

The Alexander Technique, science and new ideas

Michael Protzel continues the discussion of the scientific context surrounding Alexander's discoveries, with reference to his own theories of "weight commitment"

I thank *Statnews* Editor, Jamie McDowell, for inviting members to contribute to the ongoing discussion of Science and the Alexander Technique. I'd like to add my thoughts to those of Gerald Foley and Tim Kjeldsen.

Tim simply and eloquently sets forth Alexander's basic theory: "that misuse arises fundamentally because people rely on more or less non-conscious means (at the fundamental level of the use of themselves they employ in activity) for the pursuit of more or less conscious ends." [1] This raises an important question: How is it that infants and toddlers can 'ride the wave' of millions of years of evolution to become, in a very short time on this planet, shining examples of neck free-head forward and up-back lengthening and widening— only to very soon thereafter become children (and later, adults), manifesting the symptoms of mis-use that are so common in our culture?

The Alexander Technique is eminently practical work. Its purpose is to give an individual the tools to gain awareness of the mis-use that non-conscious direction creates — and to prevent it. But Gerald Foley notes a problem: "The differences in approach [to the practical work of the Alexander Technique] depending on teacher lineages, training schools, and individual teachers are huge and not always amiable. Using Alexander's language we cannot even explain ourselves comprehensibly to each other, let alone the outside world — think, for example, of what we mean by 'the primary control.' This lack of a clear means of communication is

a major obstacle not just to how we project ourselves as a profession, but to the development of our individual skills. I think we would be more effective...if we were able to use the much less ambiguous language that science offers." [2] Tim states that "primary control is not a mechanism...[but] a psycho-physical concept...[It] has to exploit mechanisms, but, strictly speaking, it is not critically important exactly what they are...[W]e already know [that primary control and the head-neck-back relationship] are linked, although we might not know exactly how and what else might be involved... We don't require a physiological explanation in order to treat the 'primary control' as a valid theoretical concept; although its physiological nature and status needs to be open to confirmation or refutation by disciplines external to our own... So even if we are in hock to the physical sciences over the primary control, we can learn to adapt our work to whatever it is they eventually deliver to us as an explanation for postural integration." [3]

If the work we do is first and foremost practical, then how could it be "not critically important," as Tim claims, what the "mechanisms" are that underlie primary control? If we seek to prevent interference with a particular innate mechanism, wouldn't it help to know how this mechanism works? How else can we know what interferes with it? Tensing the neck and shortening/narrowing the torso are not the causes of interference. They are symptoms.[4] As self-use professionals, it should be up to us to come up with a coherent explanation.

By the time *The Use of the Self* was published in 1932, Alexander had already recognized that he had founded a new field of inquiry.⁵ Yet, according to Marjory Barlow, Alexander also recognized that he had "only scratched the surface of the egg," and that it was up to his successors to "scratch deeper."⁶ This plainly indicates that Alexander was aware that his knowledge of self-use was limited, that there was much he did not know. As profound and inspiring as his body of work is, he was only one person. Scientific progress requires the work of many people.

We don't require a physiological explanation in order to treat the 'primary control' as a valid theoretical concept; although its physiological nature and status needs to be open to confirmation or refutation by disciplines external to our own...

I came to the Alexander Technique in 1980 at age 30, genuinely afraid for my future health and well-being. I had a major case of debauched kinesthesia and a lifetime of injuries to show for it. Although my problems were dramatically different than Alexander's — starting at my feet and moving up the body joint-by-joint — my process for addressing them was formed solely through following F.M. Alexander's map of 'self-use territory,' with the aid of my teachers and colleagues.

In 1992, my self-study took a sudden and unexpected turn when I witnessed myself 'mis-committing my body weight.' In a flash, I 'knew' that I was witnessing the source of all my injuries. I have spent the last 20 years exploring this in depth. Through my explorations, I've developed an understanding of the "mechanisms" of primary control. By attempting to articulate this understanding, I mean no disrespect to Alexander. He is my inspiration.

Without his work, I would have nothing at all to say. But I do have something to say — something I believe adds to our field. Any developing field of inquiry needs to be able to hear and incorporate non-conforming, new ideas when valid. If we want our work to be better recognized in the world, we ourselves need to recognize some clear and simple truths that have been obscured by habit and faulty sensory appreciation, and that, seemingly, have not been observed or understood by anyone else.

Basic uprighting/weight commitment theory

1. From the moment we're born, gravity compels our body mass down to earth. The substantial energy thus generated (I call it the 'force of our falling') has determinative impact, for better or for worse, on how we upright.

Uprighting — the act of lifting ourselves into verticality — is a species-defining activity. Innate uprighting, having evolved over millions of years, is the act of doing this with optimal efficiency. We all inherit this innate uprighting ability and manifest it as infants/toddlers. Although infants/toddlers may appear clumsy because they lack coordination skills for complex activities that take time and advanced muscularity to develop, they are not at all clumsy when it comes to the basic skill of uprighting. In this, they are free and easy.

Innate uprighting works in a very specific way. Most importantly, it requires that we use the full force of our gravity-compelled falling as fuel to power our self-lifting. Moreover, if the force of our falling is not used constructively, this very force works against us; it is never neutral. By better understanding how innate uprighting works, we can better understand how we interfere. It is through interfering with this fundamental human ability —

the basis of all sitting, standing and locomotive activities — that we disable ‘neck free, head forward and up, back lengthening and widening.’

2. Each of us, individually, is responsible for directing the force of his/her own falling. Gravity only sends us down. It is our individual consciousness that directs, moment-by-moment, the specific downward trajectory. It is this trajectory that determines whether the force of our gravity-compelled body mass is working for or against us.

Committing body weight is not optional. We don’t get to choose whether or not to do it. Our body mass is constantly falling down to earth. And it is we, individually, who constantly provide the direction — whether or not we are aware of doing so. When well-directed (through the sit-bones in simple sitting, the tali in simple standing, for example), the force of our falling provides the energy source — clean and renewable — that fuels our deepest extensor musculature. Infants/toddlers inherit and employ our innate uprighting capabilities as they learn to sit, stand and move with ease, grace and power. When mis-directed (away from the sit bones or tali), the abundant energy of our body mass ceases to fuel optimal uprighting. Instead, the force of our falling drives us off-balance, creating a topple that requires: (1) an immediate muscular bracing, to stop the topple and establish the stability required to lever ourselves up into verticality (a bracing that needs to be held as long as our mis-direction persists); and (2) a contorting of our skeleton, so that we maintain a relatively level head in the midst of our topple.

The greater the mis-direction, the more skeletal contortion and the more strenuous the act of uprighting.

“When well-directed (through the sit-bones in simple sitting, the tali in simple standing, for example), the force of our falling provides the energy source — clean and renewable — that fuels our deepest extensor musculature.

3. At a very early age, all of us in Western civilization begin interfering with innate uprighting, without recognizing it. We fall backwards in sitting, lean one-way-or-another in standing. We lose all recognition of the vital link between the trajectory of our downward movement and the quality of our uprighting, something we experienced as infants/toddlers. We continue to be able to gain our ‘ends’ — to be able to sit, stand, walk and run. But we use concocted, inferior means. The innate uprighting system lies dormant. Functioning declines. We are trapped in habit. From the day we are born, we see big people sitting back in chairs, sofas, cars, trains.... everywhere. Of course, this does not cause immediate or even near-term problems because engaging the innate uprighting system is the only way we, as infants/toddlers, can gain the ends we so passionately desire (to sit and stand). Mis-committing weight is not an option — we have not yet developed the musculature to support bad use. But observing our elders leaves an indelible impression, with a message that is all too clear: committing weight backwards is a perfectly

appropriate thing for people to be doing. It isn’t! Yet, by age 5, the act of sitting back has become utterly routine — and by this time we have developed the muscle strength to support mis-use.

Committing weight backwards aborts innate uprighting. Every time we do it, we tense the neck and shorten/narrow the torso. As children, we do it constantly, everywhere — including all day long in school — without giving it a second thought. We remain successful in achieving our ends: sitting, standing, etc. But this success comes at great cost. We lose the basic skill of innate uprighting that we inherited. We lose awareness of the vital connection between how we fall and how we lift. And we lose it so early in life that we don’t even know we have lost anything. And neither do any of the adults watching us, because they are even more lost. We have set ourselves up for a lifetime of habitual mis-use and degraded functioning.

4. To free ourselves of this habit, and regain the use of our powerful innate uprighting system, we need to begin a process of witnessing how we tend to commit our weight in our daily activities — so that we can register its impact and learn to direct the downward movement of our body mass more consciously and constructively.

All of this can easily be tested. It hasn’t been, I believe, because ‘gravity’ is understood only abstractly — by scientists as well as laymen — as a force operating outside of ourselves, compelling all objects straight down to earth, period. For purposes of human motor coordination, this is simply wrong. The trajectory of the gravity-compelled falling of

our body mass is very much within our control. And as long as we are unaware of how we exercise this control, we are in trouble.

Uprighting/Weight Commitment work identifies a central aspect of our habitual manner of use — an unrecognized source of the interference we seek to prevent. It enables us to kinesthetically access key sensations attendant to the act of uprighting (sensations to which we have become numb), as well as to intellectually understand its ABCs. To “scratch deeper” and move the science of self-use forwards, we in the Alexander Technique community need to be open to revising our map of self-use territory when appropriate.

Notes

1. Kjeldsen, T. 2012, The Alexander Technique and Science, *Statnews*, May, 2012, p. 21.
2. Foley, G. 2012, The Alexander Technique and science: a reply. *Statnews*, September, 2012, p. 25.
3. Kjeldsen, Ibid., p. 21.
4. Alexander, F.M., 1923, reprint 1985. *Constructive Conscious Control of the Individual*. Centerline Press, p. 65.
5. Alexander, F.M., 1932; reprint 1984. *The Use of the Self*. Centerline Press, p. 4.
6. Barlow, M. & Davies, T.A. 2002. *An Examined Life*. Mornum Time Press, Preface.

Michael Protzel has been a STAT member since 1986. Uprighting/Weight Commitment work is explained in detail, with animated illustrations at www.uprighting.com.

Replies from STAT Members

Statnews, Volume 8, Issue 3, May 2013, Page 24

To the Editor:

On a rather different note, my assertion that the concept of the primary control is valid even if we don't fully understand all the physical mechanisms involved was made on the assumption that there is a consensus within the profession of the primacy of the head/body relationship in postural integration and the coordination of use. Michael Protzel reminds us that this consensus is not universal. I did say, though, that if the relevant sciences show us that that the head/body relationship doesn't have the significance we think, we will have to adjust our conception of the primary control appropriately. So, if Michael is right, then we need a new conception of postural integration. As he knows, although I think he has done the work a great service by bringing our attention to weight commitment, I still think his insight is complementary to, rather than a replacement for, Alexander's conception of the primary control. But I accept that this is an area in which we will need help from the relevant sciences.

Tim Kjeldsen

Dear Editor:

Some time ago this message was posted on twitter: "Sign at the Alternative Health Fair: 'Defy gravity with the Alexander Technique!' No one at the stand. Maybe they succeeded?" (My translation from Norwegian).

We understand what our colleagues were trying to say, but the choice of wording was very unfortunate. In the Statnews article "The Alexander Technique, science and new ideas," Michael Protzel writes about balanced sitting and standing and says that: "Our body mass is constantly falling down to earth." We understand what he is trying to say, but his choice of words is unfortunate. In balanced sitting and standing the weight is directed through the 'sit-bones' and the 'tali' and there is an equal force (contact force) working in the opposite direction. This means that the body weight is supported by the ground and that we are not falling. It is not possible to be balanced and supported and to be falling at the same time. If we want our work to be better recognized in the world, we must make sure that our descriptions comply with the laws of physics.

Halvard Heggdal, Oslo

Protzel Replies

Statnews, Volume 8, Issue 3, May 2013, Page 25

I thank Tim for his response to my article and, especially, for his kind and generous words about my work.

As I see it, a new conception is necessary whenever we recognize that an old conception obscures rather than clarifies. In my view, "postural integration" is such a conception. It speaks of human functioning in abstract language utterly divorced from what human beings are actually doing. This is why I speak of "uprighting." Any conception of motor coordination will be seriously flawed if it lacks recognition (1) that our fundamental human activity is lifting ourselves into verticality, and (2) that the energy generated by

our gravity-compelled, downward-moving body mass — the trajectory of which we control — is of fundamental influence, for good or for ill.

Tim suggests that we will get “help from the relevant sciences” to understand the workings of primary control. Yet, scientists are human beings, trapped in “faulty sensory appreciation” like everyone else. With symptoms of mis-use rampant, science remains mute as to the source. Faulty sensory appreciation not only distorts our self-experience, but also makes it hard to see some things that are right in front of us. F.M. Alexander taught us that a clear conception requires that we re-develop an accurate sensory appreciation through addressing our habitual manner of use. This is what AT teachers do. Thus, it is we who need to explain how innate primary control works, and how we come to interfere.

Only seriously ill infants/toddlers fail to attain ‘neck free, head forward and up, back lengthening and widening.’ This shows that optimal uprighting is ‘in our genes’, something we are born with, a distinct human ability that has evolved over eons of time. Yet, by age 5 or 6 we are well on our way to losing it. How?

There is no evidence that interference with our innate uprighting ability begins with *direct* interference with the head/body relationship (i.e. by tensing the neck). There is, however, ample evidence that young children spend countless hours throwing their weight back into chair-supports, sofas, car seats, etc. All we need do is to rationally consider the physiological consequences of this activity. Upon falling backwards from the hip joints, out of necessity we compensate sub-consciously so that we maintain functional level-headedness. As the pelvis and lower spine fall backwards, the upper spine is brought forward (usually too much) and the head tilted back. We all do this for years and years, with staggering repetition. Thus, it is not surprising that it is difficult to gain an accurate appreciation of the sensations associated with this habit. We have been ‘in it’ virtually our entire lives.

F.M. Alexander was a trail-blazer in recognizing the ‘corrupting’ influence of our habitual manner of use. He saw that, through faulty sensory appreciation and end-gaining, we reek havoc upon our head-neck-back relationship, and that this affects our ability to function optimally in all activities. His teachings were profound. I see my work as building on his legacy.

Halvard says: “It is not possible to be balanced and supported and to be falling at the same time.” I say that here on earth it is impossible *not* to be falling. This is the effect gravity has on us. Yet, when we speak of “gravity” nowadays, we convert a real, live experiential event into a meaningless abstraction. I use the word “falling” for its ‘active’ connotation. It is vitally important to recognize that we are actively falling *especially when we are not moving, not descending in space*. When we mis-commit our weight, we direct ourselves away from our balance points, creating a momentary topple. Our brain is programmed to ‘protect’ us, subconsciously, with muscular bracing that immediately stops the topple, thus keeping our head from colliding with the ground. By not recognizing the active force of the falling, we don’t recognize the muscular bracing either. This faulty sensory appreciation masks a serious mis-use syndrome.

I do not write of “balanced” sitting as Halvard suggests. I write of sitting as *the act of lifting* — everything from the sit bones up. To do this lifting with optimum efficiency requires that we commit our weight accurately, basically straight down. When we do this, we allow a slight flexing of the head/neck joint, all spinal joints and the hip joints. This requires absolutely no effort on our part, and produces not only a tiny little descent, but we also rock forwards a tiny little bit. Near-immediately, our body mass makes a new, slightly forward ground contact (ideally, only on the sit bones and feet, not the thighs). This is where our body captures the energy generated by our slight falling and tipping. This clean and renewable energy empowers our deepest extensor muscles to lift us back-and-up the slight amount we have fallen and tipped. This ongoing flexing/extending, rest/work cycle is the essence of what I call “innate uprighting” — our highly evolved, optimally efficient lifting system.

When we do not commit our weight accurately, we lose our innate uprighting capacity to one degree or another. Then we must *hold* ourselves up. Lifting mis-committed weight requires considerable effort that cannot be sustained for very long. For example, sitting vertically with weight supported by the sit-bones alone (not by a chair-back), does not mean that a person is actually committing his weight accurately and uprighting efficiently. The practical consequence of our deeply entrenched sitting-back habit is that we end up concocting a means of sitting vertically far inferior to the innate means of uprighting we inherited and used as infants/toddlers. ‘Underneath’ the verticality, our backwards weight commitment persists invisibly. It is simply masked — with the backwards movement over-powered by the tensing of the very strong psoas muscles that momentarily hold up the pelvis and lower spine. When we inevitably tire and let go of this muscle tensing, the backwards fall becomes quite visible. ***

To my knowledge, no one else has discussed these phenomena. There is no existing vocabulary. I have had to create words that seem to me to best describe the events I have observed. I find that my language — we are “falling” and “lifting” — is far more descriptive of reality than commonly accepted language, such as, “we live in a gravitational field” and achieve “postural integration.”

*** This can easily be tested out with a student: have her sit vertically; from the side, with a very gentle touch, place the thumb of one hand on the front of the ilium, a little below the superior anterior iliac spine, and the middle finger of the same hand on the back of the ilium; if her weight commitment is accurate, you will feel a very slight front-back rocking; if there is no movement, then she is, to one degree or another, locked-in-place; this may be confirmed by very gently using your fingers to actually try to move her backwards; it is likely you will find that the pelvis does not move at all — because it is being pulled and held forwards; then, ask her to let go of this holding and allow herself to sit back; once given permission to do this, you will see how easy and familiar a movement it is for her; and witness how much control she has in falling back into the chair-support and in coming up off of it (being able to stop instantly on command at any point). We've all had a lot of practice at this.

Heggdal Replies

Statnews, Volume 8, Issue 4, September 2013, Page 25

SEEKING TO AVOID PSEUDO-SCIENCE

Dear Editor,

I commented on Michael Protzel's use of the word 'falling' in the article "The Alexander Technique, science and new ideas" in the January Statnews. In his reply he expounds his theory nicely but largely fails to address my concerns.

The context was science, and Protzel's choice of words does not comply with basic physical concepts and can be very misleading. His use of the word 'falling' is not the only problem. In the January *Statnews* he writes: "[...] the force of our falling provides the energy source - clean and renewable – that fuels our deepest extensor musculature;" And: "When mis-directed (away from the sit bones or tali), the abundant energy of our body mass ceases to fuel optimal uprighting."

And in the *May Statnews*: "This clean and renewable energy empowers our deepest extensor muscles to lift us back-and-up the slight amount we have fallen and tipped." In our movements we do get some energy back because of the elasticity of tissue. Under the conditions presented by Protzel we get this energy back only if we meet resistance from the ground. In other words, only if we are not falling!

We never get all of the energy back, but Protzel appears to be saying that he not only gets all the energy back, but that 'the force of our falling' is an energy source. It seems as if Protzel has evoked Perpetual Motion, the hallmark of pseudo-science.

In actual teaching we have to use whatever expressions and formulations that serve the needs of the situation. But, when we try to explain our ideas in a scientific context we need to be much more accurate, otherwise I fear our profession will lose the little credibility it has. Being closely associated with 'alternative medicine' means our credibility is a very fragile thing.

Regards,
Halvard Heggdal

Protzel Replies

Statnews, Volume 8, Issue 5, January 2014, Page 29

FALLING DISPUTE

[Note: Cited images appear on following pages]

To the Editor:

I would like to address Halvard Heggdal's criticisms of my observations and ideas regarding committing body mass and how it impacts the quality of our uprighting. (Statnews, Vol 8, Issue 4, September 2013, p. 25)

Halvard claims that "Protzel's choice of words does not comply with basic physical concepts and can be very misleading. His use of the word 'falling' is not the only problem...In our movements we do get some energy back because of the elasticity of

tissue. Under the conditions presented by Protzel we get this energy back only if we meet resistance from the ground. In other words, only if we are not falling!”

Halvard seeks to dismiss my views by characterizing them as “pseudo-science.” He sees a contradiction within my core description of “innate uprighting.” I say that the energy generated by our falling body mass, upon hitting the ground at key skeletal contact points, is transferred into our deepest extensor muscles which then upright us with minimal effort. Halvard seems certain that when a person is “meet[ing] resistance from the ground,” this person cannot possibly be “falling.” He thus concludes that Protzel’s words don’t “comply with basic physical concepts.” But Halvard is wrong. “Meeting resistance from the ground” and “falling” can, and do, occur simultaneously. Let’s look at simple standing.

We stand upon a heel whose bottom is **rounded** — creating a **pivot-point** that gives us the flexibility that is absolutely essential for navigating the uneven, often rough terrain here on Earth (when we hit an unexpected bump in the road, we don’t want to break our ankle). I draw your attention to the adjacent photo of the foot/lower leg as viewed from the rear. Notice that the tibia rests squarely atop the talus, which is located on the medial side of the foot. When our body mass falls straight down, it falls directly onto the talus. As can easily be seen in the photo, this will cause a medial rocking at the heel (and a slightly forwards rocking as well, because we have more body mass in front of our center-line than behind it). As the heel rocks, our body mass descends. This descending generates energy. *As this is happening, we never for an instant lose the resistance from the ground. We keep meeting new points of resistance (both at the heel and at the sesamoid bones on the ball of the big toe.)*

The act of innate uprighting is a flexing/extending cycle, just as the act of innate breathing is an exhalation/inhalation cycle. We flex all of our joints a tiny bit — head/neck, vertebral joints, hips, knees and ankles. This tiny flexing of all of our joints — which requires absolutely no effort on our part — creates the descent of our entire body, as described above. The pressure upon the foot of our descending body mass slightly flattens our foot bones at the arch, stretching plantar muscles. And with the slight flexing of the ankle joints, deep ankle extensors are also stretched. In these stretchings, the energy generated by our descent is ‘captured.’ In turn, the energy is unleashed in the ‘stretch reflex’ contractions of these deep and powerful muscles. This initiates the extending part of the cycle.

It is worthwhile to take special notice of this important structural location — slightly forward and medial to the pivot point on the heel. This is where we find the optimal leverage to stop, on command, our small descent and reverse it so that we end up back atop the heel pivot points, extending all of our joints in the process. It is truly a wonderful and beautifully efficient system. But certain sensitivities are required.

Unfortunately, years of conditioning have left all of us in Western culture unable to consciously control the trajectory of our falling. Beginning at a very young age, we are all conditioned to throw our body mass backwards sitting in chairs, sofas, car seats, etc. We do this with staggering repetition. It becomes an habitual tendency that seeps deep into our being, without our even noticing. Committing body mass backwards aborts innate uprighting. But it doesn’t stop us from continuing to upright. We just do it very poorly. F.M. Alexander called this kind of situation, “end-gaining” — where a goal is achieved without awareness of *how* it is being achieved. In sitting, one goal that is invariably achieved — even though it is a goal that we never even put into words in our mind — is the goal of maintaining of a relatively vertical head/neck. The problem is: to maintain a relatively vertical neck *as we are committing body mass backwards* requires that we tense the neck (for safety and stability), and shorten the torso (as the pelvis and lower spine fall backwards, the thoracic spine must flex forwards). It all goes together.

I draw your attention to the adjacent photo of a young Walter Carrington on the cover of *Direction* magazine. He appears supremely comfortable and relaxed. He gives no indication whatsoever that he is

under great stress. But look at what he is doing with, and to, his body! We all grew up doing this. It is utterly routine. Our unexamined acceptance of this sitting-back behavior explains why we fail to recognize the extreme mis-use at play. F.M. Alexander called this kind of kinesthetic numbing, “faulty sensory appreciation.” All the sensations associated with sitting in this manner feel “right” to us. We notice nothing about how we are committing our body mass and how it is affecting us.

As our falling-back habit spills over into standing, we tend to rock *backwards* off the rounded pivot point on the heel — often laterally as well, so that we end up standing predominantly on one leg. Descending backwards off of the pivot point leaves us no choice but to brace to stop our fall — thereby protecting our head from a collision with the ground. We do this by employing large leg, pelvic, torso and neck muscles. This wasteful effort — and the skeletal distortion that comes with it — are necessary because we have directed the force of our falling according to our habitual manner of use. Our body mass is now working decidedly against us.

Halvard mocks me for claiming that our body mass is an energy source that, when used properly, facilitates good use. He then goes further in his attempt to discredit my viewpoint: “It seems as if Protzel has evoked Perpetual Motion, the hallmark of pseudo-science.” No, I have not evoked Perpetual Motion. What I have done is identified what I call “innate uprighting.” Millions of years of evolution have produced a neuro-muscular-skeletal organism ideally suited to one of our species’ most important goals — to have our head reach and sustain maximum height with minimal effort. Achieving this with optimal efficiency requires tapping the full force of our body mass.

Halvard concludes his critique by saying: “[W]hen we try to explain our ideas in a scientific context, we need to be much more accurate [than Protzel], otherwise I fear our profession will lose the little credibility it has.”

I believe that the credibility of our profession will only be *strengthened* by our developing a deeper understanding of self-use. My Alexander-inspired and Alexander-informed self-explorations have led me to recognize a profound connection between how we direct the downward trajectory of our body mass and how we upright. I have learned a lot about how innate uprighting works and about the conditioning that has left contemporary human beings in the dark. My observations and ideas pertain directly to central Alexander Technique concepts: habitual manner of use, direction, faulty sensory appreciation and end-gaining. They offer teachers and students an opportunity to better understand, and to more clearly experience, how we interfere with our head-neck-back relationship and how we can stop interfering. (More at www.uprighting.com.)

Michael Protzel
New York, New York

