

INCLUSION

inclusion: the turning towards and experiencing of another person's subjective experience, without judgment and without losing the separateness or centeredness of one's own existence,

Discussion:

In therapy, in contrast to everyday relationships, this is usually a more one-sided relationship, and not always even possible, as when a patient is defensive or resisting contact.

Illustrative Quotations:

• **Buber:** "...a bold swinging – demanding the most intensive stirring of one's being – into the life of the other." (1965, p. 81)

• **Buber:** "It would be wrong to identify what is meant here with the familiar...term, 'empathy.' Empathy means to 'transpose' oneself over there and in there. Thus it means the exclusion of one's own concreteness, the extinguishing of the actual situation of life, ... Inclusion is the opposite of this. ... Its elements are, first, a relation, of no matter of what kind, between two persons, second, an event experienced by them in common, in which at least one of them actively participates, and third, the fact that this one person, without forfeiting anything of the felt reality of his activity, at the same time lives through the common event from the standpoint of the other.

A relation...of inclusion may be termed a dialogical relation." (1947/1955, p. 97)

• **Hycner:** "...inclusion was not in any manner a cognitive act – rather it was an *existential stance* paradoxically embodying the other's experience (the 'the not-me as-experienced-by-me') without losing my experience (Hycner & Jacobs, 1995, p. 48)

• **"Reva"** (a patient): "I wanted someone to be there *with me*,...to *touch my soul*, to *feel my despair*,..."*I felt you were right there with me, at my core.* ...I knew you understood." (Hycner & Jacobs, 1995, pp. 34, 38)

• **Jacobs:** "Buber describes the therapy relationship as a 'one-sided inclusion' rather than mutual inclusion. In one-sided inclusion the helper strives to imagine the reality of the other, but the reverse does not ordinarily happen and is not intended. If the relationship is mutually inclusive then it cannot be therapy. ...it is the responsibility of the therapist to meet the patient, and not for the patient to meet the therapist (Hycner & Jacobs, 1995, pp. 79-80)

"...the healing effects of dialogue are inaccessible to the patient whose defensive structures prohibit entering dialogue (in Friedman, 1976a) ...*the practice of inclusion may not be enough.* Patients can be assisted in their attempts to enter dialogue by increasing awareness of their defensive structures." (Hycner & Jacobs, 1995, p. 69)

Last Update: 12/16/12

Stephanie Sabar, MSW, LCSW
Website: stephaniesabar.com

Content copyright 2012. Stephanie Sabar. All rights reserved.
No material may be republished in print or online without the author's permission.