceptualize that gatekeepers in Imaginal Psychology are essentially shaming encapsulated grandiose subjectivities that are engaging in intrapsychic colonization. It is also easy to imagine that in intrapsychic colonization, self-destructive grandiose encapsulated subjectivities as seen in the third learning, could get extreme and become demonic as in Kalshced’s model. The Persecutor/Protector archetype in his work is essentially engaging in intrapsychic colonization. Following his ideas, with early and prolonged trauma, intrapsychic colonization can become demonic. It could also be said that many cases of suicide are examples of extreme intrapsychic colonization.

The next contribution of this dissertation to Imaginal Psychology is the linking of shame with a failure of the imagination and fixed images. These phrases are primarily linked with trauma in the literature. Shame is a large enough phenomenon to be considered on its own in relationship to imagination and images, not just a subset of trauma because feeling shame is traumatic. Along these lines, this research showed that
grandiose subjectivities can be autonomous and harmful to the individual by intrapsychic colonization. Because of this, shame may result in triggering the archetypal defense of the personal spirit or core identity much as trauma does. This dissertation expands on Kalsched’s model by giving shame an important place in the etiology of the archetypal defense system of the psyche.

Grandiose enactments are part of group psychological life. Sometimes grandiose enactments negatively impact groups by individuals monopolizing time, taking over the role of leader, or projecting their psychic contents onto the leader. Addressing shame that underlies grandiosity in group work before grandiose enactments occur, could be a positive influence of this research. Encouraging group participants to actively look for grandiose subjectivities and working with underlying shame should facilitate this. It may also be helpful for participants to name their encapsulated subjectivities. In this research, naming encapsulated subjectivities also seemed to facilitate the differentiation of them, which helped in conversing with them and attending to their shame issues.

In individuals, this dissertation showed that grandiosity has the potential to be transmuted into appropriate entitlement and interdependency leading to empowerment. The research proved that appropriate collaboration between encapsulated subjectivities can help to heal intrapsychic colonization and lead to the development of a more appropriate intrapsychic power structure. This internal power shift is important because it has the potential to help individuals to become more authentically powerful interpersonally.

**Psychotherapeutic Implications**
This dissertation has the potential to bring shame, multiplicity, dependency, and grandiosity more into the center of psychology in general. Specifically it redeems grandiosity, which is so widely help to be a strictly negative phenomenon associated with narcissism. The learnings connect grandiosity with potential empowerment.

Working directly with multiplicity using grandiosity as a marker to help find shame in clients as I have discussed, is not easy, so it may be only appropriate for highly functioning and stable clients. For individuals that are not yet able to speak directly as their subjectivities, using language that simply explains multiplicity and problematic parts should work to help them find shame underlying grandiosity without them having actually speak as their subjectivities. This use of language makes the findings of this dissertation accessible to most therapy clients.

The link between shame and multiplicity is implied in the psychological literature but rarely clearly stated. This dissertation adds to the literature linking the two concepts. Shame and Affect Theory in general are important contributions, which are already used in Imaginal Transformation Praxis. This dissertation has the potential to connect shame and Affect Theory more directly with the established ways of working with multiplicity, like Internal Family System Therapy, Voice Dialogue, and Ego-State Therapy.

In an age where mainstream psychology is dominated by the cognitive/behavioral point of view, this dissertation does some bridging between depth psychology and the mainstream. Internal Family Systems therapy is doing this already, by bringing a way to work with multiplicity to the general psychological practitioner.\textsuperscript{de} This dissertation shows that grandiosity and shame can be important in IFS therapy.
Another specific contribution this research might make to psychology in general is that working with grandiosity and shame within the context of multiplicity can prevent negative transference. Much as members in a group or subjectivities in the psyche can project onto or even emotionally attack a group leader or the I that leads, a client can grandiosely attack a therapist. This grandiose attack can be a positive phenomenon if worked through in therapy. This potential will not be met if a client quits therapy because of the negative transference reaction. Addressing grandiosity before enactments of negative transference might keep individuals in therapy and help clients reach a reflexive identity more quickly.

**Implications for the Culture**

The most obvious cultural relevance of this research is that if individuals work with their grandiosity and shame, they can develop more authentic power individually, which may result in them being a more positive influence on their communities and the broader culture as leaders. There is a deeper level of cultural relevance however that begins with the concept that the current culture in the West is quite narcissistic. In a narcissistic culture there is plenty of grandiosity that can be addressed individually and culturally.

The principle of the cultural complex allows the relevance of the research to be discussed at the cultural level. Individual complexes have been likened to encapsulated subjectivities, or groups of encapsulated subjectivities. Using a similar comparison it follows that the cultural complexes are similar to encapsulated subjectivities that operate at the cultural level, influenced by both the personal and archetypal energies of the
psyche. It follows also that there are grandiose cultural complexes, just as there are
grandiose encapsulated subjectivities. Addressing group shame that underlies grandiose
cultural complexes may prove to be important in the current troubled times.

There are many examples of cultural grandiosity in the West in general and the
United States in particular. Grandiosity is evident in the exportation of capitalist and
democratic ideals. The U.S. assumes that other areas of the world want the same kind of
freedoms and lifestyles that individuals here have. This assumption is naïve and neither
the public nor the politicians seem to connect cultural grandiosity with the current
political problems that plague the United States.

As this section is being written, the United States is still involved with Iraq war.
The Bush administration, enacting cultural grandiosity, assumed that the fall of Saddam
Hussein would result in a stable, friendly, unified, and democratic Iraq. In its grandiosity,
the United States thought it could use force to topple an evil regime, stabilize a country
that has deep cultural divides, and have the Iraqi people rapidly accept its democratic way
of life that would stabilize the Middle East. None of this has come to pass although the
situation is more stable now.

In 2002 Mark Danner, predicting that the plan to invade Iraq would fail, called the
invasion plan grandiose.\textsuperscript{dclxxxvi} It is easy to call Mr. Bush and his administration
grandiose without seeing the grandiosity that exists in the culture and the individuals in
the culture. Psychologically it must be asked how much of this dynamic was a grandiose
cultural complex at work in the culture at large, in the congress, and the entire
administration? If the invasion was a grandiose enactment of a cultural complex,
individuals must ask themselves what grandiosity lives in each of them that is being
enacted on the cultural level. Questions like this reflect the cultural applicability of this research.

Both Hillman and López-Pedraza discuss how current Western culture may be moving from narcissism to titanism. Hillman relates titanism to the monotheistic focus on the Self, which he feels is more serious than narcissism. The Titans represent the excess, chaos, unboundedness, and feelings of emptiness that come out of a psyche that is not freely forming well differentiated images. Without fluid images, an individual has feelings of emptiness and less opportunity for reflection. In extreme, the Titans also represent barbarism and unlawlessness.

The effect of shame and trauma causing fixed images in the individual has been covered earlier. Singer has made the connection between Kalsched’s ideas on the archetypal defense of the personal spirit and the archetypal defense of the cultural spirit in cultural trauma. The results of this dissertation have linked shame with the archetypal defense of the personal spirit. It follows that culturally, both trauma and shame can lead to the formation of rigid cultural complexes. The West seems to be caught in an age of excess and heading towards more chaos, from narcissism to titanism. This move can be seen in the microcosm of the war in Iraq, which the United States started.

In its cultural grandiosity the United States toppled Saddam Hussein with force ushering in an age of titanism in Iraq. All of the factions in Iraq, the Shia, the Sunni, and the foreign insurgents like al-Qaeda, are monotheistic in their religion, but more importantly to this study, these factions are monotheistic in their psychic cultural complexes. The grandiosity of the United States with its own fixed images has inflamed the fixed images of radical Islamic factions and resulted in titanism. The outer result is
chaos, unlawlessness, and unboundedness that would most likely devolve into a major
civil war without American military presence.\textsuperscript{dcxii}

Had the United States been more aware of its grandiose cultural complexes and
the cultural shame that they cover, perhaps they could have avoided triggering the
grandiose cultural complexes of the groups in Iraq. The result is that the United States is
now deeply involved in the war in Iraq and is less able to put its resources directly
towards improving diplomatic relations with the entire Muslim world and fighting
terrorism.\textsuperscript{dcxiii}

Things in Iraq are calming down recently but the area is still volatile. With the
election of Barrack Obama there is much hope for the future. It would be wise for U.S.
citizens to be aware of our cultural grandiosity at this critical time. As much as Obama
may be an authentic leader, many are projecting a huge amount of hope and expectation
on to him. We would be wise to remember that idealizing Obama culturally is much like
a dependent child idealizing a parent in Kohut’s model of the Self, a very narcissistic
place. If we, in our cultural grandiosity, idealize Obama too much we can easily flip to
Kohut’s other narcissistic pole and attack him.\textsuperscript{dcxiv} We could culturally enact our
grandiosity much the way an individual with Borderline Personality Disorder might,
switching from idealizing to attacking. Perhaps cultural borderline behavior is just a part
of the narcissistic culture, but it could be a step that leads to more titanism as Hillman and
López-Pedraza have warned us about.

Cultural awareness begins with individual awareness. Imaginal Psychologists,
with a focus on the personal, archetypal, and cultural aspects of experience can help to
find grandiosity in clients and themselves. Finding grandiosity and working with it allows
the exploration of underlying shame, which can begin to bring out integrated multiplicity, deepen capacities, psychological autonomy, and authentic power. These qualities are necessary for the leadership to emerge to bring a broader awareness to cultural grandiosity. Awareness of cultural grandiosity will allow an exploration of deeper cultural shame. Only then can individuals begin to shift the collective cultural power from force to authentic power. Perhaps in Iraq and elsewhere around the globe this would mean less military force and more diplomatic interventions.

The cultural center has been defined by Omer as the prevailing cultural norms, values, and practices, which are conventional and static in steady-state times. At these times “the periphery is marginalized and remains disenfranchised, disempowered, and often scapegoated.” Omer has discussed the idea that the cultural center of modernity has collapsed, citing the planet’s ecological crisis as a call for global cultural transformation. The United States’ excessive use of the earth’s resources compared to our population size is another example of cultural entitlement and grandiosity. This cultural grandiosity is especially important considering the possibility that dependence on fossil fuels may be enhancing global warming past the point of no return.

Because the cultural center of modernity has collapsed, the norms, values, and practices that we are used to have lost some of their credibility and legitimacy. The unsteady relationship between the periphery and center in the global culture brings peril as well as opportunity. The peril is that the West might continue down the path of global ecological unsustainability and economic and military oppressiveness. This might result in more global titanism. This pattern may already be happening as reflected by increases in stateless terrorism, and a more open hostility towards the U.S. by legitimate
governments around the world. The opportunity of the current non-steady state between the periphery and the center is that during times like this, the center is much more responsive to the different and unknown aspects of the periphery. A visionary black man would probably not have been elected president of the United States had the center not collapsed somewhat. A case could also be made that a woman, Hillary Clinton would never had come so close to the nomination either, had the center not been in flux.

With appropriate cultural leadership, individuals, and groups around the world can create a “ ‘spacious center’ in which the creative potentials of diversity, conflict, and chaos can be actualized.” This spacious center is the opposite of titanism. Recognizing the grandiosity that exists individually and culturally is one way to make therapists more effective cultural leaders. Omer says, “Cultural leaders are able to transmute how they are personally affected by the culture into creative action that midwives the future.”

Imaginal Psychologists can help a better future to be born. They can work towards transmuting their own grandiosity and help their clients to do the same. Imaginal Psychologists can also begin to recognize cultural grandiose complexes and develop creative ways to meet this grandiosity. Omer suggests meeting the outmoded aspects of the cultural center with creative transgression. Creative transgression involves principled and imaginative actions, and conscious sacrifice. To meet and transmute the center, a cultural leader must use creative ritual. Creative ritual allows cultural trauma to be healed by ritualizing cultural shame and activating cultural memory. Cultural memory is necessary to remember collective forgetting that cultural trauma causes.
Perhaps cultural grandiosity and cultural shame should also be addressed with creative ritualizing. Cultural creative ritualizing builds ritual trust on a cultural level that will allow a collaborative inquiry into possibilities of creating and solving the problems that face all individuals in the new world order, both politically and in the global ecology. Omer states that “Creative ritual, along with the ritual trust that it engenders, facilitates collaborative inquiry into our past, present, and future.”

Conclusion

In this research, individual grandiosity was met by working with personified subjective grandiose states in a creative ritual container. This research showed that authentic empowerment could result from addressing individual grandiosity. Working through the shame associated with grandiosity can allow the expression of creativity by bringing the energy of dissociated subjectivities forward allowing an individual to think, feel, and behave outside the bounds of their adaptive identity.

Grandiosity is not such a bad thing because it shows us where shame is hidden. Grandiosity as a symptom of the soul, reflected by fixed images and problematic behavior, can tell therapists where work with shame needs to be done to develop a more integrated multiplicity. A more integrated multiplicity will help therapists and their clients lessen the internal conflicts of problematic multiplicity and help them in interpersonal relationships as well.

The capacities that emerge with integrated multiplicity lead to a more reflexive identity, which can also help those that work with their personal grandiosity to recognize and address cultural grandiosity as well. Meeting cultural grandiosity begins by working with culturally related grandiose subjectivities in individuals. Beyond this individual
work, working with individuals in a group setting will help members of a group become aware of the cultural grandiosity that lives in their group.

As psychotherapists, turning towards our own grandiosity and helping our clients to do the same thing individually and in groups may be one important first step towards the development of a more congenial, convivial, and sustainable global culture. I can imagine the empowerment and reflexivity that comes from working with grandiose subjectivities rippling outwards through communities, states, nations, and finally to the global community helping to create a new spacious center culturally. Perhaps there is some grandiosity in this dream, but as this research found, sometimes a little grandiosity can help creativity to emerge.

As awareness of grandiosity is raised, more cultural leaders may arise that can shift dynamics on a broader level. Past political leaders have sometimes acted out of cultural grandiosity that does not look at policy on a global level. Perhaps President Obama will be different, but he will need the help of many cultural leaders. With true empowerment, rather than acting out of cultural grandiosity, the United States can potentially muster the capacities necessary to creatively ritualize and collaborate with other nations around the globe. Creative ritualization that leads to collaboration is the best way to create a spacious center in the postmodern global culture. Individually, culturally, and globally, if we do not learn to collaborate effectively, find the Friend, we are in peril socially, ecologically, and economically.

Grandiosity is generally considered a negative phenomenon. Looking for grandiosity is a good place to start the process of collaboration individually and culturally because grandiosity can lead us towards shame awareness. Generally, working with
shame can transmute it into dignity. This dissertation showed that working with shame bound encapsulated subjectivities has the potential to transmute grandiosity into healthy entitlement, interdependency, integrated multiplicity, and a more reflexive identity. Grandiosity will perhaps be somewhat redeemed when we see its potential to help authentically empower people individually and in groups. The exploration of grandiosity may even help to create a more spacious center in our postmodern culture. These are some of the important challenges of multiplicity.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX 1

ETHICS APPLICATION

1. Participant Population

Participants must be adults that have been actively exploring their multiplicity. Participants should be somewhat psychologically aware in that they must be willing to work with their multiplicity, grandiosity and shame but not too psychologically sophisticated. Too much psychological sophistication and education about inflation and narcissism might interfere with the data collection. Seven to eight individuals that are not therapists that have been trained in Alchemical Hypnotherapy and Voice Dialogue will be recruited. These are systems in which students are trained to work with encapsulated subjectivities in themselves and others but are not (yet) therapists. Two to three students from Meridian University that have finished the first year will also be included. This will increase the direct applicability of the data to Meridian University. Students who have just finished the first year should fit the criteria. A final total of eight to ten participants will be used. If sufficient numbers of participants are not found in these three groups, referral of psychotherapy clients from therapists that work with multiplicity will be considered. Both genders should be represented. Diversity will be encouraged as far as race and socio-economic status to broaden the applicability of the data.

Individuals with DID will not be included in this study because alters tend to have a strong narcissistic investment in separateness. Alter personalities in DID, because of this narcissistic investment in separateness, stronger dissociation, and more overt control
over the individual’s behavior, have grandiose enactments before entering therapy or group work, as well as during them. The dynamic that is seen in problematic multiplicity seems to be different than is seen in DID. Although it would make sense that encapsulated subjectivities are also narcissistic and also have an investment in separateness, in problematic multiplicity, the grandiose enactments tend to happen after entering group work or therapy. Grandiose enactments seem to be one of the results of the exploration of multiplicity. Grandiose enactments are seen when encapsulated subjectivities are personified, given attention, and the chance to speak in Transformative practices. In DID the alters already have much more autonomy than this and they use it to control the individuals behavior. Another important consideration in not including individuals with DID in this research is that it may be too risky for them.

The participants need be sufficiently stable so that the exploration of a grandiose subjectivity will not trigger a grandiose enactment. Any obvious signs of instability or personality disorders will exclude participants. Signs of grandiosity or narcissism will not exclude participants. The prospect of participating in research may in itself elicit the type of grandiose subjectivity that the study is interested in. This research is aimed at looking at grandiose enactments in individuals that are primarily not narcissistic. However, if the primary character style of the individuals turns out to be narcissistic, the researcher will have the option to look for covertly narcissistic subjectivities, and explore how they impact the individual’s experience and behavior.

Any participants with a classic heavily shame-based syndrome like substance abuse or victims of serious sexual, emotional, or physical abuse will be excluded. The
goal here is to exclude individuals with Dissociative disorders. This dissertation is most interested in problematic multiplicity that is associated with shame, not trauma.

The process will begin with a written description of the study being sent to David Quigley of The Alchemy Institute of Healing Arts and Drs. Hal and Sidra Stone of the Voice Dialogue system, asking for help recruiting participants. A flyer describing the study will be included for posting at their facilities. A request will be made for mailing lists of prospective participants so that they can be mailed a flyer by the researcher.

2. Procedures Involving Research Participants

The process of contact with prospective participants will start with mailing them a flyer. The flyer will be professional, much like a therapist would receive for a continuing education seminar. This flyer and scripts for all procedures involving research participants are in the next sections, (Appendices 5 and 9).

Prospective participants will be able to contact the researcher by email or phone for further information. Respondents will be mailed a statement describing the study, a questionnaire for screening purposes, and a confidentiality statement with a self addressed stamped envelope.

In the statement describing the study, the topic of problematic multiplicity will be shared with them as will the interest in how strong affect creates the encapsulation of parts. They will be told that the research will explore the entitled nature of some parts, but this information and the research protocol will not use the terms grandiosity, inflation, or narcissism. The information will include that the methodology will use movie clips, written and spoken reflective dialogues to get to know one or two of their
parts. The participants will find out they will work briefly with these parts to give them a voice which may begin to get them into better relationship to their egos and other parts, beginning a process moving towards a more integrated multiplicity. They will be notified that audio taping will be used to collect data.

Respondents to the written questionnaire will be contacted by phone and further screened with a verbal questionnaire. Those selected and not selected will be notified by mail.

Evoking the experience of a grandiose part will be crucial to this study. The researcher will facilitate the personification and differentiation of a grandiose psychic subjectivity into imaginal figures that can be worked with in a one-on-one meeting with the participant. The underlying assumption will be that the most problematic part that they have already encountered before the study will have issues of unhealthy entitlement and grandiosity. The task will be uncovering it. The researcher will begin the process by asking them to go inside and imagine an image of the most problematic part they have come across during the exploration of their multiplicity. The individuals will then be asked to keep these in mind while watching the movie clips that will be shown next. To begin to explore the types of grandiosity that their parts might be involved with, the researcher will show movie clips that depict grandiose behavior.

There will be clips from four movies used. The characters in these film clips have personality disorders or character styles that will show the major themes seen in grandiosity. Films that depict grandiosity in both men and women will be used. The researcher will have the participants focus attention on the main characters; most of them reflect overt narcissism and grandiosity. The other main characters reflect the style that
has been called inverted or covert narcissism. This covert or inverted style could also be called covert or inverted grandiosity in that they have a gap between the image of the self and the real qualities of the self, just like overt narcissism. Along a similar line of thought, overt and covert entitlement has also been identified in therapy clients. The covert or inverted styles represent Echo like characteristics as opposed to Narcissus like attributes as reflected in the Narcissus and Echo myth.

In this research we will be looking for similar traits in encapsulated subjectivities. These Echo-like subjectivities may be less likely than overtly grandiose subjectivities to lead people to act out and leave groups or individual therapy, but their repressed grandiose subjectivities may erupt during work with multiplicity as well. Any participants that resonate with a covertly narcissistic character will be questioned to see if they have any awareness of a grandiose part, the other pole of the dynamic.

The first movie, *Once Around*, depicts a classically inflated grandiose character that goes through life very successfully in the outside world as a leader in a sales company, but creates havoc in his personal relationships with his wife and her family. He is outgoing, exhibitionistic, self-centered, usually lacks empathy for others, has infantile omnipotency, but is generally good-natured. The wife has mild dependency issues, some overt entitlement and mainly chooses to put up with him because of his good points. She feels entitled to the good things in life he can provide her with. Emotionally, he is fun some of the time, and in the material world, he is very rich. He is overtly entitled and she is primarily covertly entitled. An interesting image is seen at the beginning of the clip where the woman twice gazes unseen at him, with curiosity and admiration, much like Echo does with Narcissus in the mythic narrative. This is the beginning of a great deal of
idealizing of him, which she shows throughout much of the film. This reflects the opposite of the grandiose pole of Kohut’s bipolar self, the idealizing self.

The second film, *Sunset Boulevard*, takes place in the 1950’s. It depicts a silent film star that is struggling emotionally with her fall from the spotlight decades after the movie industry has left her behind. She hires a financially strapped scriptwriter to rewrite a screenplay that she has penned to resurrect her career. A short clip, showing examples of her sense of entitlement and his dependence will be shown. She is controlling, lacks empathy, and has infantile omnipotency. Another short clip depicting her threatening to reattempt suicide will be described to the participants. This is a very grandiose enactment and reflects another aspect of narcissism, depression or narcissistic collapse.

The next film, *Independence Day*, depicts a similar polarity between characters as the first two movies, with some additional aspects of grandiose behavior. In this movie, the male character is outgoing, exhibitionistic, self-centered, and angry, lacks empathy for others, and has infantile omnipotency in relationship to his wife and her family. His wife holds the other pole, a dependent character that shows the traits of covert entitlement. She is diffusely vulnerable, modest, self-denying, depressed, empty feeling, and in some ways also lacking empathy. She does not have much energy left to give to others. In her, the opposite of infantile omnipotency can be seen, severe dependency. The man in this clip shows the aspect of narcissism that is not seen in the other characters, narcissistic rage.

The final movie, *To Die For*, will depict a grandiose and entitled female character named Suzanne that is totally obsessed with her image and her ambition to become a television star. She is not concerned about what others will think of her, she is fixated on
how she visually appears. Suzanne is obsessed with her desire to become a television star as a platform from which to be seen. She is a modern day Narcissus, gazing into the camera and fixated on her image on the television screen. She has marked entitlement issues, lacks empathy and definitely has infantile omnipotency.

These film clips should be very powerful and evocative. The intention will be to evoke an experience of a subjectivity that can be grandiose, not to precipitate a grandiose enactment. These subjectivities will probably have had a history of grandiose enactments but the research will focus on the grandiose nature of the subjectivities, either covert or overt, and how addressing the shame that underlies the grandiosity can begin a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. The assumption here is that noting grandiosity and then actively working with the shame underneath it may lessen grandiose enactments. It is known that alienation of the ego, by some sort of wounding is necessary for an inflated ego to mature. The goal in working with the shame underlying grandiosity is to lessen the severity of the enactments and the pain of the fall without impeding maturation. It is important to lessen the severity of these enactments because it is these enactments that can lead to problems in groups and negative countertransference in individual therapy. These subjectivities can even cause people to leave groups or quit individual therapy. Quitting may result if these individuals focus on their wounding, rather than persisting in their therapeutic work to understand and integrate the shame that underlies their grandiosity. Persistence allows the opportunity for them to move through the inflation, the wounding, and the shame to get to the maturity on the other side.

After playing each movie clip, the researcher will interview the participants to see if their most problematic subjectivity has qualities like those enacted by the movie
characters. If they do not, they will be asked if they have any other parts that the clip reminds them of, and this subjectivity will be worked with. This will be an opportunity for them to express their experience.

After seeing all the movie clips, the participants will be asked to have a short, three to five minute, written reflective dialogue with their most entitled subjectivity. This may or may not be the one that the thought of earlier. They will be asked to concentrate on issues around entitlement and whether this part is problematic just to them or to other people as well. This subjectivity might be overtly grandiose or covertly grandiose. The participant will then share their writing with the researcher.

Next, the researcher will interview the participants about the subjectivity that have come out in the written reflective dialogues looking for additional signs of grandiosity. Included in this exploration, the researcher will look for signs of infantile omnipotence, depression, anger, inferiority, unhealthy dependency, shame-affect binds, and shame scenes. If grandiosity has been identified, shame issues will be explored with questions about the core areas of shame, competency, relationships, personal power, body image and identity. The researcher will specifically look for shame based identity scripts, shame based governing scenes, and shame-affect binds. Finally the participants will be asked to share their reactions and reflections to the day’s work.

During the second day of data gathering, the emphasis will shift to direct interaction of the researcher with the grandiose subjectivity. The final intentional evocative experience of this research will be a reflective dialogue with the subjectivity identified on the first day.
The researcher will ask questions of the subjectivity in reflective dialogue, looking for grandiosity, exploring any grandiose enactments from its past and looking for underlying shame issues. These questions will be based on what the researcher has learned about the individual and the subjectivity on day one. During the reflective dialoguing, the researcher will work with the subjectivities in a supportive way, giving them voice, especially around issues related to shame. The goal here is to begin to bring the subjectivity and adaptive identity into a more mature relationship. Healing shame issues is beyond the scope of this study.

Next, the participant will verbally share their reactions to and reflections about the reflective dialogue. The participant will then be led in a guided imagery session welcoming their encapsulated subjectivity into the community of soul. Finally, the participants will have the opportunity to share their reflections and reactions to how the guided imagery and the research project in general have affected them. This will be the end of the data collection phase.

3. Informed Consent Process and Documentation

Sample informed consent forms will be mailed to all prospective participants with the information about the study, so that they can read them ahead of time. Informed consent forms with their names on them will be read, signed, and explained in person on day one of the research project. This will be the first order of business. The form will be read and signed before proceeding with the research. Participants will receive a copy of the signed informed consent form at the beginning of day two.
4. **Risks**

This research project involves the risk of taking individuals into affective places that might make them uncomfortable. These are emotional places that their grandiose subjectivities may be actively keeping them from going. The researcher will be actively looking for shame-related imaginal structures including governing scenes and shame scripts. It is possible that reactions may go beyond uncomfortable and into intense states of affect like anger, grief, or shame. Feeling shame may trigger shame-affect binds. They may for example, react to feeling shame by expressing anger. This would be similar to narcissistic rage. The reverse may also true, if they get angry with the researcher, they may react with shame. These are both examples of shame-affect binds. In the exploration of a shame-related issue that lies underneath grandiosity, the research will explore issues of competency, identity, relationships, personal power, and body image. These may also trigger strong affect in some individuals. The participants will be warned about gatekeeping voices that may arise to defend their imaginal structures after the project.

5. **Safeguards**

The first safeguard to protect the participants is by the screening and selecting of them. Every attempt will be made to make sure that the participants are mature and stable. They should be able to handle the affective states that might arise during the exploration of a grandiose subjectivity. Also, more specific screening will be done. For the general participants, any victims of severe trauma will be eliminated. A history of major addictions, PTSD, physical, emotional, and sexual abuse will also cause individuals to be eliminated from the participant pool. The intention will be to eliminate
individuals that may have Dissociative disorders. Anyone currently on psychotropic medication will be eliminated. They also will be asked about any current life stressors that might make participation too much for them. They will also be asked if they are comfortable sharing their emotions in front of the researcher. The researcher will spend enough time on the phone with each participant to start building rapport which will be carried on into the research meetings.

Every attempt will be made to create a safe and ritualized container. We will work in professional therapy room that has a comfortable and warm feeling. During the research, the researcher will be careful to not shame the participants during questioning and reflective dialoguing. Questions will be asked that are looking for grandiosity and shame, but care will be taken not to evoke these. This will be a subtle distinction that will serve to protect the safety of the participants and the validity of the data. Neutral, empathic exploration without judgment will be attempted at all times.

The researcher will adequately prepare for the meetings ahead of time, ritualizing and processing any reactivity that comes up before the sessions with co-researchers. The researcher will track and record his reactions as well as anything noticed in the participants during the study that will not be evident in the data recordings. Any sign of affect in the body language of the participants will be noted, especially signs of shame.

6. Benefits

Developing integrated multiplicity by healing the shame issues of the participants that underlie grandiosity is beyond the scope of this project. However, the work done during study will allow for the beginning of a move in that direction. The participants
should become aware of a major encapsulated subjectivity that is problematic to themselves or others. The reflective dialogue on the second day should begin to loosen the imaginal structures that encapsulate this subjectivity. The participants will have the opportunity to continue to engage their subjectivity to see what energies live there after the study as they continue to explore their multiplicity.

This work may also allow for a shift in perspective in the participants, an appreciation for their multiplicity in a different way. Integrated multiplicity increases flexibility and adaptability and makes for a richer life experience. It will give the participants the opportunity to dethrone the monotheistic adaptive identity and begin to develop a more imaginal and reflexive identity, one that honors the multiplicity of the polytheistic and pluralized soul. Paradoxically, the seeming decrease in power of the adaptive identity may actually increase its ability to meet the world in a more compassionate and balanced way. This is a different kind of power than the adaptive identity is used to. An imaginal adaptive identity can meet life with the reflexivity gained from listening to the multiple voices of soul without being paralyzed by any one of them.

There will also be benefits to the field of Psychology. Linking the concepts of shame and multiplicity will be a positive contribution. The literature on multiplicity focuses strongly on trauma, fear and dissociation. This research will help to link shame with multiplicity as well. These concepts have been linked clinically and theoretically but not with any research projects. Also, just normalizing multiplicity is an important contribution because psychological multiplicity is still being repressed in many areas of Psychology.
Further benefits to the field of Psychology should come out of the exploration of the relationships between unfolding multiplicity, grandiose enactments and shame. Grandiose enactments during the exploration of multiplicity are often directed at the group leader, teacher, or therapist or minimally, they affect these relationships. These enactments are a form of transference. This research should reveal more information about transference and acting out in the therapy room and in groups.

Grandiosity is not limited to one side of the therapy room. Therapists can have issues with grandiosity. It follows that as a therapist’s issues are triggered by the therapeutic relationship or identification with the client’s issues and the therapist begins to explore their multiplicity, they too may have grandiosity come up to guard against shame. These concepts apply to group leaders and participants as well. These issues reflect the clinical relevance of this study.

Working through grandiosity in the transference, and countertransference by exploring multiplicity and shame should lead to the development of reflexivity and integrated multiplicity in both parties of the therapeutic relationship. This is perhaps the most important clinical relevance of the work. The therapist and client both need the capacity of reflexivity.

Reflexivity can lead to the emergence of other capacities, like courage, wisdom, dignity, empathy, and compassion. The mutual entailment of these virtues is needed for leadership. This is the relevance of the work culturally. True leadership is necessary if we are to move out of our current post-modern narcissistic culture towards a more convivial, mature, and sustainable one. Therapists, by developing reflexivity and the mutual entailment of virtues, can become cultural leaders and help others to do the same.
7. After the Study

After the study, the summary of the learnings will be organized as to what was learned into categories. The categories will be, multiplicity, encapsulated subjectivities, grandiosity and inflation, splitting of archetypes, affects, shame, and the principles of treating shame, dependency, Transformative practices, and collaboration. Major themes will be summarized and written up according to these categories. The participants will be mailed a copy of the Summary of Learnings if they desire to receive one.

Participants are told that they can contact researcher with any follow up questions, concerns or input.

8. Attachments

Please see the following appendices: 2 to 13
APPENDIX 2

CONCEPTUAL OUTLINE

Evoking Experience

Meeting One

• Researcher shows movie clips showing grandiose personality styles.

Meeting Two

• Researcher has a reflective dialogue directly with the encapsulated subjectivity that is judged by the researcher and participant to be the most grandiose from the previous session. The researcher asks questions to look for grandiosity, exploring any grandiose enactments and getting a feel for what triggered the enactment and what might have prevented it.

• Researcher has another reflective dialogue directly with the encapsulated subjectivity.

Expressing Experience

Meeting One

• After each movie clip, participants are taped sharing about any subjectivities they have that resonate with the movie characters.

• After seeing all the movie clips, the participant is asked to pick the most problematic subjectivity to them individually and have a written reflective dialogue with it. This writing will also be saved for data collection purposes.

• The participant is asked to pick the most problematic subjectivity to other people and have a written reflective dialogue with it.

• Researcher interviews the participant about each of these two subjectivities (or one if they are the same subjectivity) looking for shame-affect binds, shame scenes, signs of inferiority and grandiosity. This will be taped.
• Participants verbally share their reactions to the day’s work. This will be audio taped.

Meeting Two

• Participant asked to share any reactions that have come up since the previous meeting. This will be audio taped.

• Participants verbally share their reactions to the reflective dialogue. This will be audio taped.

• Participants share their reactions to initial interpretations and the reflective dialogue.

Interpreting Experience

Meeting One

• Participants verbally share their reflections to the day’s work. This will be audio taped.

Meeting Two

• Participants verbally share their reflections about the reflective dialogue. This will be audio taped.

Integrating Experience

Meeting Two

• Participants participate in a guided imagery session welcoming their encapsulated subjectivities into the community of soul.

• Participants share their reactions and reflections about how the guided imagery and the research project in general have affected them.
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CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLINE

Meeting One

1. Obtain each participant’s signed consent form
   
   a. Greet participant and discuss the informed consent form including participation and confidentiality.
   
   b. Participation at all times is voluntary.
   
   c. Researcher will keep the participants identities confidential.
   
   d. Discuss any questions the participant might have.
   
   e. Obtain participant’s signature on consent form.

2. Data Gathering 60 to 90 minute individual meeting. (The film clips will take about 30 minutes to present.)

   a. Researcher asks participants to go inside, remember and form an image of the most problematic subjectivity they have learned about in the exploration of their multiplicity. The participants will then be asked to keep this image in mind during the next phase of the research.

   b. Show movie clips showing grandiose personality styles. There will be four movie clips, all of which show variations of the polarity between the overt and covert forms of entitlement or grandiosity.

   c. After each clip, interview the participant to see if their most problematic subjectivity has qualities like those enacted by the movie characters. If they do not, they will be asked if they have any other parts that the clip reminds them of, and this part may be worked with.

   d. After seeing all the movie clips, the participant will be asked to have a short, three to five minute, written reflective dialogue with their most entitled subjectivity. The participants will be asked to concentrate on issues around entitlement and whether this part is problematic just to them or to other people. This subjectivity might be overtly grandiose or covertly grandiose.
e. The participant will then share about their written reflective dialogue. Next, the researcher will then interview the participant about their subjectivity looking for signs of grandiosity. Included in this exploration, the researcher will look for signs of infantile omnipotence, depression, anger, inferiority, unhealthy dependency, shame-affect binds, and shame scenes.

f. Participants verbally share their reactions to the research meeting.

g. Participants verbally share their reflections to the research meeting.

3. Closing

a. The researcher makes sure the participant is not fragmenting by asking them how the participants are doing and then observing for signs of anxiety in their answer, tone of voice, or body posture. If the participants are fragmenting, appropriate support will be given at the time. If the participants are seriously fragmenting, they will be referred to an appropriate mental health professional. If they are doing fine, the researcher will thank them, and remind them of the date and time of next meeting.

b. Researcher provides phone numbers in case problems or questions arise.

Meeting Two

1. Data Gathering- 60 minute individual meeting

a. Participant is asked to share any reactions that have come up since the previous meeting.

b. Researcher has a reflective dialogue directly with the grandiose encapsulated subjectivity that was identified the previous day. The researcher will ask questions of the subjectivity in reflective dialogue, looking for grandiosity, exploring any grandiose enactments from its past and looking for underlying shame issues. These questions will be based on what the researcher has learned about the individual and the subjectivity on day one.

c. Participants verbally share their reactions to the reflective dialogue.

d. Participants verbally share their reflections about the reflective dialogue.

e. Participants participate in a guided imagery session welcoming their encapsulated subjectivities into the community of soul.
f. Participants share their reflections and reactions to how the guided imagery and the research project in general have affected them.

2. Closing

a. Researcher thanks the participants and their subjectivities for their participation. The researcher makes sure the participant is not fragmenting by assessing the same things as at the end of meeting one.

b. Participants are told that they can contact researcher with any follow up questions, concerns or input.
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM

To the Participant in this Research:

You are invited to participate in a study on problematic multiplicity. The study’s purpose is to better understand the creation of and maintenance of parts within the psyche. This study will look at what types of parts emerge during the exploration of multiplicity that may become problematic for you or others.

Participation will involve, watching video clips from major motion pictures depicting some problematic behaviors. We will then explore your responses to the film clips. We will use journal writing and discussion to get to know that part. This work will take place at a therapy office in Santa Rosa, California. We will have two individual sessions. Each session will last about sixty minutes.

Meetings will be audio taped in order to be transcribed at a later date. For the protection of your privacy, all tapes and transcripts will be kept confidential and your identity will be protected. The tapes and transcripts will be kept in a secure area under the control of the researcher. Only the researcher and the two co-researchers will have access to this material. In the final published dissertation, or if the data is published in any other way, any information that might identify you will be altered to ensure your anonymity.

This study is of a research nature and may offer no direct benefit to you. It should allow you to get to know a subjective part of yourself better, which may be of benefit. The published findings may be useful to therapists and may benefit the understanding of the relationship between emotional states and multiplicity.

This study is designed to minimize potential risks to you. However, some of the procedures done, such as exploring the emotional history of a problematic part may touch sensitive areas for some people. I will be asking you to explore the affective experience around your problematic part. This means you may experience distress, anger, disgust, anxiety, fear, sadness, shame or other variations of these emotions.

If at any time you develop any concerns or questions, I will make every effort to discuss these with you. I, the researcher, cannot provide counseling or psychotherapy, but at your request or using my personal judgment, will facilitate referrals to an appropriate mental health professional, if such a need should arise.
If you decide to participate in this research, you may withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time for any reason. Please note as well that I, the researcher, reserve the right to terminate your participation from the study at any point and for any reason.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may call me at (xxx) xxx-xxxx any evening or weekend or you may call my cell phone at (xxx) xxx-xxxx. If I am not available immediately I will make every attempt to get back to you in a timely manner.

You may also contact the Dissertation Director at Meridian University, 47 Sixth Street, Petaluma, Ca., 94952, telephone: (707) 765-1836.

Meridian University assumes no responsibility for any psychological or physical injury resulting from this research.

I, [participant’s name], consent to participate in the study of problematic multiplicity. I have had this study explained to me by Ed Biery. Any questions of mine about this research have been answered, and, I have received a copy of this consent form. My participation in this study is entirely voluntary.

________________________________________  ______________________
Participant’s Signature                                           Date
APPENDIX 5

MULTIPLICITY FLYER

Are you actively exploring your multiplicity?
Have you found a part of you that creates problems your life?

If so, consider participating in a research project on psychological multiplicity. This Ph.D. dissertation research project will look into the nature of parts that are problematic in our lives.

Join me to participate in a potentially vital study.

For more information, please contact Ed Biery at eabiii@comcast.net.

This study will involve two one-hour sessions in Santa Rosa.
APPENDIX 6

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY

Dear Prospective Participant:

Thank you for expressing interest in my Ph.D. research project. I am a graduate student attending Institute of Imaginal Studies I have finished course work and have finished over 1500 hours of clinical psychological work as an intern. I am now devoting my energy towards finishing my dissertation. Let me tell you generally what the project is about.

I am interested in psychological multiplicity, the experience of having multiple parts of the self. My understanding is that as a participant in hypnotherapy training, Voice Dialogue, or as a student at Institute of Imaginal Studies you have done some work exploring your multiplicity. (I customized the last sentence to the organization they are affiliated with.) In its best form, multiplicity is balanced and gives us adaptability and flexibility. In its worst form, Dissociative Identity Disorder, there is so much dissociation between parts that the individuals have major psychological issues. Most of us fall somewhere in between these two extremes. We have many parts that are adaptive and help us, but we also have parts that keep us stuck and create problems in our lives. When we have parts that create trouble or suffering in our lives, we have problematic multiplicity.

I am interested in the type of subjectivities that create problems in your life and what kind of emotional states they are associated with. I am specifically interested in
what kind of subjectivities you have become aware of during your training. The
teach methodology will use clips from feature films of various characters to explore different
parts of the self and what their style is like. We will then dialogue with the parts you
identify to learn more about them.

I am looking for participants that have already started to explore their multiplicity
and have a keen interest in doing more self-exploration. I need people that are willing to
look inside and recognize their own emotional experience and be willing to share these
experiences.

The project will involve two individual one-hour meetings with the researcher in a
therapy office in Santa Rosa. Dates and times will be arranged that fit both of our
schedules. This research project will be collaborative in nature. You will be given a
chance to share your experience and your interpretation of the things that we learn during
the project. Once the dissertation is approved and defended you will be mailed a copy of
the Summary of Learnings that you helped co-create if you would like one.

Meetings will be audiotaped to collect data. For the protection of your privacy, all
tapes and transcripts will be kept confidential and your identity will be protected. The
tapes and transcripts will be kept in a secure area under the control of the researcher.
Only the researcher and two co-researchers will have access to this material and the co-
researchers will not have your identity. In the final published dissertation, or if the data is
published in any other way, any information that might identify you will be altered to
ensure your anonymity.
If you are interested in participating, please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope. Also feel free to contact me at (phone number and e-mail address was provided) with any questions or concerns.
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QUESTIONNAIRES

Written Questionnaire

The answers to these questions will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. Please see the enclosed copy of the informed consent form for more details about confidentiality.

Name-

Age-

Living situation- Circle all that apply: partnered children single

Occupation-

Are you currently in therapy? If yes, how long?

Have you ever been in therapy in the past? How long?

Are you on any psychiatric medications? If so, what are they and what is your diagnosis?

Tell me about some of the parts identified in you work with multiplicity (Please use the reverse side if you need more space.)

In working with your multiplicity, have you encountered a particularly problematic part? If so, please write a brief statement about this part and the problems that it causes for you and for others.
Phone Questionnaire

I received your questionnaire and I would like to get to know you a bit better. Is this a good time to talk? Can you answer a few questions? Great.

Tell me what draws you to participate.

Do you feel comfortable sharing your emotional states?

Do you have any addictive issues?

Have you ever been a victim of a major traumatic experience such as rape, physical abuse, sexual abuse or witnessed a violent crime?

Do you have any major emotional issues or stressful events going on right now?

If selected, do you have flexibility and time to commit to two one-hour sessions?

Do you have any questions or concerns about the study that I can help you with right now?

I will notify you in writing within three weeks to let you know if it will work to have you participate in the project.

Thank you very much.
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LETTERS TO REFERRAL SOURCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Letter to Drs. Hal and Sidra Stone of Voice Dialogue

Dear Dr. Stone and Dr. Stone:

I am writing to ask for your help in finding research participants for my Ph.D. dissertation project. I am currently a post course work student at Meridian University in Petaluma. After finishing my first fifteen hundred hours of clinical internship, I am devoting my time to finishing my dissertation on psychological multiplicity.

Your work is familiar to me from the Voice Dialogue Series audio and video sets and the Aware Ego tapes. I have studied these and they will be a valuable part of my literature review. I have worked on my own multiplicity in hypnosis with Dr. Lorna Cutler before she passed away and as a student at Meridian University. I plan to work with multiplicity as a therapist when I return to clinical work when my dissertation is finished. It is also my intention to attend one of your trainings in the future when I am done with my dissertation, to expand my understanding of working with multiplicity.

It is my hope that you will allow me to use a mailing list of individuals that you have trained in Voice Dialogue in order to assist with recruiting participants.

I have enclosed a flyer and a summary of the project that I will send to prospective participants. I am specifically interested in working with individuals that are not therapists but have done work with their disowned selves in Voice Dialogue. The list would only be used for this purpose. It would not be passed on to anyone else for any reason.

Please review the enclosed material and let me know if my request would be possible. I would very much appreciate your help. Feel free to contact me by phone, xxx xxx-xxx, mail or email, xxxxxxx@aol.com, if you would like to know more about my project or me.

Ed Biery, M.A.
Letter to Mr. Quigley of The Alchemical Institute of Healing Arts

Dear Mr. Quigley:

I am writing to ask for your help in finding research participants for my Ph.D. dissertation project. I am currently a post course work student at Meridian University in Petaluma. After finishing my first fifteen hundred hours of clinical internship, I am devoting my time to finishing my dissertation on psychological multiplicity.

Your work is familiar to me from your book, *Alchemical Hypnotherapy*, and *The Alchemical Hypnotherapy Workbook*. I have studied these and they will be a valuable part of my literature review, especially your work with the inner family, inner mate, inner guides, and the conference room technique.

I have worked on my own multiplicity in hypnosis with Dr. Lorna Cutler before she passed away and as a student at Meridian University. Clinically I have used hypnosis in my internship placement with Tony Madrid, Ph.D. I plan to work with multiplicity and hypnosis as a therapist when I return to clinical work when my dissertation is finished. It is also my intention to attend one of your trainings in the future when I am done with my dissertation, to expand my understanding of working with multiplicity and hypnosis. I took an NLP and hypnosis training with Tad James in Hawaii, just before I started pursuing a degree in psychology.

I am specifically interested in working with individuals that have worked with their own multiplicity before, so people that have trained with you, would be great participants in my research. It is my hope that you will allow me to use a mailing list of individuals that you have trained in Alchemical Hypnotherapy in order to assist with recruiting participants.

I have enclosed a flyer that I will send to prospective participants and also a summary of the project that I will send to them. The list would only be used for this purpose. It would not be passed on to anyone else for any reason.

Please review the enclosed material and let me know if this would be possible. I would very much appreciate your help. Feel free to contact me by phone, xxx xxx-xxxx, mail or email, xxxxxxx@aol.com. I would also be happy to meet with you in person to discuss my project.

Thank you,

Ed Biery
Acceptance Letter

Dear …:

This letter is to inform you that you have been accepted to be a participant in my research project on problematic multiplicity. Thank you for your willingness to participate in this endeavor.

I will contact you soon to set up a date for our first meeting. Please review the Informed Consent form that I previously sent you. We will go over this form at the beginning of the first meeting and your signature on it is required to participate in the study. If you have any questions about this please call me as soon as possible.

Please feel free to contact me at any time with questions or concerns.

Warmly:

Ed Biery

Rejection Letter

Dear…:

This letter is to inform you that you have not been selected to participate in my research project on problematic multiplicity. The response to the flyer I sent was quite good and I could only include ten participants. Selection was made on a basis of diversity so some of applicants were included due to their demographic information. I regret that I could not include everyone that expressed interest.

Thank you for your willingness to participate.

Sincerely:

Ed Biery
Thank You Letter

Dear …:

Thank you so much for your participation in my research project. I am very pleased with the willingness that you had to share deeply of yourself. Your participation, courage, and honesty are all very much appreciated.

Thanks Again,

Ed Biery
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SCRIPTS USED WITH THE PARTICIPANTS

The following scripts follow the chronological outline.

Meeting One

(First the researcher will greet the participant, introduce himself, and show them the room.)

Let’s get the business out of the way. Before I read the informed consent form, let’s talk about participation and confidentiality. Participation in this project is at all times voluntary. I will keep your identity confidential. The data generated will be presented in a way that protects your anonymity. The data will be analyzed with the help of my co-researchers, but they will not know your identity. I will now read the informed consent form and have you sign it.

Do you have any questions or concerns about the study or informed consent form before you sign? (The participants will then sign it and the researcher will give them the particulars about the space and the schedule.)

Is anything else you want to share with me about yourself, before we get started? Great, let’s take about a minute in silence to bring ourselves fully into the room to transition into the work we are going to do today.

Ok, let’s get started.
The first thing that I would like to do is to have you go inside and remember a problematic part that you encountered as you began to explore your multiplicity. This is probably going to be the same one that you wrote about on your questionnaire but if another one jumps up go with it. You may close your eyes if that helps. You do not have to tell me about that part yet.

Now I am going to show you some movie clips. I’m particularly interested to see if the characters remind you in any way of the problematic part that you just thought about but if they remind you of another part, we will discuss the other part. At the end of each clip I will ask you to reflect on the main characters to see if you identify with them or more likely, have a part of you that is like them in any way. The characters may interact with other parts of you in the ways that are depicted in the films or they may jump in and take over your behavior in ways that remind you of your problematic part.

I am primarily interested in parts that lead you to act in such a way that we deserve special consideration or treatment that you ordinarily would not expect. These parts have issues of entitlement, issues around feeling special that may have become problematic to you or others.

The first clip is from a movie called *About a Boy* with Hugh Grant. This is the beginning of the movie. He explains his views on life. Let’s watch it.

- So, what do you think?
- Do you have a part like him that feels OK being an island, a part that does not need other people?
- The next film is called *Once Around*. Let me set the scene. In the first clip you’ll see the Richard Dreyfus character, Sam Sharpe in his public persona speaking to a
sales meeting. He then sits down to lunch with the Holly Hunter character who plays Renata, the woman that Sam eventually marries. In this scene please pay attention to both Sam and Renata. This scene depicts when they first met.

(The movie clip will then be shown.)

End of Film Clip

• So, any comments?
• Sam seems to enjoy to being the center of attention.
• Do you have a part that enjoys putting you in the center of attention, a position you do not normally jump into?
• Sam is obviously a very successful salesperson. Has your exploration of your multiplicity brought out any ambitious, optimistic parts that really made you feel like you could do great things? Did these parts make you feel special?
• He made some off color jokes. Do you have a part that uses humor, even if it is not off color humor to draw attention to your self?
• Do you have a part that uses self-deprecating humor?
• How do you feel about Sam? Did Sam bug you? Do you have a subjective part of you that creates a similar reaction inside you or to other people?
• Do you have a part that makes you feel special because it makes you feel like you know more than others or are skilled in some way?
• How about Renata? Any comments, do you relate to her in this clip? Do you have a part that is like her in this clip?
• She was pretty manipulative in order to meet Sam. She denied someone else the opportunity to sit next to Sam, the man of the hour. Do you have a part that manipulates the environment or others to get attention from someone special?

• You get the pattern here, from now on, I will not say each time do you have a part that…. 

• I’ll just make comments and you can tell me if the concepts they contain remind you of a part of you 

• She seems drawn to material success. 

• She seemed to really enjoy the attention of Sam, the most important person at the meeting. 

• Do you have a part that makes you feel special because you get attention from someone that you are impressed by or truly is special? 

• Another way to ask this is do you have a part that makes you feel special by proxy, just because you are associated with this person? 

• The next clip shows Jack Nicholson as Melvin in *As Good as it Gets*. You may have seen this one. This is a scene when he needs the Helen Hunt character Carol. She is the normal waitress at the restaurant where he eats breakfast every morning. It is clear from previous scenes that she is very kind and is the only one at the restaurant that puts up with all of his odd, sometimes blatantly rude and offensive behavior. In this scene he gets upset because she is not there to wait on him. He not only gets upset, he takes it out on the substitute waitress. 

Let’s watch it 

• Comments?
• He does suffer because he has obsessive and compulsive issues, but this clip focuses on how he goes over the top with the way he treats others because he is suffering.

• He acts like he is the only one that suffers.

• He is odd, but he is suffering, the waitress does not know about his compulsions such as the plastic silverware and gets attacked by Melvin.

• The manager does know about these quirks in Melvin but does not mediate the situation; he kicks Melvin out.

• Melvin brings on the wrath of the manager but when all the other patrons cheer, it feels like they have no space at all for his suffering. It feels like they are ganging up on him.

• Do you have a part that makes you feel special because it makes you feel like you suffer more than other people?

Let’s move on to the next clip from the same movie. This is the scene where Carol is overreacting with suspicion to Melvin’s generosity. He has supplied a doctor for her son that has long-term lung problems so that she will not have to miss work. He needs her there because she is part of his daily routine but she also puts up with him. He is wealthy and he wants her to be at work so he has a stake in her son’s health. You also get that under the selfish exterior he does care about her and her son. From observing Carol earlier in the film you get that she is very kind but also feels special because she is the only one that can put up with Melvin.

Let’s watch.

• Any reactions?
• Do you have a part that causes you to overreact to generosity?
• This is a special case of overreacting. She is not just overreacting to his generosity. She has put up with a lot of rude behavior from him. She has been the only one that we know of that has put up with Melvin, and then she turns on him.
• Do you have a Carol part that normally makes you feel like you can put up with annoying people or even help people that others cannot deal with or help?
• Does this part then make you turn on them?
• Put another way, do you have a part that comes on too strong with setting limits after you have put up with someone that bugs you?
• Does this part set limits too late and too harshly?
• Does this part feel justified in setting limits?
• Does it make you feel guilty after setting limits?
• Does this part ever get fed up with you and turn on you because you annoy it?

Let’s move to the final clip. This clip shows Mel Gibson in Movie in *What Women Want* in a scene at his work where he thinks he’s going to get a big promotion.

Let’s watch.

Any reactions?

• He definitely counted his chickens before they were hatched.
• He’s sort of full of himself.
• Do you have a part that just makes you feel special sometimes, like you are better than other people?
• Does this part elicit criticism or guilt from you about feeling special?
• Do you have any other parts that make you feel special that are not similar to the characters in the clips.

• Now what I would like to do is look at what part you have mentioned today seems to be the most entitled. What do you think?

• Is this part problematic for you?

• Is it problematic for others?

Well, that’s about it.

How are you feeling? Anything else you want to add? Do you have any reflections or comments? Any questions?

Next time we will dialogue directly with your most entitled subjectivity.

Meeting Two

Hi, how are you? Is there anything you want to ask or comment on before we talk to your subjectivity?

Take a moment to get into character, if you’d like, close your eyes. When you’re ready, open your eyes and we will have a conversation. (I then had a reflective dialogue with the subjectivities with the intention of further differentiating and personifying the energy underneath them. I watched for signs of grandiosity and underlying shame. The questions on this day were customized based on the information about the subjectivities learned during the first meeting. Issues of grandiosity were noted from day one and worked into the general type questions, examples of which follow. The general questions will be intended to find the stories and feelings underneath the grandiosity noted on day one. In the questions… means the participant’s name)
Can you please tell us who you are?

Would you please tell us your story?

How are you feeling emotionally? Is this the emotional tone you bring to ….?

What is your relationship like with …?

How do you feel about …?

How does … treat you?

What do you want … to do?

What do you really want for …?

What do you really want from …?

What sort of things do you say to …?

What sort of things do you do to …?

What sort of things do you try to make … do?

What sort of things do you try to make … feel?

What do you have to do with …’s problems? (specifics can be added here like, trouble loosing weight, depression, etc. if they have come up on day one.)

What would happen to … if you stopped doing what you do to her?

What would happen to … if you stopped doing what you do for her?

What is your relationship like with other parts of …?

What is your role in the group of subjectivities inside?

What is your role specifically in relationship to other parts?

What would happen to all the other subjectivities inside … if you stopped doing what you do to them?
What would happen to all the other subjectivities inside … if you stopped doing what you do for them?

What is it like to be able to speak freely?

How do you feel about yourself?

Specific Questions (To be used if answers to these do not come up spontaneously)

How old was …when you came to be?

What was happening at that time?

Have you always been with …?

What can we call you when we address you?

What needs do you have?

Is there another part that you are especially linked with?

Did this part come into being at the same time as you?

Do you protect … or any other parts of ….? Which parts do you protect?

Do you hassle or attack any other parts? Why do you feel the need to do this?

Do you feel exiled in relationship to the other subjectivities?

Do you feel like you have to manage the other subjectivities?

Do you feel like you have to solve problems all the time like you are putting out fires like a fire fighter?

Is there anything else you want to share before we end this reflective dialogue?

All right, that was very interesting. Thanks for participating.

Please share your experience of speaking as your subjectivity.

Do you have anything more to add about the whole experience? Thank you very much.
APPENDIX 10

SUMMARY OF DATA

The following is a summary of the raw data organized by Learnings.

Learning #1

Susan speaking as the Accomodator:
There really wasn’t room. In Susan’s family there really isn’t room for too many Albert Finney’s. Her mother had some Albert Finney and she had an older brother that had a lot of Albert Finney. And so I am really a part that found a place for Susan considering she lived with Albert Finney types. And, I just know how to be, I’m good at accomodating. The Albert Finney takes the stage and I’m more like water, that finds places other than the spot that the Albert Finney has taken. Things that bother me is when like Susan is doing something with a group and a Albert Finney type is part of the group. She had an experience when she was studying for the MFT exam, where there was this woman that she was in relationship too that had a lot of Albert Finney energy. It was all about her and it was probably me that flagged her and said, “If you hang out with her and make her a study partner, you are not going to pass that thing, because she wants to be the big fish. Your right, I can see it, I can tell it, when somebody has got that.
(bullshit detector)

Researcher- Do you have a specific story of scene that comes to mind from when you were a kid about accomodating?
This is a story with my brother when I was about nine or ten. I came out from the back of the house, my mother was gone somewhere, and my brother was stealing alcohol from my father’s liquor cabinet. My brother was fifteen, actually it was my brother’s friend that’s was stealing it and my brother came up with this really big presence and said “You are not going to tell mom about this” and “This none of your business.” He had this huge presence and I remember feeling so small and so scared. He wasn’t going to hit me or anything but he let me know that he was in charge and what he wanted and I was not going to interfere with what he was planning.

Researcher- So you really felt powerless?
Yeah, yeah.

Researcher- Do you feel powerless in relationship to the Albert Finney part in you?
Well, I’m gonna tell you another story that may answer that. I’m starting this business and I didn’t want to do it alone. I think that I’m a big part of Susan. I wanted to do it with other people because… if Susan had an Albert Finney accessed and developed, she could have done it alone. She’s very knowledgeable so she could, but I liked to be… wanted do it with other people. I like the relationship aspect, the synergy aspect. So what was your question again? Do I feel powerless? I, it’s almost like it’s a different paradigm. If I come into contact with Albert Finney energy, I exit stage left. I don’t hang around much with, because I have a visceral reaction. Clearly that movie brought up a visceral reaction. That’s me I suppose. Now I can go deeper with that.

I have been hurt by Albert Finney energy. There wasn’t space for Susan to come forth and be a star or be developed. They like the way that I would accommodate their energy.

I know Susan is very knowledgeable and important, and I don’t need to be seen like that, but I think I’d like her to be seen. There are other ways that I fit in and get my needs met in another way, because the other way wasn’t available to me.

Well, I subscribe to this idea of an aware ego, so I believe that Susan can know me, hold me and I’ll talk about some of my fears, know my fears and hold them as she opens to that (Albert Finney energy). I trust her immensely. (integrated multiplicity)

Researcher- What fears do you have?  
I am afraid that the Albert Finney energy is totally self involved and won’t be connected, and connection is important to me. And, that the Albert Finney energy will turn people off.

Researcher- How do you feel or Susan feel when that part turns people off?  
Embarrassed. Maybe there is some shame there, actually.

Researcher- Remember the story you told last time about coming forward to defend that person? I got the impression that there was…  
Shame! There was shame about that!

Researcher- But there was good intention, there was good intention.  
Yeah, but it was like a bull in a china shop, it must have been because that was the reaction she got. The other women had issues but still… I had another experience where I was at a Voice Dialogue workshop on staff, and she and another woman was training people, to be facilitators and the other woman was so gentle and connected and communicative and I noticed that when Susan talked she came from a more know-it-all place and that bothers me when that happens. Another thing about me is that, I am very intuitive, I am very energy sensitive.

Researcher-You can build people up and “make them feel like a million dollars,” you can build people up and that’s important. Right, and I’m a really good listener too.
Bill, speaking as the Pusher said:
Yeah, I was failing in a way, and that really sort of resulted in a crisis response that gave me a lot more power. I’m almost like the Homeland Security Department or something after 9/11. I really was not empowered before then.

Researcher- But this is a part that feels entitled to take control of you?
Oh yeah, he’ll take control in traffic, control getting three phone calls at once in this work, take control planning things, in my relationships, in deciding what I am going to do socially or professionally. Most of the Voice Dialogue work has been spent dealing with this self and seeing what is on the other side, which would be a more being self, Aphrodite type energy, and then trying to balance it a little bit. The advantage of having a good pusher is that you can really get things done; the disadvantage is that you never really enjoy it because there is always something else to get done. Yeah, I can really dominate. When I get a flow of things going, I go, go, go. I can be relentless, push him right through lunch hour and never have him leave the desk for ten hours. Then the rebellion comes up. I can bit out of hand and I am very aware of it, but there it seems like there is always something else to do.

Karen
Um, well at first it felt hard and then I kind of got into it. Um, I felt sort of a discomfort around the subjectivity, the special and grandiose, and I don’t want to look at this and, you know cause I could feel that come up. Like I’m embarrassed about it. Something’s wrong with it. But um, it also just too, that shining the light on it helps to diffuse it too, or that tension around it, whatever taboo I have. There’s a taboo around it that I think is both personal and cultural or something and I’m not supposed to be special. And much is coming up right now too is that how my mom would always like really try to program me, us kids, to think about others and that made it wrong if we were thinking about ourselves too much. And I, but I really have this narcissistic basic fault, early unmet self that’s really wounded so I would do a lot of stuff for myself, I think. And then she’d make me wrong about it. But I’d be so confused because I’m just trying to find myself, or take care of myself, or whatever. But yeah, so there’s a real mixed message in this place, in this move. I remember advising my niece to, you know, follow your passion, do what feels good for you. And I got in so much trouble for that. (Laughs) So, so I’ve got that family conditioning on it. So it’s both, because the family was that way or my mom’s that way, that’s why it got created, my wounding got created or something and also, that’s why I need it, that’s why I avoid it. It’s like I have this taboo feeling, this pull to it.

Researcher- Um, tell us your story. How old was Bill when you came to be?
Oh, it from the moment I was born, really. Ah, my father walked out of the hospital because I was a girl, he was so upset. And so, and they had me just, they had twins already, twin girls, and so the only reason I was born was to be a boy so I suffered because nobody wanted me. I have suffered all my life cause nobody wanted me.
Researcher- And how old were you when somebody actually told you this?
I want to say when I was born. Um, how old was I when somebody told me?
That’s a good question. I, you know, it’s story that just, I’ve known all my life. So I don’t know. My father would tell the story and he, he was an alcoholic so especially when he was drunk and not too drunk, but anyway, and then he decided to come back in the hospital to see my mom and thought well at least I should go see Harriet. And so he went in to see my mom and then my mom said, “Well have you seen her?” And so he decided to go see me and it was love at first sight. He’d always do this sort of thing. So this was, his suffering story and how he turned it around or, but I kept feeling like, I always felt it was false. I kept, I thought that he kept telling me the story to try to convince himself. And it sickened me to have to stand there and listen to him repeat this story about how he fell in love with me and love at first sight. And then it felt like love, in love with me, then it felt like there was something yucky about it. So I’ve always known this story. And again, he tried to tell it as if it was something to bond with me and it always made me sick to hear it.
Karen, speaking of her early life, said:

And I think I learned early on to adapt, like I was codependent with her [speaking about her mother] and just adapted, like getting real quiet. [Long pause] I don’t know. I disappeared as an adaptation and thus created more suffering, maybe because I didn’t learn how to show up and say ‘I need your attention.’ Instead I would disappear. ‘I won’t rock the boat. I won’t take any of your time and attention.’ And so I suffered in that personality dynamic of not knowing how to assert myself and be, have an opinion or have a personality or whatever…
So when I was a senior in high school I had sex with my boyfriend and got pregnant and went into a home for unwed mothers and gave it up for adoption. And it, but the whole structure was all about how much I had hurt my dad by getting pregnant. And…

Researcher- It was all about him again.
All about him. So I suffered in that. (Chuckles) I suffered…

Researcher- There was a lot of real suffering.
…big time. Yeah. And giving up this child and my father saying that night after I finally came home with the family and he was sitting there smoking his pipe saying, “Well for you to give up your first child doesn’t hurt you…” or something, “but for me to give up my first grandchild it hurts me so much,” that type of thing. Just so much about him. He did not understand and he was so wrapped up in his own emotions and it was very painful. And a few weeks later, the episiotomy was still healing, I slid out of a car and must have pulled a stitch out and I started really massively bleeding. They took me to an emergency room and called our family, OBGYN, who rushed in, took my hand and looked at me and said, “How are you doing?” And I remember being so startled at that attention
and my mom saying in the car when my dad had gotten out, “He’s very worried.”
Again, it’s all about him.

Katie
Researcher- So why don’t you tell me about yourself, like when you came to be.
I can’t remember not ever being with her. This is about really having volatile
parents, volatile father and a mother that would not access emotion and not a lot
of reflectivity or exploration around what relationships were in the family,
feelings heard. We weren’t allowed to go to emotional places in my family, yet
there was so much pain, palpable pain. It was really intense with lots of disowned
anger, grief, and rage. My father would avoid them but then he would rage and
drink and cry. This part came because I was the one that just did that. I knew that
he was in pain, he was just hurting. To get upset or to defend or do anything else
but just be with him was just not a choice. Plus I just had to be able to hold it and
be somewhat rational. I was scared by it.

Researcher- So you had to take care of your Dad?
Yeah, I had to take care of my Dad and my Mom but that looked different. She
wasn’t as emotional and volatile.

Researcher- So your mom wasn’t taking care of you and neither was your dad, so were
you taking care of Katie too? That’s a lot of work.

I appreciate how directly you just said that.
Researcher- Tell me about your feelings of being special.
Well it wasn’t until later, much later that I began exploring it through my own
therapy and school and I realize I couldn’t let go of that piece. It feels so slippery
that I can hardly touch it. So, speaking from this part they couldn’t survive
without me. They really couldn’t survive without me… another part comes in and
says I’m crazy. When I stay with it, my psychic energy, nobody could have done
that but me. I was the glue, I was the one that did it. I did it. See what I mean? I
just knew how to do it.

Researcher- So you kind of held the family together.
Yeah, in this way, in this emotional way; I was willing to do that.

Researcher- So what role do you play in the group of subjectivities inside Katie?
Dear God, I don’t know. I guess I know what I did in the external world.

Researcher- Tell me more about that.
It’s about being still, being able to download information, it’s about gestating,
being there, receiving. Absorb a lot of pain, you know. I’m also why she can do
this work. Where I’m having difficulty with it, is this part feels special, the part
that feels that only she can do the service, has gotten me in trouble.
That’s where the anger is. (crying) So it’s hard to speak from her without saying “shut up!” I stayed in a marriage way too long. I didn’t get mad at my father for a really long time.

Researcher- So that is how the part got you in trouble, the ability to hang with difficult people?
It’s not even that ability to hang with them, it’s an absolute necessity. That is how I feel that’s how I function. Is it hard to understand how it operates?

Sarah
Around that time, or before, I remember coming home from school with stories about the other kids that did stuff that bothered me, or that some kid was weird, and the reaction from my mom was always telling me to put myself in their shoes. It seems like that was always her message “put yourself in their shoes.” So that feels like a big part of me, putting myself in other people’s shoes, and imagining if I were them what my experience would be if my life was theirs or my situation was theirs. I think the intent was to foster empathy, but I really took that on, wearing other people’s shoes and thinking what their experience would be like.

Researcher- Was you mom compassionate with you when she was encouraging you to be like that?
Definitely.

Researcher- So you, did you idealize that part of her?
Yes in some ways, she was a very compassionate person, almost to an extreme, you’d never hear her put someone down. But it can be real extreme because when I am real present in Sarah, then the extreme is that she is not in her own shoes, she’s so busy trying to figure out what the other person’s experience is that she will loose touch with what her’s is, what it feels like to be in her shoes.

Researcher- So, it is sort of letting go of yourself in service to others.
Yeah, in an extreme way. As far as being idealized or being modeled, about my mother, I’d say that idealized feels too strong, too big. But, she was a role model.

Researcher-So you sort of patterned yourself after her in a way.
Uh hum. Yeah

Researcher- Did it get into your survival in the family mode at all?
It’s hard to say right now, maybe come back to that.

Researcher- How did you relate to Sarah’s father?
I, felt a special bond that we had was about being smart. He was a brilliant man, and I liked approval and attention from him in that way. He was real involved in community and his profession and he’d be home for dinner, maybe, once or twice a week. For me, it was more disruption of the normal routine; it altered my mom’s attention from us, for sure, because if he was around then he was the first one to be taken care of. So that model of her stepping out of her shoes, to take care of
him was maddening as a kid or even as me as this part. A story that exemplifies that is, when I was older, about 12, he did something that upset me so much that I went to my room in tears and instead of my mom taking care of me, she was more taking care of him. He was upset, because he upset me or he was mad and upset she’s busy taking care of him rather than taking care of me. So that role model was also infuriating to see. So in a way, if he wasn’t around, she was more in her own shoes. If he was around it was all about him, and she would just serve him, please him, and take care of him.

Researcher- So there was, maybe, more trauma in your mom attending to him, and not attending to you, when you were hurting so much, rather than the initial event. Although, I know at that age too, eleven or twelve, that… I ah… infuriating. (pause) I have finally come to the conclusion that my dad just wasn’t good at, didn’t have a clue about being tender, about girls being real sensitive and tender at that tender age. There was a lot of teasing, if I had a crush on someone and revealed that, if I liked someone, there was a lot of teasing. So there is a lot in there about being a woman, being a girl, a woman in relation to him, a man, and seeing my mom, her relationship to him. I’m not sure how it all fits in. So, my way of relating to him, getting all that teasing was to be really smart and really good at what I did. That was about the time I started volunteering at the crippled children’s day camp. I got a lot of praise from him for that, for having such unique interest and being able to use that hat out in the world.

Researcher- So there is a sense of having to perform to get attention, having to do special things to get noticed.
Yeah, to do something, something interesting more than just being. I had to have something interesting to talk about, to report, to be interesting.

Researcher- So, what would you say your role is within the group of parts inside?
I take control in ways that are not best for Sarah, I take control in what is best for me. [Laughing]. It also makes it hard to set boundaries sometimes, especially when it is time to stop giving to others.

When asked about whether this subjectivity affected her ability to set boundaries she said, Yeah, it can and this can lead to depression, to overwhelm first, then to depression. Midway in those three years as a teacher, I got depressed and went to therapy, just knowing something wasn’t right. What drove me to that state, to getting depressed, was not being able to stand up for myself and set boundaries.

Mike
He told a story about being shamed and ridiculed for getting mad during his birthday party as a child when one of the other kids broke his new toy gun. With outrage, he went to his mother, angrily demanding justice. He said:
I remember being corrected, brought over to the side, talked to by my mom and told to stop it, or my friends were going to go home… threatened, shamed. But I definitely remember it was like, nobody heard me, and nobody’s fixing it, nobody’s doing anything about it. I remember that then I got even angrier.
The following is Mike describing his authoritarian part:

When the Authoritarian in me starts to come out, the message has to get received, there has to be some respect, a response that says ‘I hear you.’ If it does not work, I do not leave that space and go back to being friendly or nice. I say ‘Well, I guess I was not authoritarian enough, mean enough, assertive enough. Okay, I guess we’ll go there won’t we?’ And it’s like I have to release, I’ll go into an authoritarian rage, a place that just says, ‘You will listen to what I’m saying, and you will do this, it’s not negotiable anymore. I don’t give a fuck about your feelings.’

Steve

It was fun because I didn’t feel like I needed to be the center of attention, but that I could step into that center and out of it, as I felt comfortable.” When asked if there was an earlier scene that may be related, he thought of this event in an earlier grade:

The teacher was speaking in class and I said, “Boss!” And everybody turned around and kind of laughed. And yeah, I’m remembering feeling queasy and thinking, “Oh God, what have I done?” I tried sticking myself out and I got looked down on or got singled out as… [He trailed off into silence, head and eyes turning down as if experiencing the shame and queasiness all over again.]

There were earlier episodes like this in his family of origin that evoked shame, especially feeling powerless with his father. He tells of his father leaving his mother and him at about age six, noting that his resultant fear of abandonment, kept him from speaking up to or getting out of line with his father. This subjectivity had him keep his mouth shut around his father even though he was really angry with his father leaving his mother and him. Steve’s tone reflected shame over not ever being able to confront his father over the hurt he had caused Steve and his mother when they were dependent on him.

Steve’s embarrassing story about his trying to take center stage as a child and experiences of powerlessness in his family of origin, have led him to feel more comfortable in a secondary leadership role. He describes it thusly: I feel my convictions passionately. And I feel afraid about standing up for them, on my own, by myself. So it’s, really the conflict, it is the heat or the energy of the conflict when I’m standing for something by myself that becomes tolerable only when I’m standing with another or with many others.

Learning #2

Susan

Susan speaking as the Albert Finney subjectivity:

I really don’t care about the other person.
Researcher- Really? But Susan had that one story where you came up very righteously
and defended that woman. So it’s not like you don’t always care.
Well, I don’t, well maybe the bottom line was that it was a platform for me, a
place from which I could lay into that other woman. She was bugging me. She
was all whiny and in some ways I used the second woman as an excuse.

Researcher- Well, in your written dialogue you did say that you are misunderstood and
actually take care of others by taking charge and using take charge authority.
Yeah, well I think she wrote that. Nobody has really been in touch with me, so I
think it was written through her lens! I’d be ok if I was taking care of people but
that’s one of her rules. In my purest form I am the Albert Finney energy. I want to
tell my story!

Researcher- Well tell your story then!
Am I making you nervous?

Researcher- Yeah, a little bit… So, tell me your story.
Well maybe I will tap into Susan’s story but I can just feel energetically that I
really like having the floor, getting to talk. I’m not that concerned whether people
like me or not. It is more important to me to be able to feel this power.

Researcher- So that is a very good quality, if Susan needs to stand up for herself, be
assertive, it is not only Ok but necessary at times.
Yeah, I would say stuff to some of the people that she talks about that have the
Albert Finney in them, I’d like to have an Albert Finney one-on-one with them.
You know historically she’d never let me. We’ve got to get it really strategic, set
it up…

Researcher- It must need to be really safe for her for you to even show up.
Safe? The way she’ll let me out is to totally orchestrate it so that she can massage
the person to totally be ready to receive my message. That’s how she lets me out.

Researcher- How does it feel to be under wraps all the time?
Confining. I don’t think she even knows what I can do. I make things happen. I
can make things happen.

Researcher- Right, I can feel your power in the room. You did make me nervous there.
That was correct. You clearly own a great deal of power.
Yeah, I can really feel it in my legs.

Researcher- But you don’t get to express it much.
Not completely pure like this. It’s a no no. If I have done it, I have hurt people.

Researcher- And how does that make Susan feel?
Horrible, horrible, hurting people is actually one of her number one least favorite
things in the world.
Researcher- So, if you could integrate your energy such that you could bring more power to the system without hurting people, you’d be a very positive force. Well if she could figure out how to let me be ok, she could handle that integration stuff.

Researcher- Is she ashamed of you?
She’s afraid of me. I am very powerful. I am very powerful, yeah.

Researcher- Don’t you get discouraged, isn’t a drag, it seems like you’d feel constricted?
Actually, the longer I am out, the more I realize that I am a part of her life, just not a pure part of her life. She’s got this thing going on right now with this dream group and I get bored easily.

Researcher- Because you have a lot of energy.
Yeah, and this woman that runs the group, I have an issue with. Susan really wants to be in the group. But, if I am going to stay in that group, I need to have a voice in there! So she does filter me through this system. And the last time Susan was at the dream group the leader looked at Susan and said, “I can tell you have a lot of power.” So she is feeling me.

Researcher- And what’s the story with the woman in the group? You can’t tolerate her? Is she an accommodator?
She’s the leader, she is like in charge. I didn’t join the dream group for somebody else to be in charge, I want to be in charge. I just feel judgment, and I fight those sorts of things. I am a fighter. I am a part of her that fights, takes people on.

Researcher- So you have a strong sense of righteousness?
Yeah, like Susan has never been in a physical fight and when she works with teens that have been in fights, it amazes her. I could get into a physical fight.

Researcher- You would protect Susan?
Yeah but in a different way, not by making the other person a friend, I would take charge. It’s even hard for her to stand for me to be out right now! I scare her.

Researcher- Sure. Do you remember a scene and incident where you were out as a child and what happened?
I thought you were going to say “remember that scene in the movie when Albert Finney was just standing up there, doing his own thing, telling the story and just boring the shit out of them” and I was thinking, “Yeah, I wouldn’t mind being in that position.” There is something very pure about that, pure what, can you think of the word? It’s pure something. When people use the word ego, Susan doesn’t understand what they mean by that. She knows intellectually. That is pure ego, wouldn’t you say? Albert Finney is pure ego, he is just standing up there saying this is what I am going to do…
Researcher- I think he has 100% pure entitlement to be present and to be who he is, or needs to be, and tell his story and show off his attributes without any shame about it. He is totally out there.
So, I remember a story, she was thirteen or fourteen and she was sitting at the kitchen table and her mother father was there and maybe one older brother. My father needed the milk from the refrigerator and my mom said I could get the milk. But I was same distance from the refrigerator as my father so I said, “You are right there by the refrigerator, Dad, why don’t you get it yourself?”

Researcher- Then what happened?
I don’t remember the specifics, I wasn’t hit or anything, but whatever my father said and whoever my father was energetically, I would never do that again. He totally put Susan in her place. And she got up and left the room.

Researcher- And that helped to drive you further underground.
Right, right, I have been coming out more though, in the last few years, but not as out there as I am right now. There is something very pure and seductive about this energy I am sitting in right now.

Researcher- Yeah, I feel it.
You do? Susan has spent tremendous amount of her life making other people comfortable. And, that is like a monkey on her back to some degree. And her dreams, the dreams she does have, there is a common theme of feeling responsible for other people. I don’t! And I think there is a lot of energy available as a result of that.

Researcher- Sure, like in teaching, you could help her show up bigger. You could help her to feel entitled to take up whatever space she needs to take up. Lots of positives here…
Like someone called from L.A. and wanted to use the business name we were using, and that part over there would have given it to her but, because Susan has partners, so she felt like she had to get off the phone to talk about it with them. Luckily, one of Susan’s partners has energy like me and she just said no!

Researcher- Appropriate, healthy entitlement.
Yeah, Susan could have used me when she was younger.

Researcher- So are you willing to bring your energy forward, and listen and not dismiss the accommodator, and help Susan take center stage in an appropriate manner?
I’ll show up. I will show up. Yeah, I am totally willing but I don’t think it is totally up to me, but I will show up I am totally willing.

Researcher- Anything else you want to share about yourself, about the accommodator, or Susan?
It is just so interesting! On some level, things are just coming into place. I’ll tell you one story, that when Susan was sixteen, her sister’s boyfriend, who had been
in her life for four years, taught her how to drive a stick shift and one time when they were out, they stopped for a coke and he kissed her. And from there for maybe five or six years there was this whole thing where he kind of preyed upon Susan, where he would insinuate or position himself at family parties, kind of hustle her, put the make on her. That’s what he did for all these years, her sister married him and that’s who dealt with it over there. (She gestures towards the accomodater’s chair.) She never told anybody, she just pushed him away or whatever it was, that’s who dealt with it. Now if I had been dealing with it, I know that I am more in Susan’s life now because she talks about this. I would have said fuck off, I would have told, I would not have put up with that shit. That is really interesting, that’s really how she was supposed to be, so glory be to me!

Researcher- So, you would have blown him out of the water.
Yeah, blown him out of the water, and they are divorced now and they won’t let me near him because they know that I will.

Researcher- So, thanks for coming.
I kind of hate to move back! That was very interesting.

Researcher- Reactions or reflections?
Lots of energy, a lot of energy, when I was over there I could feel the other side wanting to accommodate. The minute accommodation starts, that place is in control, running the show. I’d like to learn how to access this energy when it is appropriate like you said, when it is in a leadership position. I still feel my legs by the way (referring to a somatic experience of power from the Albert Finney position).

Bill
Researcher- Let’s go to the Aphrodite subjectivity.
Okay. Good, I can look at a rose, that’s nice. Um, open that window. He likes to keep it all shut up in here so he can just, you know, do all his power booking. The flowering pear tree is blooming right now.

Researcher- You do notice…
Yeah, I like, I like this time of year. It’s just a real pretty time of the year. Been walking a little bit during the day, which is somewhat unusual and the tulip magnolias are out and lot’s of color. You know, especially after having been in New York where it was so dark. I’m so happy to live here. It’s nice.

Researcher- So when did you come into Bill’s life?
Recently. And then he had a couple of experiences with me and he realized that I have a lot to offer, he seemed very happy. You know, I mean just, he’s somewhat shocked that I could just hang out for an extended period of time and really just enjoy just being right here. Not be worrying about what I’m gonna do next. You see I don’t have any schedule. You know my schedule is okay, I’m here at this
table, I’m in an office with a person. But I mean I still got lots going on, it’s still nice. Nice. Nice posters on the wall here and the sky up there. Yeah, this is good.

Researcher- So what strikes me is you talk about being aware, being around for only a few years and yet children naturally have your energy. Did something happen to Bill that drove you underground?
Yeah, I was, you know I wasn’t very encouraged by Bill’s parents. They’re, they’re very non-artistic. They never went to theater. They really didn’t go to movies. He never was in plays. Ah, anything that he got into in that realm he sort of had to do on his own.

Researcher- So earlier today you said that you felt smaller and overlooked.
Yeah. I mean I had a pretty small part in his life for what I can give him. Cause he’s always got so much going on. I mean he’s a busy guy. And when he’s running and multitasking I’m like dormant.

Researcher- So, that’s true, it seems like your role is increasing. Um, do you still feel powerless or…
No, I don’t feel so powerless anymore. Because I really feed him. Um, he’s stressed. He’s tired of going like hell. I mean he’s gone like hell since, certainly since law school, since age twenty, to fifty. Thirty, thirty-five years, three kids and all that kind of stuff. And he doesn’t have the, he was sort of anxiety-driven, guilt-driven, and he doesn’t have that motivator. He just has, does he really want to do it motivator? And he’s sort of questioning that probably to some extent. And I don’t know, certainly, my time has come.

Researcher- Yeah, it sounds like it.
Yeah, I mean, my guess is he sort of likes the idea of sitting out in the sun once in a while. I am productive in my own way and I feed Bill and he needs me and he’s calling for me and it’s my time and this other fellow’s gonna have to adjust a little bit to that. I think he realizes that I’m here to stay, and probably gonna grow. I mean I would think thirteen years from now when Bill is seventy I will be a bigger part yet. I will have memories and maybe a better chance to write, and just again, just hanging out. All these places that I’ve explored over the last six, seven years, ten years, I can go back to them in person or in my mind or in my photos and really just take that in. Take in the nature and the color and the beauty. You know beauty is probably what I’m all about in one form or another. That’s what will cause me to stay is if I’m in a beautiful enough place I can stay there a long time. If you can get Bill like by a running creek with some things growing and a rock and a nice place to sit he can sit there a long time. Oh, but that fellow there he’d want to be moving on. There might be an even nicer one a little farther down. And there’s always the next one, the next, the next one. (unsatisfaction)

Researcher- He makes it hard to enjoy the present.
He does.
Researcher- So what do you imagine Bill’s life would be like if um, if you um, and the pusher worked even more closely together?
I think it would be more balanced. I think it’s sort of a life of extremes right now. I mean what he does during the week, and I sort of get the weekends, they’re really different. They’re almost at odds with each other, it’s almost like two people. Or even sometimes the weekdays and the weeknights he’s been encouraged to, Bill’s been encouraged to walk more. It’s very nice around this area. You can walk all up in these hills with all these houses and everything around here. Cause he just pushes, he doesn’t really investigate whether he should push. Maybe, he’s gonna be more productive using me more.

Sarah’s follow up comments
I’m really appreciating that I volunteered, finding out what was there, who I am, this part. And through the dialoguing… it’s very interesting to tie it in with boundaries. I am fascinated by how one isolated boundary incident related to this part of me could affect me as a young girl, and how that put me out in the world later on, and how it has affected my relationships.

Mike had the following up comments after the second session.
I get the sense that if these two could work together that I would be liberated in some way. And I don’t know what that would be. I’m already sensing gatekeepers coming. So there’s a risk there, leaving the familiar, to embody that kind of change and that kind of collaborativity between subjectivities. And it’s like the scary part is will people accept me? Will I be okay?

Steve speaking as the subjectivity said:
There’s some ways in which I’ve been holding him down so long, it doesn’t give him an experience of how held back he is. It’s like throwing the baby out with the bath water or trying so hard that I overstepped my bounds and now it is insidious, part of his physiology.

Steve’s follow up comments two weeks after the second session were:
I appreciate having the time to go in-depth, or just sort of stay with it for a length of time, because this is an important dynamic in me. You know, there is a real seed of healing in this work [Pause], and some surprising things that I learned, places to do some excavation.

Learning #3

Karen
It is interesting because I see these are two compensating patterns in me, one that needs attention because I need so much, you know, because I’m a single mom or whatever [she uses a whining, self mocking, stylized tone], and the other part
[spoken in a normal tone of voice] that gets attention by having a story to tell about how much I have suffered.

Researcher- What about the Attention-getter?

I told the story about my going, home for unwed mothers, giving the child up for adoption over and over. I bent people’s ears and I told details, life in the home and...the adoption workers, how awful they were to me and I remember like a part of me being aware of the fact that I was telling the story so much.

Researcher- And do you get a feeling for how old this part was when you started telling the stories?

I think it was very young. And that’s what I, yeah, I think it (pause) I would make up some things. (Chuckle) I remember this one, third grade or something, my sister’s Brownie troop, my mom was Brownie leader, and we were gonna go on a camping trip that weekend. This is an embarrassing memory. So the teacher asked a question, you know, does anyone know the president of the United States? And I raised my hand and I go, “Um, this weekend my mom and my sisters and I are going camping.” I just needed to tell somebody this special thing. And how fucking special was it. I get to TAG ALONG (spoken loudly with anger)! And I had to brag about it. That was, I had to eek out something special out of that. Go back to that. (Chuckles) Go back to the suffering. Here, whatever, I’m feeling sorry for myself but yes, fuck!

That’s what it feels like, that for a lot of growing up just silent and sitting on it and being kind of numb or something. And then when I start, and then, and then, and then, and the pregnancy was now, pretend like it never happened, so it wasn’t, you know I went into a home to hide it, right? You know? I mean you’re supposed to just pretend and, and I first started telling the story I couldn’t stop. There’s something really, almost crazy about it.

Researcher- Seems like it’s related to the need to get it out.

But it didn’t fix it, you know? So I’d find somebody else to tell the story too, cause maybe the second time telling the story would fix it or the third time. And it never...I finally burned out with that story. But, so, that was really, it was definitely compulsive storytelling.

Researcher- Yeah. I can see why you said that the one was a compensation for the other, the Sufferer.

Yeah.

Researcher- Can you think of any episodes as an adult where this subjectivities has acted out?

I had a relationship with a girlfriend for many years where we’d get together and I found myself talking a lot about myself and not listening to her, or inviting her to talk. So it was kind of still compulsive to talk about myself. And this feeling like, I can’t just summarize it. So, yeah, I get caught in this obsessive feeling, almost like an OCD thing that I have to go, otherwise it’s no good. And it still feels like it was somebody who was paying attention to me. And grabbing that attention and
filling it, trying to download something. Trying to give her something. Trying to express something that ultimately if I keep doing it I’ll get to where I really need to get. I’ll be seen in the way I really need to be seen. You know I’ll be met in the way I really need to be met. But it did the opposite I think, you know? So I still see that impulse I have with my boyfriend. It’s really important to me that I have a hundred percent of his attention. And then I, and then I’m trying to have discipline so that I don’t take too long telling the story. But, you know, so, I’m always monitoring that. “I can multitask.” “No you can’t. You can’t listen to me the way I need you to listen to me.” (Laughs) There’s a quality of a hundred percent that I need otherwise I feel abandoned. And I’m unsafe. And fuck you for making me feel this way. I don’t even want to start talking if you’re not gonna hang with me or something, you know. I’ll touch this deep wound of neglect and feeling like nobody cares about me. And then I feel the anger or frustration.

Researcher- It’s pretty easy to trigger?
Uh-huh.

Researcher- So I’m wondering if, you were to differentiate these parts. If you got more clear on the sufferer, and the attention-getter. They almost seem like they are blended.
Uh-huh.

Researcher- I think differentiating them would be helpful in a sense that if the sufferer could just be present with the suffering without the attention-getter coming in and having you tell the story. I don’t know exactly where I’m going with this… Yeah, you know, I, I just thought of a whole other big story, you know, and where the two, arise, so maybe therapeutically it might, that might be an interesting direction to go in, what you’re suggesting, but it’s not how its been when the sufferer touches the suffering ultimately part of getting out of the suffering as wanting to tell a story. There is something connected like that. But if I, and, therapeutically, just to really be with the suffering probably is the way out rather than telling the story because the story hasn’t been satisfying, telling the story. Has not been satisfying, but it’s been my coping mechanism or something or strategy that I created to try to amend the wound or something.

Researcher- You were going to tell another story?
Yeah, you want another story? So…(she tells a story about a boyfriend that died of cancer and how again she had the need to tell the story) But it allowed me to get support and it was very gratifying to tell the story. And that was another purpose of having strangers cause I could tell them the story. Meet new friends and tell the story. And I could see, I could watch myself kind of work the story, you know. I milked it in a sense. And I always kind of wondered am I milking this too much?
Katie

Researcher- So what role do you play in Katie life?
It’s about being still, being able to download information, it’s about gestating, being there, receiving. Absorb a lot of pain, you know. I’m also why she can do this work. Where I’m having difficulty with it, is this part feels special, the part that feels that only she can do the service, has gotten me in trouble. That’s where the anger is. (crying) So it’s hard to speak from her without saying “shut up!” I stayed in a marriage way too long. I didn’t get mad at my father for a really long time.

Researcher- So that is how the part got you in trouble, the ability to hang with difficult people?
It’s not even that ability to hang with them, it’s an absolute necessity. That is how I feel that’s how I function. Is it hard to understand how it operates?

Researcher- No. So, that part controls you in many ways.
Yeah, yeah, it does (sighing). That part keeps me really away from my, it’s really about stillness. I can’t move from the spot, my job is to be here with it, whatever pain is in the room.

Researcher- And what would happen if you moved?
I wouldn’t be able to, I’d die… annihilation.

Researcher- It developed this tremendous capacity to be with pathology, craziness, and pain.
Yeah,

Researcher- Yeah (pause) That’s not what I was expecting to find. (pause) I think we have shifted away from the specialness into to the vulnerability that is underneath it.
Right.

Researcher- I don’t know if I am right, but it feels like there is this vulnerable part underneath the specialness or entitlement that only feels alive when it is in contact with the sort of suffering or craziness that we have been talking about.
I need my Kleenex. (Crying) I don’t think this is another part. It all feels like the same thing to me.

Researcher- It feels that way to me too.
No one has ever framed it that way before. It’s as if your very life depended on doing the right thing and you can’t do the right thing. Specialness is not the right word, it’s more like entitled. Entitled is the right word, it has this sovereign nature; there is a degree of “your highnessness” to it. It really is a sense of specialness, but I have a hard time with specialness like the Richard Dreyfus character. It’s more like, “I’ve got a line, and it’s like being royalty, having a line, it feels very much like a holy place, it feels like a holy place. A majestic
place, the purity, and the true intention maybe, the truth of intention, maybe it is the supremacy of the whole system, huh? Because it is such a primary place. So it is still feels like it is running the show. That’s kind of what I boil this all down to, from that place of majesty it feels like it is the one that is running the show.

Learning #4

Karen
Referring to her mother said,
And I think, for some reason, I somehow learned really early that she was overwhelmed. It feels like I needed to take care of her so that she could take care of me. So, I was quiet, I would pretend I was taking naps. I would hardly talk. An uncle nicknamed me Silent Sam, because I just wouldn’t talk. Karen, referring to working with therapy clients said,
I’ve noticed the impulse like with clients and they’ll tell a story and I want to say, “Yeah, you know that reminds me…for me too. I want to tell you, for me too.” For me this, I want to start going in my story thinking they’re gonna go, “Wow, that’s great, I really like hearing that story from you.” Or, in some way, you know that it’s gonna help them to hear my story. And maybe sometimes that might be a therapeutic intervention to do but most the time not. And so it’s a real good discipline to me. And when, that I have to be mindful of.

Researcher- You know it feels like we have these part, parts of us that help us in this field because they help us to empathize but they still need attention. Is that what this feels like to you?
Yeah. That’s a good question. I don’t have an immediate answer. I mean what, I want, my first response is to go, to want to describe the adult part that has grown up to deal with this, you know to be present, instead of the younger part that wants to tell the story. (Pause) I don’t know how to answer that. I, you know, I think that those parts aren’t so demanding anymore, you know? Or just, I recognize, oh, there’s that impulse. Not now. And it’s okay. Uh-huh. Yeah, I can deny their existence or whatever.

Researcher- If necessary while you’re working.
But it’s okay, that I’m being professional and an adult, because something else, you know another capacity needs to come up for this moment. It’s ok if it’s in a therapeutic setting. It’s learning impulse control or whatever.

Katie
Katie said, talking about the Holly Hunter and Richard Dreyfus characters,
She is drawn to his brightness and sort of needs him to fill out her feeling of self. She also said:
This part of me works really well with and does have a sense of entitlement around being able to work with problem, difficult people. At my field placement
site, I am the one who can relate to the borderline person and doesn’t get triggered by them. When everybody would be irritated at the Richard Dreyfus character, including myself, I would be able to see his beauty. (laughs)

Katie’s Written Reflections after session one
The “I am special because I can really hold space and ‘understand’ you part. (This part wants you to know that this really is a gift and a strength; It is what will make me a good therapist and difficult people need to be understood, too damn it!) [Participant drew a smiley face.] The smiley face is because I have a need to down play, am embarrassed being caught in the act of feeling soo special. Yikes. Now I will write completely from this voice. It is true that I can hold this space, and see the beauty of some very unusual folks. I am just good at it. Other people do not have the same ability to not be triggered by “difficult” people. They project, they have the need to control,…etc.

Researcher- I am interested if you have a scene or memory from childhood that typifies the role this part plays and how it may have influenced your career choice as a therapist. There are so many of them. There were so many times when my father would suddenly blow on us. We’d be sitting around the dinner table and he would go into a rage and then leave and I would be sitting there being the therapist for the whole family system. Everybody would get a little cranky and start telling him things like “how could you do this?” And then he would leave and I would be sitting there being the therapist for the whole family system. My dad would have bailed and I would be left to explain it all and soothe everybody’s feelings and understand my father’s position and make it all better somehow, make it all better somehow. Listen to my mother, listen to my brother… It also happens in bigger family gatherings with my father, my grandmother, and my aunt. There was usually alcohol involved and I would be the one that told them to go to their separate corners and I would mediate between my father and my aunt. I would always make it better. Sometimes I would say something funny, just to be ludicrous…

Researcher- Did it break the cycle?
Absolutely, I never got to be with my whole family like that, then I would withdraw, withdraw…. This is painful stuff to talk about. (long pause) just how much I…

Researcher- It’s hard work protecting that vulnerable part. It is scary work too. It takes a lot of energy. I question myself, so we come in with a certain purpose then life provides us options and opportunities, so I notice I can be this way and do things this way… It is the kind of work I do in the world and I do feel special.

Researcher- So that’s the edge, (I am referring to the edge between true specialness and entitled specialness.)
It is!

Researcher- It is the edge, you are special! Every single character I showed you on film, you had empathy for. Even the one you said you hated, later in the hour you said you saw the beauty in him. Did I say that?

Researcher- Yes. So, to me it is about this part having sort of entitled specialness because it is identifying with your gifts, with your capacities! Yes, yes. Well, what else is it going to do? I really don’t know what else it is going to do.

Researcher- Well, it could let you take care of it instead of it trying to take care of you. It did take care of me back then.

Researcher- Yes, back then it did. It was essential for survival as a child. That was the only way that you could survive or manifest power, or having power as a self when you were so young was by playing the role this part took on. The role was about protecting that vulnerable part that felt it was going to die, and maybe you with it. I don’t know what I would do without it now, but I don’t want to keep doing that. It is hard for me to really feel alive when I am not around this part makes me feel alive when I am around human suffering.

Researcher- There is an edge of ecstasy in being around the intense affect of suffering. But it’s nice to do something else…sometimes.

Researcher- Right. Does this part get you in trouble at work, with clients or other therapists? I think it could potentially get me in trouble, taking on too many clients, but I don’t really have that problem right now.

Researcher- What about not the number of clients, but the intensity of the ones you are willing take on? I have a wide range of clients.

Researcher- I can imagine you coming into a field setting like this and ending up with the clients that other therapists did not want to work with. My curiosity serves me a lot around people. I think it is a gift, to be able to see what motivates people, and see what’s going on with people. I don’t know if I can’t not be around craziness. I think that it serves me, I don’t feel safe when I’m around people that don’t own there craziness. It terrifies me. Growing up in my family, they were mainstream upper middle class people, they didn’t look crazy. Their friends didn’t look crazy and still don’t look crazy. Their children have now all grown up and they just know nobody is crazy. And I think I sensed the crazy and felt craziness, felt the madness that was not owned. So I veered towards
places where it was either that I found what was unsaid and tried to bring it out
and forward, but not overtly, covertly, or I just went to places where people were
more obviously dysfunctional, work experience is what I am talking about. I
married someone from a totally different background that me, totally different.

Researcher- So this is a slightly different slant on it.
It is different, I can’t get to the entitled part, let me think, be with it for a minute.
So, the entitled piece comes out in this particular character. It is a codependent
character, except it’s more than that, it is almost a pre-codependent character,
because it is about a spiritualizing, numinous, kind of place…. I feel like if I don’t
hold a piece of something, then nobody else can do it or it will be ignored. And
that is my work and my job and only I can do it. It is so hard to give away my
clients, to pass them on to other therapists. I have had to do quite a bit of work
with that. I had three clients with personality disorder that could only attach to
me.

Researcher- So it was real hard when you left your field placement?
So one other thing, one other place this part can get me in trouble out in the
world, what is coming up is that it is really rigid. It is really proud of itself and
really takes notice when others don’t do as well at a job that it is good at. Oh,
God so there is a lot of inflation around my capacities to see the big picture or be
empathic or be reflexive. If I see the other people being reactive or non-reflexive,
I totally go in to a judgmental place about it and I feel compelled to … I’m
thinking about the figure I brought to the symptom party where I brought a
mirror. I thought this character would be really collapsed looking in its’ mirror,
but when she came out she turned on the others with stuff like “Look at yourself!
It’s not me, it’s you!” Basically own your own stuff is the message of this
character and I can see other people not wanting to be accountable.

Researcher- So, it ties in with what you were saying earlier today, you don’t trust people
that are unconsciously crazy.
Exactly! I mean it is an obvious thing but not everyone makes the connection that
quickly. It is a nightmare to be with people that are not obviously crazy. It is so
scary because they are always pointing their finger outward, or that’s the fear of
it, me as a kid in that family, and the structure is that there is no self-reflection
happening. It is looking about and pointing out and if you don’t follow the rules,
you messed up.

Researcher- Ok so that is the basic issue around trust or not trusting somebody when they
are not able to accept their own craziness, because they are not aware of it. When
that happens their craziness can hurt you at any given time.
Yes, absolutely thank you. I don’t know, but the job that you come in to do when
you are this kind of person is pretty specific and it is special, and it is necessary,
absolutely! Sensing, being with people, knowing being able to, I mean I can
reach into archetypal realms with people and know them, apply them and really
see them. I see the bigger picture. I mean thank God for me because other wise
people would be, I mean the masses of people are just kind of going along not having these abilities. It is an important job.

When asked about boundaries and this subjectivity, Katie said,

(Laughing) This part doesn’t really work with boundaries. So what I do know is that the trouble this part gets me into is that I am busy sitting and absorbing, and being with and that I am so intent on doing my job, that my instinctive movements coming from a place of self protection, to rage, to “this is not OK,” or “don’t mess with me,” just doesn’t happen. This part can sit and understand a lot of really intense things that she has no business sitting and understanding. It would be better if it were this part’s job to get me out of there,

In her follow up comments, Katie related that this subjectivity felt special and victimized by being able to hold so much of other people’s suffering.

Sarah

Sarah said:

I can really relate to the aspect of putting up with hard to deal with people with too much patience until it is detrimental to me. I don’t realize it is detrimental until… which again, it was definitely related to my first job as a teacher with disabled kids. It was just give, give, give, give, and give, with very little awareness of what this giving was doing to me.

Sarah’s subjectivity also puts her in less than totally safe situations and has trouble setting boundaries. She said speaking as this subjectivity I have her dive into some uncertain situations. I actually go for some uncertainty… and adventure. I like adventure.”

She also said:

The lack of boundaries can lead to overwhelm and then depression. Midway in those three years as a teacher, I got depressed and went to therapy. What drove me to getting depressed was not being able to stand up for myself and set boundaries.

Researcher- So are you in control of Sarah in many ways?

Well, to some part, I play a much bigger role than say, the part that goes with professions that is about finances, about being financially stable and secure or making choices towards that, and I’m definitely in that situation now, but it is hard to say, being an intern, it puts you in that position. So in some of the decision making, I take control, as far as being in the world. Making choices as far as income vs. the type of work I am going to do, I choose.

Researcher- You are obviously important in Sarah’s being a good therapist, and there is a degree of specialness in that, but it isn’t grandiose like that salesman in the film clip.

I don’t overpower her that much.
Researcher- Any comments about that?
    No, that feels true. And I think that is part of me, this part has a humble quality to it. It is kind of counterintuitive, I am not a grandiose part, I am a very humble part actually.

Researcher- Tell me more about how you are humble.
    Well, if people really do give me praise, for me, for my specialness or my capacity for patience, I don't make that attention bigger. I actually get kind of embarrassed, or just feel like I am being me. People say, “It’s hard to be so patient or work with so and so” It doesn’t feel like a stretch, it just feels like me. I definitely like that or else I wouldn’t do it. There is attention or praise in the moment at least, I don’t feel puffed up about it or self righteous. There may be a grandiose part and a humble part, I don’t know.
The research topic of this dissertation was psychological multiplicity. The Research Problem asks, when grandiose subjectivities arise in the process of moving from problematic to integrated multiplicity, what is the effect of identifying and attending to the underlying shame that the grandiosity covers? The hypothesis that underlies this research question is that the opportunity to express grandiosity can help shift problematic multiplicity to integrated multiplicity if done with self-awareness. There were four major learnings and a cumulative learning.

Learning One showed that experiencing shame often creates grandiose subjectivities after experiences of unmet emotional needs in childhood. The second learning addressed the Research Problem. It was shown that addressing the shame underlying the grandiosity of encapsulated subjectivities leads to helpful empowerment that will allow the development of a more flexible identity and an integrated multiplicity. This was accomplished by talking to grandiose parts about their origins. This turned out to be an effective way to accept them and engage the shame issues that were underlying their grandiosity. The experiences of unmet needs in Learning One were often involved with power and control issues in the participants’ families, which resulted in subjectivities that were either covertly or overtly grandiose. Learning Two shows that working with the grandiose subjectivities around shame issues was enough to begin to see a shift towards empowerment. In the short amount of time spent with the participants,
it was clear that if they continued to work with their subjectivities, a more integrated multiplicity would result. From this point of view, it was also surmised that related to these power issues, that grandiose enactments by subjectivities may be the individual trying to find their own power, their authentic specialness, or ultimately their psychological autonomy. Intentionally working with grandiose subjectivities can allow their energy to come forward in a creative way.

The third learning was an example of the destructive potential of grandiosity. The learning was that the grandiosity of some protective rigid parts, is an inauthentic form of power that is disempowering and harmful to individuals as a whole. Some grandiose subjectivities acting as protectors are disempowering by preventing painful emotions from surfacing into awareness, which prevents energy bound by the protected subjectivity from being released that could lead to a more flexible and integrated multiplicity.

The fourth learning was that grandiosity may help novice therapists to work with challenging clients. The grandiosity of some subjectivities allowed these participants to work with challenging clients until they actually realized that they could meet the challenge. An additional aspect of this learning is that novice therapists can sometimes work with challenging clients due to the ability of grandiose subjectivities to help them tolerate strong affect and suffering. This finding related primarily to codependent subjectivities leading people into becoming therapists and grandiose subjectivities allowing individuals to do the work until competency comes with experience and mentoring. When dependency issues are adequately explored and managed in the therapist, the therapist can become highly empathic due to recognizing and relating the suffering of others and the therapeutic work does not function to meet the subjectivities’
codependent needs. This learning also has to do with boundaries. Boundaries allow the
novice therapist to mature and must be developed to prevent burnout in experienced
therapists.

The cumulative learning that came from this research is that actively working
with grandiose subjectivities can rapidly facilitate empowerment of individuals and begin
a move towards a more integrated multiplicity. Intrapsychic domination and subjugation
of dissociated subjectivities was seen by adaptive or owned subjectivities. It was through
getting to know and then talking with these subjectivities around shame issues that
empowerment started to emerge.

The data showed that individuals without a grandiose personality style have
subjectivities that embody grandiosity. Grandiose enactments by these subjectivities in
essence are behaviors telling therapists where shame is hidden and where psychological
work is needed. Covert, subtle and hidden, grandiosity was more common in the
participants studied. This finding was related to the finding that overtly grandiose
subjectivities tend to be dissociated. Covertly grandiose subjectivities can be as
problematic as overtly grandiose ones.

The data suggests that personifying and differentiating grandiose subjectivities
and dialoguing with them does seem to help to begin a shift from problematic multiplicity
to a more integrated multiplicity because it can help awareness to develop around shame
and grandiosity. This awareness in turn will help individuals to develop more healthy
interdependency, psychological autonomy, and a reflexive identity. These capacities will
lead to individuals better suited to leadership roles, which may have broad positive
ramifications for themselves, their communities, and the culture.
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DISCUSSION OF FILM CLIPS USED IN THE EVOKING EXPERIENCE PHASE OF IMAGINAL INQUIRY

I will now discuss each film clip and why they were included. Remember that the definition of grandiosity used in this dissertation is an exaggerated claim of an individual’s own importance and an entitled sense of feeling special. The first film clip was *About a Boy* with Hugh Grant. In the film Grant plays a handsome, young, wealthy playboy type that does not have to work for a living. The clip is from the beginning of the movie where he basically describes his philosophy of life. He describes his perfect life as basically being dependent only upon his freedom, his electronic toys, and a really cool apartment. Man is an island he says and this is the way it ought to be. For human companionship he seduces young women, especially young Swedish tourists, sleeps with them and then never calls them back. He comes off as very arrogant and stuck on himself. I intended this clip to represent parts of us that feel special enough to not need other people in any real deep and meaningful way.

The second clip has two characters that relate to grandiosity. It is *Once Around* with Richard Dreyfus and Holly Hunter. In this film, Dreyfus plays a character, Sam Sharp, that is a rich, successful, salesman that is speaking to a group of employees of a real estate development company. He is motivating them to sell condominiums. He is very outgoing, loud, sarcastic, and crassly humorous. He is overtly grandiose in his presentation and also in his scene with Holly Hunter later in the clip. Holly plays a character named Renata that is introverted but manipulative. She is drawn to him and
switches a place setting name card so that she can meet him by sitting next to him during lunch. During lunch, they talk, flirt, and sing *Fly Me to the Moon* together. Later in the film they get married. He is clearly narcissistic and she is codependent. I used the Richard Dreyfus character to trigger the experience of parts that feel special because they are successful or just feel better than other people. The Holly Hunter character was meant to see if the participant has a part that felt special by being around somebody or singled out by someone that truly is special. Sam is special in that he is very successful, handsome, and gregarious, but he is clearly grandiose, acting more special than he is. She is covertly grandiose, entitled enough to use her guile to get to know him and feeling special by attracting his attention. She ends up becoming the special one that he marries.

The next film clips shown were from *As Good as it Gets*, with Jack Nicholson and Helen Hunt. In the first scene, the Jack Nicholson character, Melvin, is at the restaurant where Carol, the Helen Hunt character, is the normal waitress where he eats every day. This is a scene that shows how much he needs Carol and how much he expects this need to be satisfied by her. It is clear from previous scenes that she is very kind and is the only one at the restaurant that puts up with all of his odd, sometimes blatantly rude, and offensive behavior. In this scene he gets upset because she is not there to wait on him. He not only gets upset, he takes it out on the substitute waitress. I used this clip to show the grandiosity that comes up when parts of us think, feel, and act like they are special because they suffer more than other people. Melvin has Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder in the film, so he does really suffer, but his treatment of the substitute waitress and even Carol character is too much and reflects this type of grandiosity.
The next clip, from the same film, is a scene where Carol is overreacting with suspicion to Melvin’s generosity. He has supplied a doctor for her son that has long-term lung problems, so that she will not have to miss work. He needs her there because she is part of his daily routine and she also puts up with him more than anyone else. He is wealthy and he wants her to be at work to wait on him, so he has a stake in her son’s health. You also get the feeling that under the selfish exterior he does care about her and her son. From observing Carol earlier in the film it is apparent that she is very kind but also may feel special because she is the only one that can put up with Melvin. In the clip she gets up in the middle of the night, rides the subway across New York City, gets rained on without a jacket, all to confront him by telling him she will “never, ever!” sleep with him. She is setting a very strong limit, but is exaggerated in her assertiveness. The viewer gets the impression that she has not been able to set boundaries with him earlier and when she finally does set boundaries, she over does it. I meant this scene to depict the grandiosity that is reflected with feeling special because one is able to put up with or work with someone that is very difficult to deal with, one that others do not want to deal with. The scene specifically depicts what happens when the lack of boundary setting early on in a problematic relationship, leads to acting out later on. This clip did not depict the special feelings of this character as well as I would have liked, but after showing it, I explained what the character was intended to evoke and it worked well during the research sessions.

The final clip was from *Big Fish* with Albert Finney. The beginning of the film depicts the main character telling a story, a tall tale about his relationship with a huge catfish, the big fish, at his son’s wedding. He clearly loves to be the center of attention
and loves telling his story, even at his son’s expense. This clip depicts feeling special enough to jump in, grab control, and take center stage, even when it is not appropriate. He of course is the grandiose big fish. There is also the sense that this character feels his story is more much important and special than other people’s stories, which is why I used it. It was meant to trigger the part of us that feels we are the most interesting, we have the best stories, and we need to be the center of attention.
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FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE GUIDING MYTHS

The following discussion contains additional material about the primary guiding myth from this dissertation. It expands on material presented in the literature review, methodology and reflections chapters that were not included due to page limits. It presents the material in a more cohesive and expanded way including material from the literature, my thoughts on the myths, and how the findings in this dissertation are related.

The Wizard of Oz story is a classic hero’s journey with Dorothy leaving home, having challenges in far off places, and returning home with newly earned wisdom. Dorothy is a young orphan girl. Dorothy represents our adaptive identity on its quest to find an integrated multiplicity and the capacities and psychological autonomy and reflexivity that come with it. At the beginning of the story her experience of identity is limited. As a hero’s journey, one thing that is not classic is that the main character is female. Many heroic journey myths involve young men. As Dorothy, we must start this quest with a feminine perspective, paying more attention to our interior life rather than doing things out in the world. Integrated multiplicity is not a goal that can be obtained with masculine heroic traits alone.

We must bring the youthful innocence and immature sibling aspects of ourselves along on this quest because it is these aspects of ourselves that must mature. The positive aspects of our youth, openness, enthusiasm, and longing, also help on this quest. The longing necessary for the journey was expressed in the film poignantly in the song
"Somewhere Over the Rainbow." The song also shows Dorothy’s imaginative faculty that is the key to her way out of Kansas.

Kansas is the place that Dorothy yearns to leave. It is portrayed on film in black and white; a monochromatic grey-toned world representing the false self, the adaptive identity. It lacks the color of the imaginal world represented by Oz, that Dorothy is about to visit. The descriptions in the book of Auntie Em and Uncle Henry are telling:

The sun and wind had changed her too. They had taken the sparkle from her eyes and left them a sober gray; they had taken the red from her cheeks and lips, and they were gray also. She was thin and gaunt, and never smiled now. Uncle Henry never laughed. He worked hard from morning till night and did not know what joy was. He was gray also, from his long beard to his rough boots, and he looked stern and solemn, and rarely spoke. 

Auntie Em and Uncle Henry represent the burned out adult man and woman that have lost the vitality of youth and have not integrated the richness and plurality of their multiplicity. Integrated multiplicity draws on the archetypal vitality of youth without its innocence and immaturity. Dorothy clearly loves her aunt and uncle but does not want to become like them or like the farm hands. In the actions of the farm hands early in the film we see the films first grandiose enactments, they all exaggerate their capacities when telling Dorothy what to do. These are pseudo-capacities. The farm hands represent latent capacities that exist within our multiplicity.

Like Dorothy, we are all eventually orphans in the sense that our biological parents all die. Our biological parents cannot supply the entire amount of Father and Mother energy necessary in our psychological life anyway. In this sense we are psychological orphans. We must find these energies in ourselves as we mature. Early in the film, after naively singing about a land where there are no troubles, Dorothy decides to run away from home. Toto is the catalyst for this move. Miss Gulch
wants him destroyed for biting her when she shooed him out of her garden after chasing her cat. To Miss Gulch, in the film, Toto is a threat to order and public safety. Miss Gulch represents a gatekeeper, the energy that in this case, represses our instinctive or animal nature and tries to prevent any changes to the adaptive identity. Miss Gulch comes to take Toto away, Dorothy protests and begs Uncle Henry and Aunt Em to intervene but they refuse to stand up to Miss Gulch and “go against the law.” Ms. Gulch takes Toto away but he escapes and returns to Dorothy, who then decides they have to run away.

Toto represents our socialized animal nature. This is important because he embodies a degree of wildness, instinct, and spontaneity without the danger of pure wildness. Toto gets Dorothy to run away from home, but she does not do anything too dangerous or harmful to herself or others. Throughout the story, Toto is important as a catalyst. This speaks to the importance of listening to the intuitive, instinctive voice of our animal nature. Intuition and instinct are the non-rational feeling parts of us that can connect with the core identity when no amount of rational thinking and trying can.

Longing alone was not enough to get Dorothy to leave home. It took the threat of loosing Toto and the betrayal by her aunt and uncle to get her moving. In life, it is often a disaster, a death, an accident or a divorce that is the call or catalyst for psychological change. Auntie Em and Uncle Henry also are no match for the gatekeeper, Miss Gulch. There are personal and cultural gatekeepers represented here. Elvira gulch owns “half the county,” so she has personal power and she invokes the power of the culture by bringing in the “law.” We all have personal and cultural gatekeepers that keep us in line in our adaptive identities.
We often refuse the call of initiation as Dorothy does after meeting the kind Professor Marvel who pretends to read her situation through his crystal ball and evokes just enough guilt in her to encourage her go back home. Even the threat to Toto, her longing to see the world, and find a trouble free place, does not override her resistance to answer the call.

Upon returning home, she finds her family and the farmhands in the storm cellar because a cyclone is bearing down on the farm. They cannot hear her calling them due to the storm, so she seeks refuge in the house but the twister takes the house up in the air, spinning away. Dorothy seeks refuge in her bedroom, the safest and most known place in the world to her, but fate intervenes and flying debris knocks her out. It is the chaos of life, the twister, that often calls us towards a transformational journey but even with this chaos, we seek the safe, the known, until something deeply affects us. In this case she is knocked unconscious, telling us that the real adventure begins when we delve into things that are not conscious to our limited adaptive identities.

The house lands with a thump, killing the Wicked Witch of the East in the process. Dorothy is not aware of this as she wakes up and exits the house into the colorful Land of Oz. Oz is the imaginal world, the land of the imagination. Henri Corbin coined the word imaginal as opposed to imaginary because the word imaginary connotes unreality. To the psyche, the world of the imagination is real, but not material. The imaginal infuses us all of the time, but it is easy to get fixated on the concreteness of the material world. Oz is colorful because it contains all of the possibilities inherent to the world of the imagination. Oz can also be interpreted as the dream world as it in the film, or as the unconscious. The imaginal world incorporates the waking imagination, the
dream state, and the unconscious mind, all of which are very real to the psyche. When Dorothy awakens at the end of the film, she advocates strongly for the reality of Oz, but the adults all call it only a dream. Our rational capacities tend to relate primarily to the material world and dismiss the imaginal as unreal, only a dream, and something to be taken lightly.

Getting back to the story, the first being that Dorothy meets in Oz is Glinda, the Good Witch of the North. Glinda embodies some of the energy of the Friend. The Friend is the energy that is always available to us; it is an archetypal experience of transpersonal energy that we can tap into for guidance. The personal aspect of the Friend could be called the higher self, but is known as the I-Friend at Meridian. Glinda, acting as the Friend, knows what is best for Dorothy and tells her to get the ruby slippers from the Wicked Witch of the East who was killed by the house when it fell into Oz. Ultimately the Friend is the collaboration of Father, Mother, and Peer energy that happens in the story when under Glinda’s guidance, Dorothy collaborates with her three allies on the journey to find the Friend. Glinda also has energy from the trickster archetype as we shall see. Ultimately, Glinda is just a caricature in the original book and movie versions of The Wizard of Oz story. Dorothy is the only fully represented character in the story. This works well for the symbolic use of the characters in this dissertation. The ruby slippers, once the magic belonging to the witch, represent Dorothy’s inner spark. Kalsched calls this the personal spirit, which he likens to Winnicott’s true self and Jung’s Self. Omer calls this the core identity. This is the seat of psychological autonomy that the I can sit in if we have good enough mothering and fathering. When trauma and shame push the I out of this seat, the psyche marshals a
variety of defenses to make us feel safe and bolster our sense of identity. In the case of
shame, the primary defensive reaction is grandiosity. These defensive moves are involved
in the creation of problematic encapsulated subjectivities and gatekeepers.

In problematic multiplicity, various encapsulated subjectivities will control the
thoughts feelings and behaviors of the individual, and pretend to assume the seat of
psychological autonomy depending on what is going on. This is a defensive move by
parts of the adaptive identity to take control, when the I that leads is not well developed.
Many of the encapsulated subjectivities will tend towards grandiosity because grandiosity
keeps us from feeling shame. Gatekeepers arise to defend the adaptive identity, which in
problematic multiplicity is made up of multiple encapsulated subjectivities.

Gatekeepers can be quite demonic. Groestein says, “When innocence has been
deprived of its entitlement, it becomes a diabolical spirit.” Such are the Wicked
Witches in the story, part of our innocence that has turned demonic. This is an attempt at
protection in response to perceived threats to the adaptive identity and ultimately, as
Kalsched points out, to the personal spirit or core identity. The witch wants the slippers
because in the psychic system, it has taken on the role of demonic protector of the core
identity.

Glinda has the shoes magically appear on Dorothy’s feet and tells her never to
take them off. This represents the I getting in touch with the core identity, claiming the
personal spirit back from the gatekeepers, with the help of the Friend. In the movie,
Dorothy does not get the shoes by her own volition. In the book she does; she takes them
off the witch and puts them on herself. This means that the I can take the true self back
with just a little guidance from the Friend, but sometimes more active help of the Friend
is necessary to accomplish this. Either way, in Jungian terms, the reincorporation of parts of the true self can be seen as the incorporation of necessary shadow material that is needed for individuation.

Next in the story, the Wicked Witch of the West shows up to get the slippers that had belonged to her sister. Glinda protects Dorothy at this point, but Dorothy will have to actively deal with this witch as she develops her capacities later in the story. Glinda also tells her to find her way home by following the yellow brick road to find the Wizard of Oz. Only the wonderful Wizard of Oz will be able to help her find her way back to Kansas. Glinda clearly knows that Dorothy could directly go home once she has the slippers, but she does not tell her this right away. She also knows that the Wizard is not the answer to Dorothy’s dilemma. Glinda tricks Dorothy for her own good, because she knows that Dorothy must be initiated to transform. The Friend can become the trickster to fool our adaptive identities to facilitate the necessary initiatory experiences that can facilitate the transformation into an integrated multiplicity. Our adaptive identities have access to the latent capacities at a very young age, but we must experience initiatory experiences, the hardships and messiness of life, to access and develop the capacities inherent in integrated multiplicity. The Friend does not protect us from the suffering necessary to become initiated. Our naïve, grandiose subjectivities think we can avoid this suffering.

The other beings that Dorothy meets right away are the Munchkins. They are the little people that Dorothy has freed from the slavery of the Wicked Witch of the East. The Munchkins represent imaginal figures that are parts of us but more fleeting and less
concretized than encapsulated subjectivities. They are subjectivities in us that are in our story but not the major characters.

Next Glinda sends Dorothy off to find the Wizard by following the Yellow Brick Road. Dorothy does not know where to start so Glinda tells her to start at the beginning. The beginning of The Yellow Brick Road is point that spirals outward. The cyclone of chaos has brought Dorothy spiraling inwards, back to her core identity, and now she starts to spiral outward to learn what she must learn in order to get home. Home represents the I in touch with the core identity, which brings psychological autonomy. Dorothy returns to an I that leads with a more mature and reflexive identity based on an integrated multiplicity. The outward spiral of the Yellow Brick Road represents the dance of chaos and creativity involved with psychological and spiritual growth. This spiral imagery from the story is also reminiscent of a labyrinth. Walking the labyrinth is a ritual experience of slowly moving from the periphery to the center and then repeating the pattern several times ending up at the periphery. It is a metaphor for the spiritual journey or sacred path. The Yellow Brick Road is the path that we all must follow to find our way home.

Along the road, Dorothy meets and is joined by the three main allies of her adventure, the Scarecrow, the Tin Man, and the Cowardly Lion. The Scarecrow wants a brain, the Tin Man yearns for a heart, and the Cowardly Lion wants courage. According to Stewart these represent the major functions of the self, thinking, feeling, and will. For the self to be an effective traveler on the path, these functions must be relatively balanced. For this dissertation, the characters represent these basic functions and also refinements and more developed forms of them. Specifically, the Scarecrow, the Tin
Man, and the Cowardly Lion represent, reflexivity, empathy, and the courage to take the next right action. dccxxv

Along the Yellow Brick Road the Wicked Witch keeps showing up, trying to stop Dorothy on her quest to get home and to take the ruby slippers back. This represents the gatekeepers’ incessant attempts to keep us in our adaptive identities and sometimes demonically protect our core identity. Gatekeepers are especially activated at initiatory thresholds. dccxxvi We need reflexivity, empathy, and the courage to take the next right action at each initiatory threshold.

I will not discuss all of the events that happen on the road but one is especially important. When the Oz travelers get close to the Emerald City, they can see it across a field of poppies. They decide to leave the path and cut across the field only to be put under a sleeping spell by the witch. There is grandiosity in leaving the path after Glinda told them that the yellow brick road was the way to the Emerald City. This is the grandiose assumption that there are short cuts, ways around suffering, on the path to maturity. After the Witch’s spell, Dorothy, the Cowardly Lion, and Toto all fall asleep, implying that the adaptive identity and the will have gone unconscious on the path, and in the process loose contact with the instinctive part of our nature. Dorothy has lost contact with the instinctive aspect of her nature that connects to her core identity, which is both the goal of the journey and the guide of the journey. In the story, the Tin Man and the Scarecrow stay awake, representing that if the feeling and thinking functions have stayed awake, there is a way out. But the thinking and feeling, Tin Man and Scarecrow, cannot solve the dilemma alone and they cry out for help. This is the concept that human beings turn to spirituality when we are really frightened. dccxxvii We are hard wired to reach
beyond the personal, towards the numinous when we are really overwhelmed. We cry out and the Friend responds, as does Glinda in the story. The Tin Man and Scarecrow are quite humorous in their cries for help in the film, but they represent a serious phenomenon. When the adaptive identity cannot think and feel its way out a dilemma, it must surrender control. This act of surrender frees up the imagination. This aspect of psychic guidance is represented archetypally in myths and fairy tales; for instance, ants help Psyche out of an impossible situation in the Psyche and Eros myth.\textsuperscript{dcxxviii} Whether this help is considered transpersonal or spiritual, or not, depends on your philosophy. What is clear is that the help of the Friend comes from of outside the normal constructs of the identity. The source is beyond the adaptive identity. In the story, Glinda responds to the cries for help by making it snow, breaking the sleeping spell of the witch, bringing the characters back to consciousness. The Friend, helping the I find consciousness, gets it back on the path.

Back on the Yellow Brick Road, the characters soon arrive at the Emerald City. The Emerald City represents the part of us that wants everything to be trouble free and to have the capacities we yearn for without working to develop them. The song, \textit{Somewhere Over the Rainbow}, represents the yearning for this place. It is seen as a city of magic, run by a wizard who can grant any wish the characters can dream up. A gatekeeper meets them when they arrive, who tries to turn them away. Again we have a representation of a gatekeeper, trying to keep the adaptive identity from experiencing initiation. In the film, the same actor plays the gatekeeper, the cab driver, and the Wizard’s guard. This means that gatekeepers can take many forms, many subjectivities can adopt the role of the gatekeeper.
They next go to see the Wizard to ask him for help. The Wizard presents himself as a floating green head with an angry face that has no body, floating over a throne calling himself “the great and powerful Wizard of Oz.” The throne is framed by multiple urns, which spout smoke and fire as he blusters at the Oz travelers. Here we see a grandiose subjectivity, floating, ungrounded, relying on grandiosity not substance, to maintain the illusion of control. This is the pseudo-power of grandiosity. When the Wizard asks who the travelers are, they present themselves with humility. Dorothy calls herself “Dorothy, the small and meek.” The uninitiated adaptive identity is small in the face of grandiose parts and lets them take control. The Wizard tells them he intends to grant their requests but first they must prove themselves worthy by getting the Witch’s broomstick for him. They protest suggesting they will have to kill the witch to get her broom, but the Wizard sends them off anyway saying they need to prove that they are worthy. This is another initiatory threshold that they must pass. They must learn that the Wizard, grandiosity, cannot give them the authentic power of the capacities they seek.

Next, they journey through a dangerous enchanted forest on their way to the Witch’s castle. Just as they get close, the Wicked Witch sends her evil winged monkeys to get Dorothy. The three characters are unable to save her and she and Toto are carried off to the castle, where the witch tells her she will kill her, because that is the only way she can get the shoes off of her feet. She also tells Dorothy that she plans to kill Toto too, for good measure. This symbolizes that the travails that must be endured in the process of initiation feel like they are life threatening to the adaptive identity. There may be lots of danger and fear involved. Another important feature here is that the slippers cannot come off unless Dorothy unless she is dead. This means that the gatekeepers will
go so far as to kill the individual to protect the core identity as is seen in the case of suicide. In less extreme cases, the image of the Witch being willing to kill Dorothy, speaks to how powerful gatekeeping is in protecting the adaptive identity and ultimately the core identity.

Next, Toto escapes and runs to find the three characters and leads them back to Dorothy. The intuitive animal nature again saves the day by getting things moving again. The three overcome their fear and sneak into the Witch’s castle to save Dorothy. The adaptive identity and major subjectivities in the adaptive identity must overcome fear of change to move on. They are immediately captured by the guards, the Winkies, and taken to the Wicked Witch. They have a brief attempted escape, are captured, and when the Witch threatens the Scarecrow with fire, Dorothy grabs a bucket of water and throws it at the witch causing her to melt and die uttering the classic line, “I’m melting, I’m melting.” The Winkies, another symbol of imaginal figures in the psyche, immediately praise Dorothy for killing the Witch. It turns out that the Wicked Witch of the West enslaved them just as the Wicked Witch of the East had enslaved the Munchkins. Dorothy asks them for the broomstick which they gladly surrender.

By standing up to the Witch, Dorothy is not only is showing independence and strength, she has freed the Winkies, just as she freed the Munchkins earlier. This symbolizes the I embracing and freeing up of the self’s multiplicity as it becomes a more effective leader. The I becomes more accepting of multiplicity as it matures and the pluralism of multiplicity is what allows this strength to emerge. In the story, Dorothy needs the collaboration of the Scarecrow, Tin Man, and the Lion to make the journey and accomplish her goals. The adaptive identity needs reflexivity, empathy, the courage to
make the next right step, and the domestic animal nature, to mature. Dorothy and her companions have captured the broomstick, which represents the incorporation of the Witch’s power. This represents integration of shadow material, also an important part of embracing one’s multiplicity.

They next return to the Emerald City to see the Wizard and claim their rewards, only to have the Wizard attempt to renege on his promise, telling them to come back the next day while he thinks about it. They protest and stand up to him and he reacts with blustering anger. Dorothy is no longer humble, small and meek, she is assertive. The I has found the leadership capacities it needs to stand up to grandiosity and injustice.

Next Toto intervenes again, pulling a curtain to reveal an elderly man, speaking into a microphone and pulling levers, and twisting knobs to control the fake image of the Wizard of Oz. It turns out that the Wizard is a fake, a humbug. Dorothy’s intuition tells her that grandiosity is fake, when Toto pulls back the curtain. While the Wizard does not enslave the inhabitants of the Emerald City, he manipulates them. They represent the parts of us that fall for the illusions thrown up by our own grandiose parts. The curtain that the Wizard hides behind could be considered to represent a veil of shame hiding the insecure self from view.

The Wizard, grandiosity, is not even powerful enough to get the Wicked Witch’s broomstick by himself; he sends Dorothy and her friends to do it! He represents major grandiose subjectivities that are more posture and image than substance. The Wizard controls the Emerald City by controlling his image; he has become the powerful, wonderful, and mysterious Wizard of Oz. Grandiose subjectivities are humbugs too; they have no real power. The man behind the curtain and the floating, blustering head, try to
control the identity with smoke and mirrors. The identity should be controlled by the I that leads, leading an integrated multiplicity. The throne that the head floats over represents the core identity, the seat of the self, the rightful place from which a reflexive identity can access the multiplicity of self. It is the throne of psychological autonomy.\textsuperscript{dexxix} Note that neither the Wizard nor his fake image sit in the throne. The image is disembodied, not grounded, floating above the throne, and therefore unable to sit in the seat of true psychological sovereignty and the Wizard hides behind his curtain.

When confronted, the Wizard reacts with anger, but does not collapse into narcissistic rage or depression as a true narcissist would. This is important because it tells us that grandiose encapsulated subjectivities are not as defended as a true narcissistic personality structure. In the story, Dorothy calls him a bad man to which he responds, “Oh no dear, I am a very good man, just a very bad wizard.” This tells us that grandiose subjectivities do not necessarily have the demonic intentions personified by the Witches even though they may create trouble for us. Remember from the Literature Review, that it has been theorized that all subjectivities in multiplicity have positive intentions.

The Wizard next proceeds to reveal to them that they all had the capacities they yearned for all along. He gives them symbols of their innate abilities, the Scarecrow gets a diploma, the Tin Man gets a testimonial of his philanthropy and a heart shaped clock, and the Lion gets a medal for courage. The point is that they developed their capacities on the initiatory path and all they needed at the moment was a ceremony to confirm their capacities, to make it real for them. This brings out the difference between ritual and ceremony as note by Victor Turner. He differentiated the two by saying that ceremony
It was the creative ritual of the journey that developed and transformed the latent capacities that were in them all along.

But what about Dorothy, how was she going to get her heart’s desire, to get home? The Wizard tells her that he will take her home himself in his hot air balloon. Before the Wizard leaves he puts the Scarecrow, Tin Man, and the Lion in charge of Oz. A grandiose subjectivity can be willing to turn control over to more appropriate subjectivities. A phenomenon like this was seen in the research when the adaptive subjectivities made room for the dissociated subjectivities to come forward under the leadership of the I, leading to empowerment. Dorothy is going to go with the Wizard, but as the balloon takes off Toto jumps out and Dorothy follows. This means that the I is still willing to follow grandiosity and has not yet accepted its own authentic power but that intuition tells the I to get out of the balloon, to not follow grandiosity. We then find that the Wizard does not know how to control the balloon. This hints at the concept that grandiosity often covers the shame of incompetence. This scene also shows that when confronted, a grandiose subjectivity may work with the other parts of the self, try to help but does not necessarily loose its grandiosity. It is in a position to do far less damage once it is exposed and integrated as part of the self that the I knows however.

Dorothy tries to catch him, but he cannot land the balloon. She begins to get discouraged and her friends ask her to stay with them in Oz but Glinda shows up again to her rescue. Glinda tells Dorothy she always has had the key to get home, her ruby slippers, her core identity. The Scarecrow asks why she did not tell Dorothy this secret earlier to which she answers that Dorothy had to find out how to get home for herself. This is standard for initiatory guidance. The elder only guides the initiate, he or she does
not tell the initiate what they are to learn or how to go about it. In a similar vein, at Meridian University, one of the teaching philosophies is experience before explanation. Students often have psychological experiences before getting the theoretical explanation behind the experience.

The Oz story tells us that grandiosity does not have to be cured to develop capacities. It also shows that we always know the way home inside of our selves. The core identity can be accessed to guide the I. This is a parallel concept to the Jungian concept of the Ego-Self axis. If one follows the images in psyche, individuation or narcissistic maturation is within our grasp. The Wizard of Oz story represents our ability to find a reflexive identity and authentic empowerment through dealing with the shame of inferiority that underlies grandiosity in problematic multiplicity.

There are other ancillary myths that inform this discussion. The myth of the Fall from the Genesis chapter of the Bible holds psychological importance both culturally and individually. It is a form of the lost Paradise mythology that is seen in all cultures in some fashion. It also has elements that are related to the multiplicity of the psyche, but the most important aspects of the story relate to the fall from grace of Adam and Eve and the resulting shame.

Culturally, the myth is about the awakening of consciousness in the evolution of human beings. This new consciousness was marked by the emergence of human awareness of death and the beginning of our separation from an imbedded or symbiotic relationship to nature or God. Just as in biology where ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny, individual psychological development follows the pattern of our collective psychological development.
Individually, the myth is about the I crystallizing out of the preverbal state of unity consciousness. As the child develops, he or she, like their ancestors, becomes aware of the separation from the symbiotic state with their mother and becomes aware that they will someday die. Also as the child develops, shame becomes an important force in the development of the experience of identity.

The narrative gives us clues as to how important shame is to the psyche. In their paradise, Adam and Eve are able to eat of the Tree of Life. They are blessed with all they need and will live forever providing that they do not eat the fruit of the other tree, the Tree of Knowledge. God had forbidden them to eat from this tree. They also have no shame at this point. The narrative says, “And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.” Paradise can represent the state of not feeling any shame.

Eden was experienced as paradise for Adam and Eve until they ate the apple from the Tree of Knowledge. This is the sin of hubris that Adam and Eve committed against God. This act of hubris led to the Fall of Adam and Eve from the grace of God and feelings of shame. Adam and Eve would have had an everlasting shame free life in Eden if they had not eaten the apple in order to be like God.

Edinger has outlined the meaning of the story of the Fall well in his book *Ego and Archetype*. He describes the psychic life cycle in which inflation leads to a heroic or inflated act that leads to rejection. Rejection in turn leads to shame, humility, and repentance, and eventually acceptance and a reconnection with self. In the multiplicity model as used in this dissertation, grandiose enactments by problematic subjectivities create a similar phenomenon. These episodes and the resulting fall, can lead us to areas where there is shame underlying grandiosity. This is an opportunity to for the adaptive
identity to reconnect with and further develop shame-bound parts of the self that are the keys to developing the real capacities inherent in our multiplicity. This is what Dorothy does in the Wizard of Oz. When her grandiose expectations that the Wizard can solve all her problems fail, she is able to incorporate and develop the capacities of reflexivity, empathy, and the courage to take the next right step. She also incorporates the shadow power from the witch, and with the help of the Friend, she claims these capacities for herself.

The other aspect of both the myth of the Fall and the Wizard of Oz is the longing for Paradise. It is an archetypal experience that we long for a trouble free life. This can be read as the desire to regress back to Eden, or to transcend the earthly realm for a better place. In the Oz story, Dorothy has the longing but transcends it and gets back to Kansas, her true home, with an integrated multiplicity and a reflexive identity.

The myth of Narcissus and Echo is also important to this dissertation. The images from the Wizard, from Oz, do not hold all the nuances of grandiosity that are seen in Narcissus and Echo. The Oz characters represent parts of the immature self that if integrated are healthy, but if not integrated can form encapsulated areas of grandiosity in problematic multiplicity. Narcissus and Echo represent polarized versions of narcissism and grandiosity. This dissertation dealt with more subtle forms of these energies; the myth tells us many things about the complimentary nature of overt and covert narcissism and grandiosity.

Both Narcissus and Echo are cursed by the gods and are not incorporated into integrated multiplicity. In the story their earthly forms waste away and die. Narcissus leaves behind a narcissus flower and Echo leaves behind her echoing voice. This is a
warning to us to integrate these grandiose energies in our selves, so that we can lead full
human lives and not waste away like they do.

Narcissus was a beautiful young man that would not accept the loving advances
from any of his admirers, male or female. As Ovid put it, “his soft young body housed a
pride so unyielding that neither boys nor girls could touch him.” Because he
grandiosely rejects the love of others, the god Nemesis, the goddess of just punishment,
puts a curse on him, which makes him to fall in love with his own reflection on the
surface of a pond. Narcissus pines away, starving and keeps staring at his beloved image
in the water, but is not able to touch or hold it. At first he does not realize that it is his
own reflection that he is staring at, but eventually he realizes that it is and laments his
predicament and he eventually dies. A narcissus flower blooms on the spot of his death
and he is taken to Hades. As he crosses the River Styx, his gaze is still transfixed on his
reflection in the river. According to Jacoby, Narcissus ultimately represents:

the human drive for self-knowledge an self-realization, with the admonition
‘Become who you are!’ – and thus it implies the possibility of transcending the
narrower forms of narcissistic problems.

The blooming of the narcissus flower represents the challenge of multiplicity through
shame awareness, the potential to transform grandiosity and shame into integrated
multiplicity and a reflexive identity.

Narcissus finds transformation only in death and even then, he does not lose his
preoccupation with his own image. At first Narcissus finds pleasure in the outer world,
including his physical beauty, but he grandiosely rejects the love of others. When he first
stares at the pond, it is the false, superficial, self-image that preoccupies him. He still
thinks the image is outside of self; he is still imagining the other is what he yearns for.
The image is not real, not able to be held, which causes him suffering. There is paradox here. Real others cannot satisfy him, and yet he thinks that his own reflection is another being that can fulfill him. Grandiose parts of the self cannot connect with others; they must first connect to a more authentic self in order to connect with others.

Eventually, in his suffering, Narcissus realizes that the image he sees in his reflection is his own face, and he begins to become more conscious of his inner world. He yearns for a less superficial understanding of self, which leads to a transformation that takes Narcissus deeper into his understanding of himself. The soul never loses its preoccupation with the self. Again, something flowers when grandiosity dies; it is the loss of superficiality that one obtains from deeper exploration of multiplicity. This is an aspect of being human that we all have that is essential and normal, the drive towards individuation. Jacoby makes the distinction between individuation and narcissism based on the sense of specialness felt by the individual. In the following quote, he addresses the difference between narcissism and individuation.

It may be the quality of the sense of ‘specialness’ that makes the difference. A sense of being special may mean: ‘I am especially beautiful, intelligent, good, clever, powerful, etc.’ It may also mean: ‘My sense of my own world depends on whether this fact is seen and acknowledged by others; if that is not the case, then I am totally worthless, nothing. My very existence depends on whether my specialness is admiringly acknowledged or not.’

It is this sense of specialness that is important to this dissertation in that, when the drive to individuate, the focus on self, entails specialness, we are falling into the trap of grandiosity. Narcissus only represents part of the self, a part that if integrated with other parts is healthy. In the myth, he does not integrate his grandiosity and move on to live a healthy human life. Echo also represents the possibility of something healthy, the focus
of our energy on others. But she too does not mature into integrated multiplicity; only her echoing voice lives on.

In the myth, Narcissus rejects Echo even though she is echoing his specialness back to him. This is healthy in the sense that he must focus on the self and he is rejecting the grandiose reflections of Echo. If he accepted her echoes they would be guilty of narcissistic collusion. His overt grandiosity would be reflected by her covert grandiosity, but neither would be acting out of their true selves.

Echo has been cursed to only be able to speak the words that others have said. When she reaches out to embrace Narcissus, he flees and says, “Hands off! Embrace me not! May I die before I give you power over me!” She replies by saying only, “I give you power over me!” This is very telling, Narcissus sees the love of another as giving up his power and Echo is only too willing to give hers away. He is too independent and she is too dependent. They represent the grandiose parts of us that do not have healthy interdependency and appropriate power within integrated multiplicity.

Grandiose enactments by encapsulated subjectivities can point us towards the parts of self that were created by narcissistic wounding in the past and are bound by shame in the present. These subjectivities need to be worked with to facilitate a more integrated multiplicity. It is our need to feel special mediated by our Narcissus and Echo like parts rather than the internal healthy felt sense of being unique, that keeps us from attaining a true sense of healthy self-esteem. The possibility in working with these types of encapsulated subjectivities is the alchemy of transforming the lead of grandiosity into the gold of healthy self-esteem, integrated multiplicity, and a reflexive identity.
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dlxi. [www.psychmovies.com](http://www.psychmovies.com) and [www.freudian-flicks.com](http://www.freudian-flicks.com). I am also indebted to Jay Rice who used film clips to teach psychopathology at the Meridian. This experience gave me the idea to use film to evoke this experience and even gave me one of the films, *Once Around*.
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dlxi. Ibid., p. 2.
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dlxxv. Omer, *Integrative Seminar III* course notes (Petaluma, CA: Meridian University, June 21, 2000). These are capacities that Omer considers essential for psychotherapists.
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**Chapter 4**

dlxxix. Stone and Stone, *The Voice Dialogue Series*, Disc 1. The term adaptive subjectivities will be used here, rather than owned selves because this type of subjectivity makes up the adaptive identity, a term more in line with the curriculum at Meridian University.
dlxxx. Ibid.
dlxxxi. Ibid.
dlxxxii. Also, some of the participants named their subjectivities when asked what to call them, others just referred to them with a description such as, “the part that makes me feel special because I can work with difficult people.”
dlxxxiii. Some of the subjectivities could not remember a time when they were not a part of the participant. Others could remember a specific incident that resulted in the subjectivity coming forward in the individual’s personality.
dlxxxiv. She said: He had this huge presence and I remember feeling so small and so scared. He was not going to hit me or anything, but he let me know that he was in charge and what he wanted, and I was not going to interfere with what he was planning.
dlxxxv. She said, “There wasn’t space for Susan to come forth and be a star, or to even be developed. They liked the way that I would accommodate their energy.”
dlxxxvi. For example, as a young adult, Susan put up with her sister’s husband making sexual advances towards her. Even though it really made her angry, she did not tell her sister or anyone else about his advances until after her sister and brother-in-law were divorced. She was clearly ashamed of not being able to confront this man or tell anyone in her family because of her accommodating subjectivity.
dlxxxvii. This accommodating part has also kept her out of certain positions of personal power that she has aspired towards like teaching in her field.
dlxxxviii. She went on to say, “The Albert Finney energy in someone else normally takes the stage and I’m more like water that finds places other than the spot that the Albert Finney has taken.” The Accommodator was afraid of what Albert Finney energy might do in her life, saying “I am afraid that the Albert Finney energy is totally self involved and won’t be connected, and connection is important to me. I’m afraid that the Albert Finney energy will turn people off.”
dlxxxix. While speaking about the accommodating behavior or speaking from this part, she sat slightly slumped, often with her hands folded and tended to let her eyes drift down when describing how she felt small, powerless or constantly willing to accommodate.
dxc. Bill, speaking as the Pusher said: Yeah, I was failing in a way, and that really sort of resulted in a crisis response that gave me a lot more power. I’m almost like the Homeland Security Department or something after 9/11. I really was not empowered before then.

dxci. He describes this subjectivity by saying, I have an occasionally out of control self that will cause me to do things frenetically, compulsively, and resentfully. It almost does not matter what is around me. It becomes a self that is unconscious.

dxcii. When he reluctantly went to see her in the nursery after his wife’s insistence that he had to, he claimed it was “love at first sight.” This story never felt quite right to Karen. It was not her fault she was born a girl and the feelings of rejection in the story always outweighed the supposed love at the end of the story that felt tagged on by her father to make it a better story.

dxciii. Karen, speaking of her early life, said: And I think I learned early on to adapt, like I was codependent with her [speaking about her mother] and just adapted, like getting real quiet. [Long pause] I don’t know. I disappeared as an adaptation and thus created more suffering, maybe because I didn’t learn how to show up and say ‘I need your attention.’ Instead I would disappear. ‘I won’t rock the boat. I won’t take any of your time and attention.’ And so I suffered in that personality dynamic of not knowing how to assert myself and be, have an opinion or have a personality or whatever…

dx civ. She said, “To get upset, or to defend myself, or to do anything else but just be with him was just not a choice. I just had to be able to hold it and be somewhat rational.”

dx cv. Katie also said the following about her family, “We weren’t allowed to go to emotional places in my family, yet there was so much pain, palpable pain. It was really intense with lots of disowned anger, grief, and rage.”

dx cvi. She said: If he was around, he was the first one taken care of. When I was about 12, he did something that upset me so much that I went to my room in tears. Instead of my mom taking care of me, she took care of him. He was upset, because he upset me or he was mad and upset, and she was busy taking care of him rather than taking care of me! So he hurt me, and he got taken care of! That role model was infuriating to see. So in a way, if he was not around, she was more in her own shoes. If he was around, it was all about him, and she would just serve him, please him, and take care of him.

dx cvii. She said, “I got a lot of praise from him for that, for having such a unique interest and being able to use that hat out in the world.” This subjectivity also caused Sarah to strongly identified with Helen Keller’s teacher, Ann Sullivan. The book about Ann Sullivan and Helen Keller was her favorite book as a child. She also said, “Yeah, to do something, something interesting, more than just being the way I was. I had to have something interesting to talk about, to report, to be interesting to my father.”

dx cviii. When asked about controls and boundaries her subjectivity said, “I take control in ways that are not best for Sarah, I take control in what is best for me. [Laughing]. It also makes it hard to set boundaries sometimes, especially when it is time to stop giving to others. When asked about whether this subjectivity affected her ability to set boundaries she said,

Yeah, it can and this can lead to depression, to overwhelm first, then to depression. Midway in those three years as a teacher, I got depressed and went to therapy, just knowing something wasn’t right. What drove me to that state, to getting depressed, was not being able to stand up for myself and set boundaries.

dx cix. He said: I remember being corrected, brought over to the side, talked to by my mom and told to stop it, or my friends were going to go home… threatened, shamed. But I definitely remember it was like, nobody heard me, and nobody’s fixing it, nobody’s doing anything about it. I remember that then I got even angrier.
The following is Mike describing his authoritarian part: When the Authoritarian in me starts to come out, the message has to get received, there has to be some respect, a response that says ‘I hear you.’ If it does not work, I do not leave that space and go back to being friendly or nice. I say ‘Well, I guess I was not authoritarian enough, mean enough, assertive enough. Okay, I guess we’ll go there won’t we?’ And it’s like I have to release, I’ll go into an authoritarian rage, a place that just says, ‘You will listen to what I’m saying, and you will do this, it’s not negotiable anymore. I don’t give a fuck about your feelings.’

The teacher was speaking in class and I said, “Boss!” And everybody turned around and kind of laughed. And yeah, I’m remembering feeling queasy and thinking, “Oh God, what have I done?” I tried sticking myself out and I got looked down on or got singled out as… [He trailed off into silence, head and eyes turning down as if experiencing the shame and queasiness all over again.]

He tells of his father leaving his mother and him at about age six, noting that his resultant fear of abandonment, kept him from speaking up to or getting out of line with his father. This subjectivity had him keep his mouth shut around his father even though he was really angry with his father leaving his mother and him. Steve’s tone reflected shame over not ever being able to confront his father over the hurt he had caused Steve and his mother when they were dependent on him.

He describes it thusly: I feel my convictions passionately. And I feel afraid about standing up for them, on my own, by myself. So it’s, really the conflict, it is the heat or the energy of the conflict when I’m standing for something by myself that becomes tolerable only when I’m standing with another or with many others.
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Kaufman, The Psychology of Shame, 64.

Ibid., Unmet physical needs can also result in shame although in this study unmet needs were emotional.

S. Johnson, Character Styles, 156.

Lowen, Narcissism: Denial of the True Self, 76-77.

Morrison, Shame: The Underside of Narcissism, 71

Omer, see note 234 Chapter 2.

Kaufman, The Psychology of Shame, 92.

Ibid., 69-73.

Ibid., 90-92.
dcxix. Ibid., 73-76.
dcx. Ibid., 76-79.
dcxii. Ibid., 79.
dcxiii. Ibid., 86.
dcxiv. Ibid., 87.
dcxv. Ibid., 84.
dcxvii. The manner in which the data was collected also supports the validity. The questions used to elicit data with the participants were appropriate in the sense that participants were encouraged to talk about their experience of shame without being shamed. The questions and the physical settings relate to the Modes of Experience in that they reflect father function, logistical safety, linear, structured progression of the interviews, and the mother function, emotional safety, flexibility during the interviews, and empathy. In the interviews, I was able to hold peer energy for the participants. It was made clear during the presentation of the film clips that I too had grandiose subjectivities and that I was exploring these issues in myself, not just doing research on them. The questioning during this research with mother, father, and peer energy present allowed me to embody the Friend and allowed the participants to deeply access their experience, which satisfied the Kaufman’s second step, returning internalized shame to its interpersonal origins.
dcxviii. She said “The shift has stayed in place. That session allowed me to move from the over-identification with being so accommodating of others to the detriment of myself. It allowed me to sit in that Albert Finney energy and recognize how powerful it is. So I am not projecting it on to others and I’m no longer caught in the dynamic without being caught between the tension of the opposites, the dualistic dance that started in my childhood.”
dcx. I’m really appreciating that I volunteered, finding out what was there, who I am, this part. And through the dialoging… it’s very interesting to tie it in with boundaries. I am fascinated by how one isolated boundary incident related to this part of me could affect me as a young girl, and how that put me out in the world later on, and how it has affected my relationships.
dcxii. I get the sense that if these two could work together that I would be liberated in some way. And I don’t know what that would be. I’m already sensing gatekeepers coming. So there’s a risk there, leaving the familiar, to embody that kind of change and that kind of collaborativity between subjectivities. And it’s like the scary part is will people accept me? Will I be okay?
dcxiii. There’s some ways in which I’ve been holding him down so long, it doesn’t give him an experience of how held back he is. It’s like throwing the baby out with the bath water or trying so hard that I overstepped my bounds and now it is insidious, part of his physiology.
dcxiv. I appreciate having the time to go in-depth, or just sort of stay with it for a length of time, because this is an important dynamic in me. You know, there is a real seed of healing in this work [Pause], and some surprising things that I learned, places to do some excavation.
Her success in this work speaks to skill in working with selves from her Voice Dialogue work.


Mitchell and Black, *Freud and Beyond*, 92.


Memmi, *Dependence*, 3-7.

Omer, see note 39 Chapter 1.


Ibid. Omer notes the principle that gatekeepers arise at initiatory thresholds.

It is interesting because I see these are two compensating patterns in me, one that needs attention because I need so much, you know, because I’m a single mom or whatever [she uses a whining, self mocking, stylized tone], and the other part [spoken in a normal tone of voice] that gets attention by having a story to tell about how much I have suffered.

She said; “Yeah, you know, therapeutically, just to really just be with the suffering, probably is the way out, rather than telling the story, because telling the story hasn’t been satisfying for me. It has not been satisfying, but it’s been my coping mechanism, a strategy that I have created to try to amend the wound or something.”

She said; “It’s about being still, being able to download information, it’s about gestating, being there, receiving. That part keeps me really away from my [voice trailing off, head and shoulders slumping down, she doesn’t say what this part keeps her away from] … it’s really about stillness. I can’t move from the spot. My job is to be here with it, whatever pain is in the room and not move. I then asked, What would happen if you moved? I wouldn’t be able to, I’d die… annihilation.”

Working as a therapist has helped me in this regard. It is easier to control my need and grandiosity in the therapy room.


Ibid., 7-16.

Kalsched, *Inner World of Trauma*, 45.
A demonic example that he gives would be a dream figure that is an axe murderer.

Balint, 16-23.

Ibid., 28-29.

Ibid., 29.

See note 64 in this section.

She said “He would go into a rage and then leave and I would be sitting there being the therapist for the whole family system. I would be left to explain it all, and soothe everybody’s feelings, and understand my father’s position, and make it all better somehow, listen to my mother, listen to my brother…”

I think that it serves me, however I don’t feel safe when I’m around people that don’t own their craziness. It terrifies me. Growing up in my family, they were mainstream upper middle class people, they didn’t look crazy, but they were.

The full quote was: (Laughing) This part doesn’t really work with boundaries. So what I do know is that the trouble this part gets me into is that I am busy sitting and absorbing, and being with and that I am so intent on doing my job, that my instinctive movements coming from a place of self protection, to rage, to “this is not OK,” or “don’t mess with me,” just doesn’t happen. This part can sit and understand a lot of really intense things that she has no business sitting and understanding. It would be better if it were this part’s job to get me out of there.

She said speaking as this subjectivity, “I have her dive into some uncertain situations. I actually go for some uncertainty… and adventure. I like adventure.” She said: The lack of boundaries can lead to overwhelm and then depression. Midway in those three years as a teacher, I got depressed and went to therapy. What drove me to getting depressed was not being able to stand up for myself and set boundaries.


Ibid.

Ibid.


Ibid.

Guggenbuhl-Craig, Power in the Helping Professions, 104.

Ibid.

In the previous section it was noted that in novice therapist grandiosity may be a reaction related to not knowing what to do and an inability to tolerate uncertainty. This sounds very close to a shame reaction due to inferiority that is common in all novices at many tasks.
Chapter 5

dclxix. Omer, conversation with the author, March 13, 2006. I brought this image up in personal communication with Omer and Omer suggested that I consider looking at grandiose enactments in multiplicity.


dclxxiv. Omer, *Integrative Seminar III* course notes (Petaluma CA: Meridian University, June 21, 2000). Omer introduced the concept of Pan and the nymphs relating to naïveté, I connected this with the story of Dorothy. See also López-Pedraza, *Hermes and his Children*, 141-173 for a discussion of Pan.

dclxxv. Lifton, 5 and 8. Lifton discusses Proteus as the god of multiplicity.


dclxxviii. Ibid., *Dionysus in Exile*.

dclxxix. López-Pedraza, *Hermes and his Children*, 175-201. This is a complete discussion of Priapus and his grandiosity.


dclxxxi. All individuals have archetypal potentials that can manifest as the same type of subjectivity but each of us has specific subjectivities that shape our adaptive identities.


dclxxv. Schwartz, *Internal Family Systems Therapy*. Voice Dialogue and Ego-State Therapy are also currently being taught but Schwartz is actively doing continuing education on a national level.

dclxxvii. Mark Danner, “The Struggles of Democracy and Empire,” *New York Times*, 10/8/02. He said the plan was “a vision of great sweep and imagination: comprehensive, prophetic, evangelical. In
its ambition and grandiosity there has been nothing like it in American foreign policy since the ‘rollback’ ambitions of General Douglas MacArthur and his allies in the Republican Party a half-century ago”

dclxxxvii. Would it not serve the greater good if the critics of the government took back their projections of shadow grandiosity onto the Bush administration? Would it not also serve if Bush’s supporters were able to own their own grandiosity that is being acted out on the global stage?

dclxxxviii. Hillman, Re-visioning, xii., and López-Pedraza, Cultural Anxiety, 17.

dclxxxix. López-Pedraza, Cultural Anxiety, 12, 15, 16. López-Pedraza has primarily related cultural and personal Titanism to psychic excess and emptiness. The Titans, being present earlier than the gods in Greek mythology, represent less differentiated images than the gods in the psyche.

dcx. Ibid., 15.

dcxci. Ibid.


dcxiii. As this dissertation is going for binding, the situation in Iraq is calming down but these principles still hold.

dcxiv. The United States used force to topple Saddam and it is primarily using force to try to make peace. It is time that the United States turn towards developing the authentic empowerment to solve the problem for the long run. It seems that one way to do turn towards authentic cultural power is to look at its own cultural grandiosity and the shame that it covers.

dcxv. There are those that have attacked him from the start of his campaign. I don’t mean to imply that he has universal support.


dcxvii. Ibid.

dcxviii. Ibid.

dcxix. Ibid.

dcx. Certainly titanic excessiveness may proliferate and maybe even lawlessness.


dcxii. Feminists might say that a black man is closer to the old cultural center than a woman, but there are also those that saw Clinton as closer to the center due to her connection to Bill Clinton’s circle of power. Either one would have been historic, being the first non-white or non-male president. Interestingly, Obama has appointed Hillary Clinton as his Secretary of State and has appointed many Clinton insiders to his cabinet. With this experience on board for guidance hopefully he will consult with more peripheral players during his administration. Or… maybe these individuals will feel able to bring their own peripheral ideas and energies forward in these times where change is wanted and needed.


dcxiv. Ibid., 3.
Appendix 1

dccx. Please note that the actual research did not use all of the same the same films mentioned in the Ethics Application because it became evident to me that some of them were too narcissistic. I ended up using more subtle examples of grandiosity.

Appendix 13


dccxiv. Ibid.

dccxv. Ibid.

dccxvi. Ibid.

dccxvii. Ibid.


dccxix. For a more fully developed characterization of Glinda and the Wicked Witch, see *Wicked*, the book by Gregory Maguire or the stage play of the same name. *Wicked* is psychologically about splitting of archetypes, scapegoating, and the complex nature of evil. It is an interesting back story to *The Wizard of Oz*, but it complicates the symbols used in this dissertation so is not cited here or used in this discussion of the guiding myths.


dccxxii. Zweig and Abrams, 239.


dccxxiv. Ibid., 43.

dccxxv. Omer, see note 14 Chapter 3

dccxxvi. Ibid.

dccxxvii. Mogensen, God is a Trauma, This is the main point of his book.

dccxxviii. Young, Myth and Story course notes, September 14, 2002.

dccxxix. Omer, see note 66, Chapter 4.


dccxxxi. Ibid.


dccxxxiv. The Holy Bible, King James Version, Genesis, 2: 25.

dccxxxv. Jacoby, Shame and the Origins of Self-Esteem, 17. This is reminiscent of how the titan Prometheus stole fire from the gods.

dccxxxvi. Jacoby, Longing for Paradise. See also Wilbur, Collected Works, which includes his volumes, the Atman Project and Return to Eden that are about this phenomenon individually and culturally. Wilber primarily discusses this longing as a spiritual drive to literally transcend by evolving higher consciousness.

dccxxxvii. Ovid, quoted in Jacoby, Individuation and Narcissism, 9.

dccxxxviii. Ibid., 29.

dccxxxix. Ibid., 19.
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