

Nithin Raghavan

Jake Dalton

SASIAN C154

15 March 2020

Kamenetz' approach to dreams reflects a more Western, psychoanalytic approach to dreaming that disagrees with Dzogchen on some aspects. One of the main differences is that while the *Gestalt* practise allows one to cognize living within a unified field of body and mind, the practises of dream interpretation simply exist in the conscious mind, with no further interpretation given to their universal origin and interdependency; while in Dzogchen, every visualization is inherently empty due to the concept of *pratityasamutpada*.

Another difference is that in Dzogchen, the visualizations themselves are primarily meant to allow a practitioner to transform his consciousness. The seeming discrepancy between the other (ultimacy) and the identity is what allows such transformations to take place, as these two ideas must be reconciled. However, as Kamenetz' goal is the interpretation of dreams, rather than their transformative potential, the concept of the Other takes on the form of an adversary, the Opposition, whose goal is to prevent the dreamer from contemplating dream-events during daytime. While the Opposition also comes from within the Self, its purpose is different from that of Dzogchen's Other: it is a cause of internal blocking, rather than of meditative contemplation.

A similarity between the two is the idea of the marginal. Kamenetz declares that "you [would not] break a dream into fragments.... Those...procedures destroy the...gestalt...of the dream," which is related to the Dzogchen practises of focusing on the marginal; Dzogchen views relatively unimportant aspects of visualizations such as dreams as critical due to their emergent properties in describing the ego. In both, aspects of visualizations cannot necessarily be thrown away, and objects in the dream as a whole are utilized so that one can better understand the Self.