70-21,654

FRICK, Willard Blair, 1928-
A HOLISTIC THEORY OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1969
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

A HOLISTIC THEORY OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY

by
Willard B. Frick

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in
The University of Michigan

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Warren A. Ketcham, Chairman
Associate Professor Roger Howell
Professor Howard Y. McClusky
Professor G. Max Wingo

Please Note:

Some pages have very light type. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms.

ABSTRACT

A Holistic Theory of Healthy Personality

by Willard Blair Frick

Chairman: Warren A. Ketcham

This conceptual work is concerned with the development of a holistic theory of healthy personality. The following were selected for their strong holistic orientation: Gordon Allport, Andras Angyal, Kurt Goldstein, Prescott Lecky, Abraham Maslow, Gardner Murphy and Carl Rogers.

Four major themes emerged from an analysis of the writings of the seven holistic personality theorists.

1. Organization: The personality is an organized, dynamic and open system.

2. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive, or drive.

3. Process: The growth of personality is directional, and always evolving toward a never-to-be reached unity and completeness.

4. Potentiality: Man has vast resources and unrealized potentials for growth.

Stage I First Order Integration

Autonomous Achievement

The human organism strives to enhance his own independence and to impose his own unique purpose and design upon the environment. It is a process of growing self-reliance and self assertion leading to the development of competence in meeting the expanding needs and potentials of the organism.

Stage II Second Order Integration

Homonomous Union

The second major directional tendency and stage in the development of the healthy personality is a growing participation and ego involvement in larger units and wholes. It is movement beyond individualistic limits represented by a wide range of possible identifications and involvements including bonds between man and nature, social growth, and a meaningful world order.

Stage III Third Order Integration

Ego Transcendence: Loss-of-Self Experience

The highest expression of integrated experiencing and the supreme achievement of the healthy personality are the non-national ego-transcending experiences. These "unmotivated" and non-striving moments of harmony represent an extension of traditional ego boundaries. In a supernatural context we may refer to such experiences as mystical. However, in holistic personality theory these experiences receive strong biological sanctions.

The three developmental stages of healthy personality function in a hierarchically integrated manner and each fully developed stage represents a newly integrated personality at a higher level of perfection and complexity.

A holistic theory of crisis was developed to resolve the conflict and apparent contradictions between the holistic themes of organization and process. The personality crisis was presented as a holistic model for healthy personality growth.

The educational implications of a holistic theory of healthy personality were centered on the development of a concept: The symbolic growth experience. This concept was developed to provide a viable conceptual bridge between a holistic theory of healthy personality and education. A symbolic growth experience is the individual's capacity to symbolize his experience in response to innate needs and capacities. As a consequence, he is able to utilize immediate experience directly to promote his own growth and maturity. In this way we can link the weak instinctoid growth needs with the conceptual and symbolic components so necessary for personality growth. Excerpts from selected novels and personal accounts from college students provide evidence and illustrations of the symbolic growth experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		iii
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION: THE RATIONALE AND APPROACH	1
CHAPTER II	HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE	26
CHAPTER III	THE MAJOR HOLISTIC THEMES	51
CHAPTER IV	THEORIES OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY	117
CHAPTER V	A HOLISTIC THEORY OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY	193
CHAPTER VI	IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION: THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPT	229
APPENDIX A		255
APPENDIX B		451
BIBLIOGRAPHY		461

PREFACE

The time spent in the researching and writing of this dissertation has proved to be a personal as well as a professional growth experience. Not only has it led to an exhilerating synthesis of a variety of important concepts, some having no relationship in my thinking prior to this study, but my perceptions of life and view of the world have been enormously enriched by the holistic orientation to personality. I have especially appreciated its significance and impact upon my counseling work with college students.

There have been many difficult --even painful and anxious--moments during the course of this study but the insightful moments, the articulate, flowing moments, the ecstatic moments of genuine contact with my own originality, uniqueness, and creativity; these are the undeniable rewards throughout the hours and hours of labor upon this project.

I am indebted to many people and in a variety of ways. I am convinced that no other doctoral candidate could have had a finer doctoral committee to work with. I feel most fortunate to have had Associate Professor Roger Howell and Professors Warren A. Ketcham, Howard Y. McClusky and G. Max Wingo to serve on my committee. Their interest and support

throughout the study was an important source of strength to me. The sensitivity, kindness, and respect that I received from my Chairman, Professor Warren A. Ketcham, leaves me with a deep sense of gratitude and affection. He gave wise council and valuable suggestions but never wavered in his trust in my ability, my judgement, and my integrity. The spirit that emerged from this relationship and within this learning climate proved invaluable to my efforts at creative scholarship and my desire to have aspects of my individuality maintain a forceful presence throughout the work.

This study, under the title "An Analysis of Total Personality as Advocated by Holistic Theorists and its Effect Upon Healthy Personality" has been generously supported by a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Grant No. OEG-5-9-325076-0004. As stipulated by the grant my research has also received partial support from Albion College. I would like to thank President Louis Norris for his administrative backing of my proposal.

It was the generous assistance of this grant that enabled me not only to pursue the study itself but allowed me, also, to undertake the personal interviews with Dr. Abraham Maslow, Dr. Gardner Murphy, and Dr. Carl Rogers.

These men were most hospitable and gracious in their response to my request for personal interviews. They gave themselves fully to my project and their efforts are deeply appreciated. These interviews which appear in Appendix A, have certainly added depth and enrichment to the study.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife Lois and my sons Tom and Ian for their faith, kind patience, and support throughout this project.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: THE RATIONALE AND APPROACH

The dissertation which follows is a theoretical work concerned with the development of a holistic theory of healthy personality. It investigates an area that is dimly adumbrated and only partially respectable as a viable field for study within the bounds set by traditional psychology. Admittedly, an exploration into the area of "healthy personality" or positive mental health[1] is flirting on a conceptual frontier and both suffers and is enhanced by virtue of this fact. We may probe into the increasing darkness of this frontier only to discover a dangerous or impassable precipice. We may also turn our back on the familiar and acceptable, eschew the conventional modes and models, and learn that by so doing, there has opened up new possibilities, thus extending the limits of acceptable or approved boundaries for our concepts and endeavors, i.e.,, there is a widened perspective toward the "possible." Usually, for the explorer in such a venture, precipice and possibility

---

[1]These terms are used interchangeably in the literature. In the interests of variety and readability, I also use both terms synonomously.

are both experienced for, after all, if new territory is being explored it is likely that the familiar, the new, the unexpected, and the hostile terrain will all be encountered.

In looking to the future of psychology, Murphy (1947) has predicted that two types of research will continue to dominate the scene. The first type of research constitutes a continuation of a careful verification, experimentally or clinically, of all major hypotheses extant in contemporary psychology. "The other type of research," Murphy continues, "embodies the effort to grope into the darkness of the fringe surrounding our present-day region of clarity. It involves all the characteristic errors and absurdities of such groping...but here and there it contains a germ of fresh and leavening insight into the larger context which not only our psychology of today but our society as a whole has been afraid to seek."[1]

This present study is in the tradition and spirit of Murphy's second type of research and embodies, also, attributes of heuristic research as discussed by Clark Moustakas (1967).

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947. p. 927.

Fromm (1955) has observed that a concept of mental health depends, in a final analysis, upon our image of man; how we perceive his nature and his potentials. Each concept or image of man will set a certain ceiling and impose certain restrictions and sanctions on what man's possibilities are. In the following pages the truth of this view will become apparent.

Traditionally, most personality theories have focused their concern on explaining man as he is, on the concrete here and now, and on the origin and past history of these developments. If we are to think in terms of healthy personality, however, and in terms of an ideal, of the "possible," we must not only look at man as he stands and behaves in the present decade of the twentieth century but must lift our sights to discern what man is capable of becoming or what his characteristics would be if fully evolved. Allport (1961) supports this position when he states that "...We must know what the essential "theoretical man" is like in order to understand concrete men who may fit approximately into this value direction."[1] Bertalanffy (1952), too,

---

[1]Gordon Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 1961. p. 544.

stresses the importance of developing theoretical constructs as an essential base for scientific progress rather than a focus on mere fact collecting. It is to develop a picture of "theoretical man" out of holistic theory of personality that this study is concerned

In an effort to clarify the image of man that serves as the point of departure for this study the following propositions are offered and developed.

Some Fundamental Propositions Concerning The Nature of Man

a. Man is a reactive, stimulus-bound organism. He often responds to his environment and carries out his behavior in an automatic, stereotyped fashion. Man, on the other hand, is proactive; every searching, seeking, demanding, and making an impact upon his world.

b. Man's course through life is periodically regulated and controlled by the basic drives and, seeking a refuge from tension, he draws comfort from those things that nourish his organic needs. We are often engaged in following a closed circle of heightened tension, satiation, followed by another round of increasing tension. But man, in healthier moments, can transcend the reality of the tension-reduction model for his motivations and live a life that actually

promotes tension and anxiety. We often see man making a choice to live with tension as the price to be paid for personality growth, exploratory behavior, and adventures into the unknown.

c. Man is dominated in much of his daily living by prescribed social roles that limit his freedom and define his experience and behavior. As students, as sons or daughters, as professors, husbands, or members of a political party we meet the expectations of others and submit to stereotyped response patterns. Thus, our behavior often becomes formal and rigid. However, we must be reminded that we have the capacity and freedom to discriminate, evaluate, and decide what roles we are willing to commit ourselves to. We have the power to choose roles that give meaning to our existence. Within wide limits we may also determine how we are going to fulfill a given role so that it remains consonant with our own uniqueness.

d. Man is partially determined by a genetic past and a complex reinforcement history. Few psychologists reject this fact of human development. But unless the organism's autonomy and capacity for growth and change have been buried completely, man is also oriented to the future and is free to

chart a course and construct the values to which he will devote himself and commit his energies.

e. The human organism is impulsive and may act upon unconscious motivations, often unaware of why or even how he is behaving. On the other hand, man is unique in his capacity to become aware, to become fully conscious. It is, in fact, on the basis of this capacity for full awareness that man can value, evaluate, make choices, and become responsible.

These propositions explicate the dialectic process, the ever present struggle between the polarities of human life and existence.

In one of his most recent statements on the issue of freedom vs. determinism Rogers states that, "...a part of modern living is to face the paradox that, viewed from one perspective, man is a complex machine...on the other hand, in another dimension of his existence, man is subjectively free; his personal choice and responsibility account for his own life; he is in fact the architect of himself...a truly crucial part of his existence is the discovery of his own meaningful commitment to life with all of his being. If in response to this you say, "but these views cannot both be true," my answer is, "this is a deep paradox with which we

must learn to live."[1]

In Rollo May's recent work (1967), man's most basic dilemma is seen as "...that which arises out of man's capacity to experience himself as both subject and object at the same time. Experienced as object man is a thing, a machine that is open to a multitude of manipulations and controls by various biological and social forces. Experiencing himself as subject, man is open to the possibilities within himself and in others, and he becomes free to value and to articulate these values.[2]

May (1967) points out that in both these alternatives- being "purely free" and "purely determined"- "we arrogantly refuse to accept the dilemma which is our fate and our great potentiality as human."[3] He goes on to stress that man is always oscillating between the two poles and that it is this process of oscillating that gives man his potentiality. That is, that we as human beings can choose between them and can shift the balance of power to one side or the other.

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "Freedom and Commitment." Paper delivered at San Francisco State College. 1963. p. 23ff.

[2]Rollo May, Psychology and the Human Dilemma. Princeton. D.Van Nostrand. 1967. p. 8ff.

[3]Ibid. p. 9.

Freedom for May, then, rests upon man's ability, not to live as "pure object" or as "pure subject" but to be able to experience both modes and to live with the resulting dialectical relationship.

Humanistic Psychology, (often referred to as an emerging "third force" in Psychology) drawing upon the existential emphasis on man's freedom, commitment, and capacity for creative choosing and power for self-creation, has emerged as a vigorous expression of protest against the limited and limiting view of man as seen in the two other major schools of psychology, behaviorism and psychoanalysis. These schools, their theories of motivation, their concepts of man, and even their methodology emphasize and promote a distorted, one-sided view of man. For Rogers (1963b) it is determined man; for May (1967), it is man seen almost exclusively as an object. It is not so much that this view of man is invalid. Rather, it is that this image of man is incomplete and ignores or rejects man as subject or as capable of being the architect of his own life.

Let us say that we want to become fully acquainted, fully aware of any important concept. That is, we want to experience this concept and understand it in all of its dimensions and subtlety. We would want to know something

about each facet, explore each related idea, the nuances of each implication. Now, let us say that we are interested in exploring all facets of the meaning of full humanness, of becoming acquainted with the full range of the human potential. In confronting this infinitely complex subject, we must call upon all our resources, our skills, and our full range of sensitivity, penetrating into the depths of human experience, into the mystery of human existence, even into the uncharted void of the unknown, as a virgin island is explored and mapped. And we must do these things without violating our integrity by sacrificing adventure for safety, allowing timidity to replace our courage.

Something more is required in our psychology, in our study of man and his potentials. As we map the tributaries, the converging rivers and streams that flow to the encompassing sea, we need also to see each facet, each human dimension, and each part-function in its relationship to a larger, more unified organization and purpose. We must put man together again and make him whole. In this endeavor our need is great. We must move to a disclosure of those dynamics and principles that contribute, in balanced and harmonious relationship, to the actualization of man's most noble, most creative potentials.

Our traditional images of man, expressed in the theories of psychoanalysis and in the tenets of behaviorism, have been limited and distorted and have failed to resolve the "subject-object" dichotomy. We have, in fact, created a general psychology based on stunted growth, on a kind of psychopathology of the average, and it follows that this psychology is equally stunted in its own development and lacking in vitality and courage. A scientific discipline cannot be vigorous and healthy if its assumptions, perceptions, and productivity are based on an isolated and incomplete portion of the subject matter that is perceived to be the whole. It is suggested that the concepts that psychoanalysis and behaviorism have developed about the human organism and our traditional theories of motivation are largely valid for unhealthy men, for men retarded in their progress and development toward full humanness; true for man when he is functioning in low gear. It follows, then, that much of the psychology we have developed is a low-gear psychology. As psychologists, as human beings, we have been working with an abridgement of the human potential.

One of the distortions that has taken place is that the two major forces in psychology have given us a very rich past

but little or no future. Each looks back to a life history that is remote from the dynamics of immediacy and man's concern with the here and now. Also left unattended is man's forward thrust, his "searching" nature, and his need and capacity to see himself as future possibility. It is precisely man's ability to transcend the concrete, immediate situation and to think abstractly, in terms of "the possible" that is a distinguishing feature of being human. It is by virtue of the emergence of consciousness that man possesses this future orientation to the possible within himself in relation to his environment.

It is ironical that most of us do not live our lives in ways that conform to the tenets of our own psychology that have been developed to explain human nature and behavior. We don't, in actuality, abide by those definitions that psychology presents to us. In our own lives we are rooted most deeply in the present moment with an eye on the future and we articulate past experiences, not as mechanical and inexorable determiners in our lives, but in holistic relation to the evolving dynamics of present reality and future possibility. The meaning of a past event or past experience changes, shifts its position and significance and becomes reorganized

in the evolving and growing personality. Perhaps only if a person remains rigid at a certain level of personal development will past experiences cease to shift in importance and take on new meaning. The past cannot remain static and unyielding when interpreted within the dynamic matrix of an evolving human personality.

Much recent work does, in fact, contradict an image of man that sees him as dancing in puppet fashion to the tune of the pleasure principle, or as a slave to habits resulting from stimulus-response bonds, or motivated and responding primarily out of tension-reduction needs. The exploratory, tension-seeking, purposive nature of man - his expansive properties and potentials - have been highlighted in this research (Berlyne, 1960; Kubzansky and Leiderman, 1961; White, 1959). More recently, Bettleheim (1967) emphasizes that even the infant is not a passive recipient of his nurture. On the contrary, he plays an active and vital role in the interaction between mother and child. Contrary to the view of the dependent and helpless infant in nursing, Bettleheim emphasizes that "...the infant is eminently active in what to him is a central event in his life...to regard such an experience as anaclitic, as utterly passive, contradicts the infant's experience." "More and more we begin to

realize that almost from the beginning of life the infant also takes note of his world, pays deliberate attention." "...when he is active, be it in nursing or in watching the world, he is at the height of his encounter with life. But how this activity succeeds, and the response it receives, will significantly color all his later attempts at self-motivated action."[1]

Historically, then, personality theory has reflected the psychoanalytic and behavioristic image of man and has focused much of its concern on man's low-gear attributes and on his darker side; his proclivity for personality disorganization and psychopathology. A psychology of the "normal" person has developed and become of age based in large measure on clinical experience with psychopathology.[2] With the major portion of our theoretical and research investment devoted to the understanding of psychopathology there is only a very limited progress in acquiring a knowledge and understanding of healthy functioning, of the meaning of the good life, of man at an optimal level of psychic health rather than in the

---

[1]Bruno Bettelheim, The Empty Fortress: Infantile Autism and the Birth of the Self. New York: The Free Press, 1967. p. 15ff.

[2]We refer to psychoanalytic theory and its impact upon general psychological theory.

depths of psychic disorganization and despair.[1] There is good indication that even such a concept as healthy personality or high-level wellness (Dunn, 1961) is not present in the conceptual repertoire of most people even including those in the helping professions. Murphy supports this point when he suggests that "we are...in the habit of thinking of scientific specialists as achieving more knowledge in order to ward off disease, produce more food, and help man to be more completely man, as he is."[2]

Clinically, the criterion for "normality," a term usually equated with healthy functioning, has always been the absence of illness. In recent years, however, we have questioned this clinical model and the conceptual limit it places on understanding man's potentials for positive mental health. Gradually, we have developed a commitment to the position that absence of illness or freedom from clinical symptoms is not synonomous with and does not insure a healthy personality. Indeed, there may exist a psychopathology of

---

[1]For example, there are literally hundreds of courses in colleges and universities labeled "abnormal psychology" but none, to our knowledge, intent on studying and developing a "health psychology."

[2]Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books. 1958. p. 12.

the average man, pronounced "healthy" or "normal" in terms of the clinical model and its symptom-centered criteria. Laing (1967) expresses this idea of the pathology of normality and our failure to conceptualize health and the human potential beyond the symptom level.

"What we call "normal" is a product of repression, denial, splitting, projection, introjection, and other forms of destructive action on experience. It is radically estranged from the structure of being."[1]

Perhaps one of the greatest breakthroughs in our attempts to overcome the difficulties in conceptualizing healthy personality is a growing critical appraisal of the well entrenched position of cultural relativity or "sociological relativism" (Fromm, 1955). For years we have been thwarted and misdirected by this valuable but seductive concept which more than suggests that psychopathology, and therefore mental health, is culturally relative and culturally defined. To pursue this notion to its logical conclusion means that there is no such thing as a sick society or a group of people "off the beam" but only illness and psychopathology within given individuals who transgress or deviate

---

[1]R. D. Laing, The Politics of Experience. New York: Pantheon Books. 1967. p. 11.

too far from the group sanctions, expectations, and acceptable modes of behavior. Fromm (1955) forthrightly rejects this position and advances one of "normative humanism" which is based upon the assumption that "....there are universal criteria for mental health which are valid for the human race as such and according to which the state of health of each society can be judged."[1] Fromm is critical, too, of the idea that the criterion for mental health is one of individual adjustment or conformity to a given social order. He would most certainly agree with Laing's observation that:

"In our society, personality destruction is such that by the time the new human being is fifteen or so, we are left with a being like ourselves, a half-crazed creature more or less adjusted to a mad world. This is normality in our present age."[2]

Laing continues: "From an ideal vantage point on the ground, a formation of planes may be observed in the air. One plane may be out of formation. But the whole formation may be off course. The plane that is "out of formation" may be abnormal, bad, or "mad," from the point of view of

---

[1]Eric Fromm, The Sane Society. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1955. p. 12.

[2]R. D. Laing, Politics, 1967. p. 36.

the formation. But the formation itself may be bad or mad from the point of view of the ideal observer. The "out of formation" criterion is the clinical positivist criterion." Laing stresses that "It is of fundamental importance not to make the positivist mistake of assuming that, because a group are "in formation," this means they are necessarily "on course." "If the formation is itself off course, then the man who is really to get "on course" must leave the formation." Laing then adds, "...social adaption to a dynfunctional society may be very dangerous."[1]

With these ideas in mind it should be stressed that we are reaching a point in our development as a species that will allow us to direct, control, or destroy much of human life and the environment. Indeed, we have the power to channel man's energies and his passions. The techniques, the sophisticated "know-how" are rapidly becoming a part of our equipment. This awesome potential will not remain for too much longer merely a theme in science fiction or contained within the realms of far removed, abstract discourse on utopian communities. Man is rapidly reaching a critical period, as in the eye of a hurricane, when he must resolve

---

[1] Ibid.,

the dilemma imposed by cultural relativity and move toward decision, tentative and groping though it may be, as to what human potentials he shall actualize. Camus captures the essence of our dilemma: "All I ask is that, in the midst of a murderous world we agree to reflect on murder and to make a choice."[1] We must not be frightened or intimidated by the fact that it is at base a frustrating value dilemma. This does not mean, however, that one set of values is as reasonable and as viable as another. It is most encouraging that a few behavioral scientists have turned their attention with greater timerity to a consideration of the broad spectrum of human possibilities and potentialities, (Montague, 1955; Gardner, 1963; Shaw, 1966; Otto, 1966; Dunn, 1961) and to the arduous but challenging task of conceptualizing healthy personality.

Reflecting the current expression of interest in positive mental health there have been various attempts to explore and identify more clearly this mode of being (Bertocci and Millard, 1963; Johoda, 1958; Offer and Sabshin, 1966). In addition, a plethora of recent articles have attempted to develop this or that theory or have tried to

---

[1]Albert Camus, "Neither Victims nor Executioners," Actuelles. Chroniques 1944-1948. Paris. Gallimard. 1950. p. 23.

establish various criteria for the healthy personality. The majority of these articles are isolated from the mainstream of personality theory focusing, thereby, on a single characteristic or upon multiple criteria having no real anchor in the matrix of a more comprehensive personality theory. This "criteria-list" approach with little or no theoretical foundation has provoked some criticism of the very concept, healthy personality. (Smith, 1961; Friedes, 1960) Thus, with minor exceptions, there has been no systematic attempt to relate a theory of healthy personality to a unified, coherent theory of personality. There is, therefore, a real need for a theory of healthy personality to take root in some existing theoretical structure. In the light of the contemporary trend and current interest in conceptualizing healthy personality, it is surprising that there have been no serious attempts to draw upon the collective wisdom of a theoretical structure and orientation in the development of a theory of positive mental health. Logically, it would seem reasonable to consider this the first order of business if we are interested in establishing a firm foundation for the development of more sophisticated concepts, theories, and research.

It is not possible or feasible, in the scope and purpose of this research, to consider all of the various theories of personality that might contribute to the development of a theory of healthy personality. Unfortunately, very few personality theorists treat this area with any degree of seriousness, if at all, and it would be inappropriate to include them in our study. Among those who might be considered, however, some reasonable and logical choices had to be made to insure that the theory and theorists selected for study would represent the most fruitful, direct, and comprehensive exploration of the concept of positive mental health.

As a group of theorists who fulfill these criteria, I propose to limit my study to major representatives of a holistic theory of personality. No other personality theorists, as an identifiable group, address themselves so specifically to the issues of healthy personality. In addition, holistic theory incorporates both the "active" as well as the "reactive" proclivities in the human personality and resolves or transcends the subject-object dichotomy. Holistic personality theory appears to be, in most significant respects, a theory of healthy personality.

Holistic theory will be represented by seven personality theorists who, it is hypothesized, will render a well-developed holistic theory of healthy personality. The seven theorists chosen for study are: Gordon Allport, Andras Angyal, Kurt Goldstein, Prescott Lecky, Abraham Maslow, Gardner Murphy, and Carl Rogers. These seven personality theorists are contemporaries, and as a group their writings represent a synthesis and the culmination of current holistic thought. While other theorists might have been considered as fair representatives of a holistic point of view, it is believed that the essential characteristics of holistic theory are most completely represented by the seven selected theorists listed above.

The seven holistic theorists, without exception, can be identified within the humanistic zietgiest in psychology and the three living theorists, Maslow, Murphy, and Rogers have been important to the development of the American Association for Humanistic Psychology.[1] It is not my intention to reduce their works to some label or category but only to point out that this dissertation falls within a broad humanistic orientation rather than representing the

---

[1] e.g., See also Appendix A.

psychoanalytic or behavioristic traditions. It is felt that holistic theory, with its deep humanistic orientation, should yield the most valid and fruitful theoretical picture of healthy personality. Whereas, the limited and limiting views of man promoted by psychoanalysis and behaviorism are considered as an inadequate base for an exploration of theories of the higher reaches of personality development.

The following are presented as the central themes of holistic theory most completely represented and developed by the seven selected theorists.

1. Personality is an organized whole and more than a mere aggregate of discrete parts. The holistic personality theorists emphasize the unity, integration, and coherence of personality and eschew the atomistic, reductionistic, part-function study of man as a violation of the basic nature and integrity of the individual.

The functioning of the parts of a human being, if such part-functions can be identified, must always be considered in the light of the organizational principles governing the whole.

2. The organism is guided and energized by one, and only one, sovereign motive.

3. Life is a process and must be studied and understood as an unfolding, and creative enterprise. Interest is centered on the uniquely human capacity for change, "becoming," and fulfillment.

4. Holistic theorists stress the positive aspects of human development and the growth potential of the organism. There is only minor concern with psychopathology and the stunted aspects of human development. One of their major interests and concerns, therefore, is in conceptualizing the development and principal criteria of healthy personality.

These central themes of holism will be discussed in detail in chapter III and will, we believe, lend support to the validity of our selection of theorists.

The holistic theorists have been and continue to be among the most vigorous of all personality theorists in denouncing logical positivism, in questioning the prevailing assumptions of science and the image of man that both positivism and psychoanalysis have promoted. While this critical role of the holistic theorists has proved valuable it is essentially a negative approach. What, we may legitimately ask, have the holistic thinkers to offer in the way of positive contributions? What is their image of

man and his potentials? These questions, we hope, will be fully explored and answered in this study.

The basic purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate the meaning and implications of the concept of healthy personality as developed in the writings of seven major holistic personality theorists. Each theorist considered here deals, in some direct and fundamental way, with the concepts and issues of healthy personality within the larger context of the development of his own theoretical structure. In the course of this presentation and conceptual analysis we will develop each theorist's individual contribution to the overall concept of positive mental health. The larger task set for this work, however, will be to forge, insofar as it is possible, a holistic theory of healthy personality from the basic writings of the seven theorists.

Following this introduction we strive to develop some historical perspective in chapter II by examining important precursors of holistic personality theory. In chapter III the major themes of holistic personality theory will be developed. These thematic statements will be followed, in chapter IV, by a presentation and analysis of the individual theories of healthy personality. In chapter V there will

be a synthetic analysis of the material and the presentation of a holistic theory of healthy personality. The final chapter will discuss important educational implications of holistic theory of healthy personality.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The purpose of this historical survey is not to trace the specific and discrete influences upon the thought and the writings of each holistic theorist. It is not clear that this would be meaningful or even possible, certainly not within the scope and purpose of this study. Rather, the primary intent of the chapter is to help view the holistic writings in some perspective and to appreciate historical process and the evolution of a Zietgiest, reaching its zenith and most articulate expression in the writings of the holistic personality theorists.

The precursors of the articulated point of view that we find in the holistic personality theorists did not belong to a single "movement" or school of thought and we find that they did not share, nor do we, the advantages and disadvantages of a monolithic philosophical or theoretical stream as do the neo-Freudians and neo- or quasi-behaviorists. When we examine the various contributions to the philosophical and theoretical development of holistic thought we do not encounter any linear conceptual progression. At first glance

they each seem isolated, scattered, and fragmentary and in an ironic sense, curiously unholistic. However, the variety of conceptual schemes available to us for the interpretation of reality is limited (Bertalanffy, 1952) and we discover that compatible and corresponding schemes do appear in fields as seemingly diverse as neurology and biology, (Jackson, 1931; Sherrington, 1906; Smuts, 1926; Coghill, 1929) Philosophy (Whitehead, 1938; Ryle, 1949; Dewey, 1896) and psychosomatic medicine (Dunbar, 1954); Seminal contributions to the fashioning of contemporary holistic or organismic theory have also come from the psychobiology of Adolf Meyer (1948), from Bertalanffy's work in system theory (1950, 1952), and from the Gestalt movement in psychology initiated by Wertheimer, Koffka, and Köhler and in its later, more specific applications to personality theory by Lewin (1935). Thus, the wide applicability of a holistic orientation can be seen by the range of fields, the diverse scientific disciplines and points of view represented here.

The following pages of this chapter will be concerned with a brief discussion of the contributions of the following men: Jan C. Smuts, John Hughlings Jackson, G. E. Coghill, John Dewey, Alfred North Whitehead, L. Von Bertalanffy, Adolf Meyer, and Kurt Lewin.

Jan C. Smuts

The title of patron Saint of holistic theory, as it has evolved, must be awarded to the great scholar-soldier-statesman Jan Christian Smuts, for many years the prime minister of Africa and one of the key architects of the League of Nations. Smuts' personality and his creative and dramatic style of life reminds us of Churchill and his concepts of the holistic character and evolution of life and the universe certainly achieves its most powerful validity and expression in the growth of his own personality. It is clear that Smuts, as few men do, lived his philosophy.

As a biologist and philosopher he was an amateur and yet, with his publication of Holism and Evolution in 1926 came one of Smuts' greatest personal achievements and, in retrospect, perhaps his most seminal contribution. Sinnot (1961) in an introduction to a recent edition of Smuts' work, credits his amateur status as being partially responsible for the freshness and originality of his insights and concepts. That is, Smuts was able to develop his ideas "...with no preconceptions, no confirmed habits of thought,

and no commitment to a scientific orthodoxy..."[1]

Smuts was not only a highly original thinker but genuinely prophetic, and many of the holistic personality theorists, each in his own idiom, reflect his views with surprisingly little alteration. Working his way on the debatable borderland between science and philosophy, Smuts develops his thesis of holism around such concepts as space, time, and matter, the cell, mechanism, evolution, and finally, the development of the personality. Ansbacher (1961) considers Smuts to be the primary inspiration of the holistic movement and Ansbacher judges the early controversy between the deterministic, mechanistic point of view and that of holism and organicism that Smuts discussed over forty years ago to be a continuing and vital issue today. Smuts considered every facet of life as an integral part of a synthetic tendency in the universe, and engaged in an evolutionary pilgrimage toward the development and articulation of greater unity and the creation of larger and more highly integrated wholes.

---

[1]Edmund W. Sinnot, "Introduction to the Compass Edition," J. C. Smuts, Holism and Evolution. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1961. ix.

Smuts is not only an important exponent of a general holistic theory of evolution and the universe, he is also of considerable interest to us in his application of these holistic concepts to personality. Smuts, even in his undergraduate days at Cambridge, was interested in personality development and he wrote a paper, "Walt Whitman: A Study in the Evolution of Personality." This undergraduate study clearly adumbrated his later interest in personality and its holistic evolution. A subsequent paper, "An Inquiry into the Whole," written as early as 1910, reflected a wider and more sophisticated application of the holistic principles he had first perceived in the personality development of Whitman.

"Gradually, I came to realize that personality was only a special case of a much more universal phenomenon, namely, the existence of wholes and the tendency toward wholes and wholeness in nature."[1]

For Smuts, however, the highest form of holistic integration to be found in all of nature and the culmination of the long process of progressive creation is to be found in the development of personality.

---

[1]Jan C. Smuts, Holism and Evolution. New York: Macmillan, 1926, Preface, VI.

Personality, according to Smuts, is "...the culminating phase of the great holistic movement in the universe.... Personality is the supreme embodiment of Holism both in its individual and its universal tendencies. It is the final synthesis...."[1]

Mind, for Smuts, is the most important and conspicuous constituient of personality and is endowed with consciousness. With mind and consciousness comes purpose which is "... probably the highest, most complex manifestation of the free, creative, holistic activity of the mind."[2]

Considering the dedication and originality in his writings it is not hard to believe, as Hall and Lindzey (1957) suggest, that Smuts' book was very influential. However, it is difficult to appraise his direct influence on the seven holistic personality theorists under consideration in this study. In spite of the fact that Smuts coined the word holism from the Greek word holos, meaning complete or whole, and applied the concept to the development of the personality, we seldom find reference to his name.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 261ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 259.

John Hughlings Jackson

Some strong roots of holistic theory must also be traced to the work of the brilliant English neurologist-philosopher Hughlings Jackson (1931) and to his concepts of the evolutionary development of the central nervous system and the hierarchical levels of this development. His concept of the evolutionary process of the central nervous system is essentially an integrative and holistic one and is based on a multilevel analysis of the nervous system. He saw this process as going from highly organized lower centers of the system to higher, less well-organized ones; from simple to complex centers; and from relatively automatic, mechanical centers to more autonomous, voluntary ones. Such an evolutionary process of human development proceeds, according to Mazurkiewicz, a chief interpreter of Jackson's work, by superimposing new dynamics on top of old ones which does not include the destruction of the latter (Dabrowski, 1964).[1] Jackson's philosophical-integrative theories of neurological development have, for many years, served as one major frame of reference in the interpretation of psychological, psychopathological, and neurological phenomena.

---

[1]See also the introduction to Dabrowski's work by Jason Aronson.

It appears, however, that Jackson held a limited view of the value of disintegration or the process of dissolution as a normal part of the growth of neural processes. We shall return to this issue, a central one in holistic personality theory, in chapter V.

G. E. Coghill

As with Smuts, the adumbration of Coghill's later personal and professional contributions took place at the collegiate level and reflected an early interest in the nature and possible integration of sensation, perception, and thought. Early in his career, Coghill rejected the traditional neuroanatomy of the day that dealt with discrete elements that led, ultimately, to a mechanistic "switchboard" concept of the human nervous system.

With the Amblystoma as primary subject, Coghill sought holistic reference points that would link both behavior and neurological development. His search for such reference points centered around the answer to the question: Does behavior develop in an orderly, predictable manner? Coghill (1929, 1930) proceeded, in well-executed research studies on the locomotion development patterns of Amblystoma, to establish neurological correlates with sequential behavior and

development. Three major conclusions, now classic in their significance, followed Coghill's studies (Coghill, 1929).

1. Behavior patterns develop in a sequential order which parallels the order of development of the nervous system and its parts.

2. Physiological processes follow the order of their prior embryological development in the functions of aquatic and terrestrial locomotion and feeding.

3. Behavior develops, from the beginning, through the progressive expansion of a perfectly integrated total pattern and the individuation within it of partial patterns which acquire various degrees of discreteness.

Coghill's work enabled him to see the growth of the neuron and actual behavior of the organism in close relation to each other under controlled conditions. He showed that the form and pattern of behavior in Amblystoma paralleled the step-by-step order of growth in particular parts of the nervous system. This interaction and its concomitants led Coghill to reject the neuron theory as "...a fixed unit of structure and function."[1] Hooker's studies at Pittsburg confirmed the application of Coghill's principles to the development of early overt behavior in the human infant (Hooker, 1944, 1951).

---

[1]G. E. Coghill, Anatomy and the Problem of Behavior. London: Cambridge University Press, 1929. p. 81.

From Coghill's work, two simultaneous processes emerged: 1. The growth expansion of the total pattern of the organism as an integrated unit. 2. The development of specificity or individuation, emerging as "figure on ground" out of the prior integration. These finer processes of individuation emerge "...as a special feature within a more diffuse but dominant mechanism of integration of the whole organism."[1] Referring again to the neuron theory Coghill (1929) concludes that these two complex processes cannot be regarded as the simple action of chains of neurons without some welding into the organism as a whole.

From the beginnings of life, Coghill concludes, there is conclusive evidence of a pervasive organic unity and that the basic function of the nervous system is to maintain the integrity of the individual as a whole while the individual is growing and creating himself. "Man is more than the sum of his reflexes, instincts, and immediate reactions of all sorts. He is all these plus his creative potential for the future."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 89.

[2] Ibid., p. 109.

Commenting on Coghill's work, Herrick (1956), a former teacher and colleague, remarks that the partial-patterns-the discrete specializations-are concerned with analysis of experience and resulting action while the holistic total-patterns are synthetic or integrative and maintains the integrity of the organism in the interests of total development and functioning.

In summary, Coghill states: "All reflexes emerge as partial or local patterns within an expanding or growing total pattern that normally is from the beginning perfectly integrated...they are inherently components of the total pattern or they are under its dominance. An instinctive reaction, on the other hand, is the total pattern overtly in action...the mechanism of the total behavior pattern is, therefore, the agency of integration."[1]

Adolf Meyer

Dr. Adolf Meyer, one of the most influential figures in American psychiatry is credited by Whitehorn and Zilboorg (1933) with initiating in American psychiatry the tradition

---

[1]G. E. Coghill, The Genetic Interrelation of Instinctive Behavior and Reflexes, Psychological Review. 37: 264-266. 1930. p. 264 ff.

of respect for the whole character of an individual's life. Dr. Meyer's emphasis on this totality implied a new and deeper individualization of therapeutic effort. Meyer, through his psychobiological approach, presented a more comprehensive union of conflicting theories.

Meyer did not believe that it was necessary to dissect the person into detachable elements in order to be scientific. He rejected Cartesian dualism and emphasized in his psychobiological approach that the primary unit of integration was the whole person.

> "If mind were split from body, neither could exist and operate by itself, but their union in a person obviously provides quite a different state. And so, the existence of units or integers in life can be taken directly out of experience, without having to be broken down by preliminary analysis. Such integral units have their specific organization which is more than the mere summation of their component parts."[1]

For Meyer the study of an isolated part-function becomes recognizable as a part of the total person as soon as memory and consciousness are allowed to enter in, thus becoming a true psychobiological functioning.

---

[1]Adolf Meyer, The Common Sense Psychiatry of Dr. Adolf Meyer. A. Liet (Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948. p. 559. Quotation from address delivered by Dr. Meyer at the Henry Phipps Psychiatric Clinic: Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration, The Johns Hopkins Hospital, 1939.

In his psychobiological point of view Dr. Meyer (1948) made an explicit distinction between the functioning of detachable organs and the role these same organs play in the "he" or "she" or in the "you" and "I." He was certainly echoing the words of John Dewey when he made a distinction between the knee-jerk when the slightly stretched tendon is hit and the anticipatory action of the whole person in this phenomenon. This common orientation may explain the fact that Meyer (1948) looked upon Dewey as the greatest exponent of American philosophical thought.

In his long and active career Dr. Meyer was frequently at odds with the prevailing assumptions of behaviorism and psychoanalysis. He decried the fragmented and compartmentalizing approach of psychoanalysis and its narrow conception of man built around sexual pathology. Meyer could only conceive of man's mind, behavior, and organs as a biological whole and was most critical of behaviorism in its evasion or denial of the subjective in man and its confusion over the mental aspects.

At seventy-five years of age, following his resignation from the Johns Hopkins University in 1941, Dr. Adolf Meyer

continued to speak out against the rigidity of scientific dogma, and to bring the whole person into exclusive focus: The major foundation of his psychobiology.

Alfred North Whitehead

Alfred North Whitehead, in his writings and lectures, consistently maintained a holistic posture regarding his concepts of behavior, world, and the unity of the universe. Atomistic, fact-bound thought is the apex of abstractive intelligence and yet, "A single fact in isolation is the primary myth required for finite thought, that is to say, for thought unable to embrace totality."[1]

Whitehead believed that connectedness is of the essence of all things and when the connectedness character of types and events is lost there has been an omission of essential factors in the fact considered. Such a focus on "matter-of-fact" makes learning, "A fugitive, and a cloistered virtue" [2] that avoids the essential relationships that reveal the universe and its influence upon individual experience.

---

[1] Alfred N. Whitehead, Modes of Thought. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958. p. 12.

[2] Ibid., p. 27.

Whitehead spoke out on the need for integration and he sought to resolve the mind-body-environment dichotomies. He maintained that mind and body were a complex unity and, in addition, that there was no way to identify or define a demarcation between body and external nature. Where does the body become separate and distinct from environment and when does environment cease to be a part of the body? Whitehead asked. We find the holistic personality theorists echoing the same questions and the same concern.

Whitehead pleaded for a concept of experience that is evolved and structured out of an intimate relationship to the rest of things; an evolving of experience so that new relationships are formed to create new and more highly evolved centers of unity. "The present receives the past and builds the future."[1] Whitehead saw such modes of unity in the organization of molecules, stones, and in the lives of animals and men. However, he stressed that the universe can never bend to complete stability and points out the virtues of the frustration of order. Whitehead suggests a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 43.

concept of disintegration as a stimulus for growth wherein there develops new and dominant forms of unity and order.[1]

> "The essence of life is to be found in the frustrations of established order. The universe refuses the deadening influence of complete conformity."[2]

Out of the disintegration of established order, Whitehead insists, there is the emergence of new wholes and processes. In creative evolution, for example, are the three major factors: data, process, and issue. That is "...data, process with its form relevant to these data, and issue into datum for further process--data, process, issue."[3] The very basis for existence is in the ultimate transition from datum to issue. Thus, process and existence presuppose each other. Existence, therefore, cannot be isolated or abstracted from process.

For Whitehead, process and individuality require each other. They are interdependent with process serving as the matrix or context within which individuality finds expression. In harmony with Smuts, Whitehead's vision was centered on the ever evolving and dynamic wholes amid diversity. It is

---

[1] Cf. Our Theory of Crisis in chapter V.

[2] Whitehead. Ibid., p. 119.

[3] Ibid., p. 127.

this process that bestows impact upon the future as potentialities evolve and are actualized.

The idèa of "static actuality" was anathema to Whitehead as it precluded the concept of potentiality. Whitehead stressed the "becoming" nature of man, his process character, his future orientation, and his intentionality.

The laws of life and nature, according to Whitehead, cannot be seen as static structures and as discrete entities. Every abstraction inevitably neglects significant factors which are inexorably related to the wider patterns. A limited universe is thus created by a special science. Attention to this theme is evident in the writings of the holistic personality theorists and especially parallels Angyal's (1941) concept of "parenthetic exclusions" where the organism and environment are viewed by the sciences as static structures separable in space. Aspects of the biospheric total field are thus abstracted and studied by the various segmental sciences.

Whitehead believed, above all, in the essential unity and pattern character of the human person and the engagement of this unity to a future ideal and to the process of self-creation. In this process Whitehead saw a certain time-binding integration of the past-present-future.

John Dewey

John Dewey was one of the first to criticize the atomistic focus in psychology and his specific target in his epoch-making article was the stimulus-response model and the reflex arc concept, so characteristic of the psychology of his day. Dewey (1896) considered the reflex arc concept to be a survival of Plato's metaphysical dualism and, similarly, he criticized the tacit assumption in the reflex-arc theory that the outcome of the resulting response is a totally new experience. Thus, Dewey saw the reflex-arc concept as "...a patchwork of disjointed parts..."[1] He stressed the need in psychology for a unifying principle and for a central and integrating working hypothesis. "The material is too great in mass and too varied in style to fit into existing pigeon-holes..."[2]

L. Von Bertalanffy

Underlying all of the above humanistic-holistic orientations toward man we see him viewed as a dynamic and open

---

[1] John Dewey, "The Reflex-Arc Concept in Psychology," Psychological Review, 3, 357-370. 1896. p. 358.

[2] Ibid., p. 357.

system in free exchange with the environment in contrast to a closed system subject to entrophy, loss of energy, and where there is little or no transaction with the environment. Bertalanffy (1950,1952) has long advocated a concept of the organism as an open system. He introduced the concept of "equa-finality" to suggest that the final state of an organism is not necessarily determined by initial conditions as seen in most closed physical system. Here, we may define a system as a complex of elements in mutual interaction as contrasted to simple reaction theories and mechanistic determinism. For Bertalanffy, the human organism represents a complex open system, active as well as reactive, and engaged in a creative and uniquely human process. "Goal seeking behavior is a general biological characteristic; true purposiveness is a privilege of man and is based upon the anticipation of the future in symbols. Instead of being a product, man becomes the creator of his environment."[1]

Allport (1960b), in a related article, builds upon Bertalanffy's contribution and specifically relates this

---

[1]L. Von Bertalanffy, "Theoretical Models in Biology and Psychology," Theoretical Models and Personality Theory. David Krech and George S. Klein (Eds.). Durham: Duke University Press, 1952. p. 37.

concept of the open system to personality theory. Allport stresses that while most psychologists and personality theorists today accept a semi-open system of the human organism, agreeing that there is an intake and output of matter and energy, and that the organism achieves and maintains a steady state, few regard the organism as a completely open system. Allport indicates that most current semi-open system supporters would object to at least two important criteria of the open system:

1. The tendency of such systems to enhance their degree of order and become something more than they now are.

2. In the open system there is more than mere intake and output of matter and energy; there is extensive transactional commerce with the environment.

Kurt Lewin

It is in viewing human functioning via system principles that Gestalt psychology was nurtured in protest. The Gestalt Psychologists were characterized by their opposition to "atomism." In part, at least, the early development of the Gestalt movement was a reactionary one in opposition to both structural psychology, with its mental analysis into elements, and behaviorism. Thus, organization, relatedness,

and pattern were major themes stressed by the Gestaltists. In concept and philosophy, therefore, Gestalt psychology has certainly made an impact on the development of holistic theory as well as upon the larger arena of modern psychological thought. Although the former influence has been considerable and the two areas are warmly compatible, it must be pointed out that Gestalt psychology cannot be regarded as a truely holistic or organismic psychology. Its attention has been directed primarily to sensory phenomena and the phenomenon of conscious awareness and, as developed by Wertheimer, Koffka, and Köhler, has not addressed itself to personality organization and personality development as a whole (Hall and Lindzey, 1957). Maslow (1954), too, points out that the Gestalt psychologists have limited their work primarily to the organization of the phenomenal world and to the various "fields" outside the organism. Holistic theory, then, may be seen as the extension and amplification of many of the Gestalt principles to personality theory and to the organism as a whole.

The psychologist most responsible for utilizing Gestalt principles and concepts and employing them to advantage in understanding the personality and the totality of the

organism was the brilliant psychologist and exponent of field theory, Kurt Lewin. Lewin, too, was reacting to the partitive concepts and reductionistic efforts seen in the stimulus-response behaviorism of his day, and he expressed a debt of gratitude for his background in Gestalt theory and to its major proponents Wertheimer, and Köhler. He was closely associated with both men and it is clear that Gestalt theory served as a major foundation for Lewin's singular contributions to personality theory. Lewin's field theory, however, proved much more psychological in nature and contrasted, somewhat, with the physicalistic emphasis of Gestalt psychology.

Lewin stressed the unity of mind and made a protest against the piecemeal dissection of the mind into discrete elements, sensations, and feelings. However, according to Lewin, we cannot contend that everything is related to everything else. In judging the importance of a single experience or event it must be evaluated in terms of its embedded position in "Spheres of the personality and whole processes."[1] One event may be linked to one system or

---

[1]Kurt Lewin, A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935. p. 54.

process and another contiguous experience may be bound primarily yet within another system or sub-system. Thus, for Lewin, ordered action depends upon some partial segregation of systems.

Lewin, in a rejection of "associationism" and habit hierarchies, criticized the idea of discrete cause-effect relationships or "mechanically rigid" couplings in an effort to explain psychical events. He supported the idea, just beginning to gain some currency at the time of his writing, that we are not dealing with rigid connections of discrete elements but rather with "temporally extended wholes"[1] as in a melody.

Lewin emphasized the dynamic relationship between the person and his environment with such concepts as "life-space" and "field-forces" and, anticipating the holistic personality theorists, he insisted upon the contemporaneousness of all motivation. Lewin sought to transcend traditional dichotomies including the firmly established boundaries between person and world. To Lewin, the person and the environment meet one another in an organized, dynamic field.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 44.

According to Murphy's interpretation "Kurt Lewin and other creative thinkers in the land of "field-theory" have undertaken to show that the "life space" of man is a function neither of man's inner existence nor of his environment nor of some bland formula regarding the interaction of the two, but of new creations of possible systems of relationship between man and his environment."[1]

In some respects Lewin failed to fully elaborate a psychology of the individual and in his later years he devoted himself almost entirely to a study of group processes, group dynamics, and action research (Hall and Lindzey, 1957). In contrast, holistic personality theory becomes, more completely than any other, a psychology of the organism or person. It was Lewin, however, who was instrumental in developing a conceptual bridge between the Gestaltists and the holistic theorists. It was his theory that helped bring about a revival of man seen as a highly complex, creative energy system, behaving within a given field and motivated by psychological forces (Hall and Lindzey, 1957).

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books, 1958. p. 21.

In some ways, of course, these diverse forerunners of holistic personality theory held little in common. In at least two important respects, however, they represent an important expression of commitment that advanced the evolution of holistic theory. First, they were all voicing a protest to the Cartesian mind-body dualism of the seventeenth century, to the American subscription to British Associationism in the nineteenth century, and to all other such attempts to abridge or compartmentalize the human organism. The second meeting of minds among these men of diverse interests and specialities was found in more than a negative and reactionary response to partitive concepts and the growing trend toward reductionism in the concepts and study of the human organism. Each man, in a manner appropriate to his own field of endeavor, sought to redress the imbalance and rectify, as they perceived it in their own professions, the violation to the essential nature and integrity of the organism which they firmly believed to be found in man's capacity for unity, organization, and integration. They vigorously fought artificiality, over-simplification, and the unnecessary abridgment of human nature.

CHAPTER III

THE MAJOR HOLISTIC THEMES

Introduction

The following chapter is devoted to a statement and discussion of the major holistic themes in the writings of the seven holistic personality theorists under consideration in this study. Each theorist's treatment of each theme will be considered. In Chapters IV and V these themes will be integrated with the salient issues relevant to a consideration of a holistic theory of healthy personality.

It will better serve the purpose of this chapter to point out that the three major themes developed will be, indeed, should be, repetitious. The seven theorists represented in this study were chosen for their strongly holistic orientation toward human development and personality study. If the development of a holistic theory of healthy personality is to be a valid presentation we must have some assurance, some very sound indication, that they do represent a common reference in their philosophical position regarding the nature of the human organism and present a shared orientation toward human development. One purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to develop a supportive structure for the study and to

offer the substantive themes as evidence that the selected theorists are, in fact, viable representatives of holistic theory.

It should also be stressed that the seven writers have developed unique features in their respective personality theories. Each theory is an idiomatic expression of a holistic orientation to life and human growth. While it is impossible, within the purpose and design of this study, to do a comprehensive critique of each theory, it has been possible, we believe, to treat the major themes and their relationships to a theory of healthy personality, without neglecting this uniqueness and without violating or distorting major theoretical features. Theoretical elements have not been removed from their context. Rather, the substantive themes, the important contextual elements, have been selected for study. The themes treated in this chapter are not mutually exclusive and there is an endeavor, whenever relevant or appropriate, to integrate them.

A Note on Personality Structure

What are the basic units that compose the edifice of the human personality? To those concerned with the essence of personality and behavior this has been a major question throughout the ages. Historically, this taxonomic search

has been focused on instincts, on a discovery of atomistic or molecular units as contained in the familiar doctrine of drives and in the reflex-arc concept or the habit unit.

The holistic theorists' answer to this question, while making possible certain generalizations, is an ambiguous one. An outline and analysis of structure per se holds no great appeal to the holistic writers. There is no real interest in component parts. A primary source of ambiguity is found in the fact that in specific discussions of structure little or no distinction is made between the meaning of the terms structure, organization, and personality dynamics.[1]

In spite of this semantic lattitude, certain firm generalizations can be made concerning the holistic treatment of personality structure.

a. The holistic theorists prefer broad and parsimonious units that will help define man as a whole and come to grips with his veridical nature. They seek relatively complex and comprehensive structural elements rather than discrete, molecular ones. For example, Angyal(1941) asks that

---

[1]Definitions of "structure" seem to support this variety of meanings. See English, Horace B. and English, Ava Champney. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1958.

structure be determined by the leading principle of organization which constitutes the essential nature of the whole organism.

b. In holistic theory, therefore, structure becomes almost synonomous with motivational forces (Allport, 1961; Goldstein, 1963b; Maslow, 1954).

c. Structural considerations must preserve the concept of the "uniqueness" of each personality organization as well as define the commonality of the components of personality. In general, these theorists look askance at "nomothetic" elements that may deny or distort unique structural patterns (Allport, 1961, 1946).

d. Holistic theory requires that personality structure is interpreted as subject to change. It is not an indelibly fixed entity. The holistic theorists reject the concept of unchanging structure, unchanging energies or any form of "hard" determinism. In a positive sense, personality structure is subject to change through therapy, significant encounters with the environment, and during the evolution of the personality in the process of growth and "becoming." (Rogers, 1951; Murphy, 1947, 1968; Allport, 1955, 1961) According to Allport (1955) unfinished structure has a dynamic power and is responsible for growth toward closure. In a

different manifestation, it has been observed that function can change structure. For example, an impoverished environment can not only lead to a declining I.Q. score but to a retardation of the growth of the brain cortex in baby rodents (Krech et al. 1960).

Gordon Allport gives more attention to personality structure than any other holistic theorist with the exception of Gardner Murphy. Allport is often labeled as a trait theorist because traits are the structural components of the personality. Allport identifies both the common traits and those that include the more centralized and individualistic personal dispositions that make up the proprium. These latter traits form "systems of purpose"[1] in the organism.

Andras Angyal (1941) sees structure in terms of the two basic motivational trends of the organism (autonomy and homonomy) operating within the three primary structural dimensions of the biosphere; a term designating the organism-environment field or system. These dimensions include:

a. The vertical dimension, moving from the central core of

---

[1]Gordon Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 1961. p. 373.

the personality up to the overt expressions and behaviors. b. The progressive dimension, constituting a series of related acts in carrying out goal-directed behavior. c. The transverse dimension, representing the coordination of discrete acts.

Kurt Goldstein (1963b)gives little attention to structure per se. However, a discernable structural feature in his theory is the concept of figure-ground relationships which constitutes the structure of any ordered behavior (Bischof, 1964). Added to this ubiquitous structural feature of Goldstein's is the sovereign motive of self-actualization and the three additional structural elements, equalization, ordered behavior, and centeredness, that confer unity upon the developmental process.

Prescott Lecky's (1951) goal-directed strivings toward self-consistency represent an organization of values and attitudes. These may be considered to represent the structural elements in Lecky's theory. Here, again, it must be pointed out that personality structure cannot be clearly distinguished from the primary motivations of the organism.

Personality structure in Abraham Maslow's theory consists of an hierarchical arrangement of instinctoid needs.

There is a tendency to fulfill each set of needs in a progressive development of the personality.

Gardner Murphy's (1947) more elaborate structure consists of: a. physiological dispositions, b. canalizations, c. conditioned responses, d. cognitive and perceptual habits (Hall & Lindzey, 1957).

Carl Rogers' (1961, 1959) use of the term personality structure and personality organization are synonomous. The chief structural element in Rogers' self-theory is the self-concept, or the self-gestalt.

Major Themes in Holistic Theory

The four major themes in holistic theory are:

1. Organization: The personality is seen as an organized, dynamic, and open system. There is a striving for perfect order and symetry.
2. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need or drive.
3. Process: The growth of the personality is directional and always evolving in a process of change toward a never-to-be-reached perfection, unity, and fulfillment.
4. Potentiality: Man has vast resources and unrealized potentials for growth. There is a concern for the

development of this human potential and for a conceptualization of healthy personality.[1]

Gordon Allport

I. Organization: The personality is an organized, dynamic, and open system.

> "We view the personality in the only way it can be intelligently viewed--as a network of organization, composed of systems within systems, some systems of smaller magnitude and somewhat peripheral to the central or propriate structure, other systems of wider scope at the core of the edifice..."[2]

To Allport, life is inherently synthetic and the key to life process is to be found in organization. The system properties of personality lead to an idiographic lawfulness and although perfect organization is never achieved, there is a striving in the human personality to complete incomplete structure and bring harmony and integration to an open and growing system.[3] At any given time, according to Allport's

---

[1] The theme of potentiality and healthy personality will be explored in Chapters IV and V.

[2] Allport, Pattern and Growth, p. 360.

[3] We define system as a complex of elements in mutual interaction. The major criteria for an open system are: 1. material and energy exchange, 2. the maintenance of steady states, 3. the striving for the enhancement of internal order and 4. significant transactions with the environment. According to Allport (1960b) only the latter two distinguish quasi-open theories from the truely open ones.

(1961) principle of convergence, available energies are directed toward a maximally integrated course of conduct.

It is the proprium and its eight functions[1] which serves as the integrating core of the personality and "includes all aspects of personality that makes for inward unity."[2] In its synthesizing role the proprium aids the individual in incorporating perceptions and experiences into the system as a whole.

The propriate functions are laden with value and can be distinguished from tribal and opportunistic responses to the demands of the environment. In most cases these latter adjustments involve the personality at a peripheral level. The proprium, the synthesizing core of the personality, can be considered as subjective states of self-relevance and include "All the regions of our life that we regard as peculiarly ours."[3] Allport does not fail to recognize the

---

[1]The proprium covers all functions of the personality that forge unity and create distinctiveness. Allport lists eight functions of the proprium: 1. bodily sense, 2. self-identity, 3. ego-enhancement, 4. ego-extension, 5. rational agent, 6. self-image, 7. propriate strivings and 8. the knower. For a succinct discussion of these eight functions see Gordon Allport, Becoming: Basic Consideration for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955. p. 41 ff.

[2]Ibid., p. 40.

[3]Ibid.

important interaction and mutuality between the organism and the environment. However, he takes vigorous issue with the conception of the personality as existing only as an interpersonal system. Regardless of all of his involvement and outreaching into his world "the individual remains a unit."[1]

Allport is critical of S-R formulations, drive-reduction theories, the part-function approaches to personality and all other attempts to fragment, oversimplify and caricature the human personality and destroy its essential wholeness and unity. His major criticism of these reductive efforts lies in the common theoretical assumption that all such components or units are of equal value in the development of the personality. Allport (1955) believes that the forces of organization are so strong that only a few central characteristics will depict the course of growth.

II. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive, or drive.

> "At low levels of behavior the familiar formula of drives and their conditioning appears to suffice.

---

[1]Gordon Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 1961. p. 570.

> But as soon as the personality enters the stage of ego-extension, and develops a self-image with the visions of self-perfection, we are, I think, forced to postulate motives of a different order, motives that reflect propriate strivings."[1]

Gordon Allport (1953, 1955, 1961) is, at times, adament in his rejection of all "traditional wisdom" of motivation theory. As an explanation of human motivation he rejects the formula of drive reduction, homeostasis, and the accompanying habit hierarchies designed to reduce tension. To Allport these are static conceptions representing a semi-closed system that does not adequately provide for change and growth of the personality. According to S-R models, the tension-reduction theories and the steady states pursued under the physiological concepts of homeostasis, man is perceived as an "empty organism" (Allport, 1961) without the interests and purposes of the human person.

Allport's rejection of classical motivation theory must be qualified. He sees a strict discontinuity in human motivation and he makes a distinction between arrested or low-levels of behavior (immature, neurotic, etc.) that are largely governed by the tension-reduction, homeostatic

---

[1]Gordon Allport, Becoming: Basic Consideration for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. p. 48.

formula and motivations representing more mature levels of functioning that truly reflect propriate strivings. This dichotomy is often expressed as opportunistic adjustments involving external determinants and peripheral motivations vs. the more ego-involved, propriate-centered behaviors. Allport stresses the distinction between deficiency-based motives and the growth motives with the former following a tension-reduction model vis-a-vis severe frustration and the latter representing strivings leading to self-actualization where tensions are maintained rather than reduced in the interests of distant, evolving goals. "Growth motives... distinguish human from animal becoming, and adult from infant becoming."[1]

Allport rejects an ad hoc multiple drive theory of human motivation and, while he stresses that any adequate theory of motivation must encompass a range of motives, he advances the general term propriate strivings as the all encompassing and sovereign motivation of adulthood.

III. Process: The growth of personality is directional, always evolving and undergoing change.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 68.

> "Personality is less a finished product than a transitive process. While it has some stable features, it is at the same time continually undergoing change."[1]

From birth until death, personality is in process as an unfinished structure tending toward closure. In spite of its tendency to organization and self-consistency, the organism's growth is directional as he tries to bring fulfillment to propriate strivings. The personality is a dynamic, evolving phenomenon. As goals are reached new ones emerge. There is a reorganization within the system whereby a new synthesis is achieved. With fresh aspirations, latent potentials, and the challenge of new dimensions of self-discovery, the personality both creates new levels of unfinished structure and strives for its completion. There would be no propriate striving in the face of a static, completed structure. "...it is the unfinished structure that has this dynamic power."[2]

Allport is critical of any theory of behavior that irrevocably links man to a past that precludes or limits process and growth. He rejects the geneticism of instinctual bonds and the notion of early conditioned determinants

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

[2] Ibid., p. 91.

of contemporary adult behavior. Allport seeks to counter this genetic emphasis with his concept of propriate functional autonomy. Premordial impulses and the inborn dispositions which exist in infancy become incorporated and transformed by later stages of development (Allport, 1955, 1961). Lives are lived in the present with a focus on the future. In the process of becoming, the unfinished structure of the personality represents an ideal self-image concerned with the realization of future possibility or with "....visions of self-perfection."[1] This imaginative quality of the proprium orients man's life toward the future as he seeks to bring fulfillment to the vision of his future possibility. Bonner refers to this commitment to future possibility as "Idealization...the unconscious tendency to perceive ourselves and others as different from what we 'really are'."[2]

With Allport's (1961) emphasis on the process of becoming and the long range goals of propriate striving he

---

[1] Ibid., p. 48.

[2] Hubert Bonner, Idealization and Mental Health. Journal of Individual Psychology. Vol. 18, no. 2, 1962. p. 137.

reintroduces and adapts a term from medieval philosophy, "intentionality" to refer to the characteristics that unite biological vitality with a system of meanings. These intentional characteristics guide the process of propriate striving and represent primary modes of addressing oneself to the future. Allport regards these intentional dispositions, future pointed, to be the most comprehensive units in the personality and his work with such concepts as intentionality, purpose, and goal-direction of propriate strivings places him squarely in support of a modified teleological view of the human personality.

Andras Angyal

I. Organization: The personality is an Organized, Dynamic, and Open System.

> "It is characteristic of the holistic approach that it...'seeks to understand various phenomena of human behavior in terms of the underlying organization. Thus, the concept basic for the holistic explanation of behavior is that of organization or integration.' "[1]

Angyal asserts that knowledge of the whole person will never emerge from segmental studies of the personality.

---

[1]Andras Angyal, The Holistic Approach in Psychiatry. American Journal of Psychiatry, 105: 1948. p. 178.

Instead, life and personality must be studied as a dynamic whole whereby we can determine the leading principles of organization within the "biological total process."[1] It is the presence of this principle of an organizing system that distinguishes the whole from a simple aggregate of items. The whole is always structurally differentiated into parts--a unitas multiplex--but the divisional lines are determined or prescribed by the whole itself. Hence the parts, if we can discover them, will prove to be genuine holistic units rather than fragments in a superficial, additive process. These real holistic units, in turn, contribute to the leading principles of the whole and constitute the essence of the given whole (Angyal, 1941).

The growth of the personality, therefore, is not a haphazard and capricious development. The organism, throughout life, follows the laws of Gestalt formation: "The tendency toward closure and the tendency toward praegnanz, or as I would put it, a tendency toward the perfect realization of the system principle." "Every incomplete whole tends to a continuation which is in accordance with the system

---

[1]Andras Angyal, Foundations for a Science of Personality. New York: The Commonwealth Fund. 1941. p. 21.

principle of that whole."[1] This process or tendency toward completeness involves successive stages of differentiation, new combinations, and a shifting and reembedding of parts into the whole.

The material of the personality structure is organized and differentiated within a dimensional domain. This dimensional domain includes three primary dimensions: 1. The verticle dimension; a depth to surface dimension in which we go in a verticle fashion from potentiality to actuality, i.e., from the basic human trends to their altered and concretized expression. 2. The dimension of progression; a means-end organization or the sequential stages in a teleological organization. 3. The transverse dimension. The coordination and integration of the verticle and progression attributes, the discrete elements, having similar positions on their respective scales. Thus, we see that the "personality may be viewed as a highly organized whole, a hierarchy of systems."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64 ff.

[2] Andras Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1965. (E. Hanfmann and R. M. Jones, eds.) p. 50.

At the base of all three dimensions is the system principle of the total biological process directed by the two basic trends in human development: 1. The trend toward increased autonomy. 2. The trend toward increased homonomy.

Consistent with his holistic position, Angyal believes it is impossible to draw a line of demarcation between the individual and the environment. The organism is a system of dynamic processes and no structural or morphological distinctions can be made. There is no biological process that takes place exclusively within the organismic or environmental domain. Rather, it may be possible to determine the respective controls that the organism and the environment maintain over these processes. Their relative controls, therefore, may be expressed as a ratio (Angyal, 1941).

Theoretically and dynamically expressed, the organism is an autonomous, self-governing unit while the environment maintains a heteronomous influence. The life process, however, can never be carried out exclusively within the body but involves a broader realm of events. This larger field in which the biological total process takes place, Angyal calls the biosphere. It includes the organism and the environment "as aspects of a single reality which can be

separated only by abstraction."[1] Although the biosphere is an undivided unit, it is structured into subject (organism) and object (environment) gradients and represents a dynamic tensional relationship between two poles: the autonomous determination of the organism and the heteronomous controls of the environment. These two poles of the total biological process are inseparably united in the total dynamics of the biosphere.

II. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive or drive.

> "Besides the trend toward self-expansion, increased autonomy, a second trend has also to be examined for an understanding of human behavior. This trend we call the trend toward homonomy...the tendency to conform to, unite with, participate in and fit into superindividual wholes."[2]

Angyal rejects the "immanence hypothesis" and its conception of life as revolving around a central position of equilibrium and forming a closed circle of part-function relationships. This theory, a homeostatic concept of human motivation, sees life as a cyclic phenomenon of repeated

---

[1] Andras Angyal, Foundations for a Science of Personality. New York: The Commonwealth Fund. 1941. p. 100.

[2] Ibid., p. 181 ff.

deficits and re-establishments of equilibrium. In the "immanence hypothesis" the broad holistic dimensions and the biological facts of assimilation and production are ignored and directions of development are impossible. In considering motivation Angyal prefers to involve the larger, holistic units with the questions, "What is the direction in which the total life process evolves? What is the organism aiming at in its total functioning?

The organismic total process (the dynamic whole) is organized around two basic trends or strivings: the trend toward autonomy and the trend toward homonomy. All partial functions and sub-systems are subordinated to these two general trends.

Autonomy: The organism is not merely a passive, reactive being, but is self-governing and endowed with spontaneity. The organism follows a trend toward increased self-government and actively engages in selection, choice, self-regulation and adaptation, all of which imply autonomy. Autonomy for Angyal (1941) also presupposes a close interaction of the organism with the environment, with the organism displaying a growing proficiency in controlling or modifying the events of its environment. "The tendency toward increased autonomy

is a tendency to achieve, dominate, and master the environment."[1]

Angyal emphasizes that autonomy is not some mysterious entity but, rather, a "pattern of the life process."[2] Neither is it strictly teleological, implying fixed goals, but rather directional. This direction, however, may define a range of appropriate, goal-related objects. Angyal's concept of autonomous strivings includes joy of action, the drive to act, resourcefulness and competence, curiosity, acquisitive characteristics, and self-reliance. He stresses, however, that there must be harmony between the trend toward autonomy and its specific manifestations (Angyal, 1965).

Homonomy: The second major trend or principle of the biologic total process is the trend toward homonomy; the need to relate to and be in harmony with superindividual units extending beyond the individual self. Angyal regards this trend as no less basic than the autonomous strivings of the organism. In fact, Angyal considers the expression of the homonomous trend to be at the most specifically human level of all and he suggests that the whole concept of homonomy

---

[1] Ibid., p. 48.

[2] Ibid., p. 52.

could be equated with love. Homonomy, however, can be manifest in a variety of social, artistic, and religious attitudes and be in harmony with the social group, nature, God, or some ethical or moral world order.

The trends toward autonomy and homonomy, seemingly incompatible opposites, may on occasion produce some internal conflict. Unless they are insufficiently developed or poorly integrated, however, the autonomous and homonomous orientations to life are essentially complimentary (Angyal, 1941), and there is evidence that suggests that these two basic features of human striving proposed by Angyal are interdependent parts of the same motivational system (Storr, 1963; Rogers, 1961).

Beyond the system principle of the biological total organism and its trends toward autonomy and homonomy, Angyal concludes that the broadest motivation, the greatest concern of the person, is to shape his life into "a coherent meaningful whole" which is "an intrinsic or self-purpose."[1] It is this intrinsic desire for self-realization, for completeness, that lends unity to the life process.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 354.

III. Process: The growth of the personality is directional, always evolving and undergoing change.

> "To see personality as a time-Gestalt means to assume that it exists not only at a given moment, that the person is not only what he is here and now, but that he is an organized process extending through time..."[1]

Angyal eschews the concept of the personality as "a closed book" with the past irrevocably fixed and unchanging, as an immutable imprint, in determining the course of life and where "the future is incalculable."[2]

The contemporaneous nature of personality stresses a constellation of current factors. As a time-Gestalt, however, Angyal views personality as evolving through time and valid not only in a contemporary sense but as a dynamic unity of past events, present constellations and future possibility. Each time element is in process and each has significance only in terms of its positional value in relation to the whole of which each is a part. The dynamic interaction within this time-Gestalt constructs new forms, new relationships, and new structures. Personality is an evolving, ever-changing phenomenon.

---

[1] Andras Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. New York: John Wiley & Sons. 1965. (E. Hanfmann and R. M. Jones, eds.) p. 63.

[2] Ibid.

Kurt Goldstein

I. Organization: The Personality is an Organized, Dynamic, and Open System.

> "...any phenomenon can be understood only when considered in relation to every other phenomenon; it can be evaluated only by recognizing its significance in the functioning of the organism as a whole."[1]

Kurt Goldstein rejects the validity of the reflex theory which "represents the organism as a bundle of isolable mechanisms"[2] and he disavows the aim of research methodology to be the discovery of part-processes. Goldstein emphasizes the importance of research in aiding us to know the organism as a whole and in uniting part-processes into holistic, molar units so that an understanding of the organization of the total person and the basic laws and principles governing organismic life will be achieved. Goldstein's own research and methodological procedures have been directed toward a recognition of the whole. His empirical observations and studies of abstract and concrete behavior in brain-injured

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein, Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology. New York: Schocken Books, 1963. (Harvard University Press. 1940) Foreword, vii.

[2]Kurt Goldstein, The Organism. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963. (American Book Co. 1939). p. 67.

patients clearly illustrates that a disturbance to one part of the organism has repercussions throughout the entire system. These part-process disturbances are expressed as symptoms and Goldstein (1963b) reveals the falacy of the isolated symptom. He demonstrates its integral relationship to the behavior of the total organism.

Goldstein's efforts have been directed primarily toward discovering this intrinsic, molar structure and the true Gestalt of the organism. Out of his work has come a conceptual differentiation between the less vital, surface aspects of the organism and the more comprehensive, veridical aspects of its nature (Goldstein, 1963a).

Just as it is impossible to understand human behavior as reflexes or as isolated S-R bonds, it is equally impossible to accept instincts as basic elements in human performance. Goldstein does not deny the presence of reflex units or instinctual responses in the behavioral repertoire of the organism. However, he views them as he does any other symptom, molecular unit, or part process: they have relevance and significance only as they are viewed holistically, in reference to the whole organism. All parts are interpreted as belonging to the life and functioning of the total organism and should be studied and understood as such (Goldstein, 1963b).

Within the context of organic and environmental changes and in the process of coming to terms with the environment the organism maintains a consistancy and unity of personality whereby the organism displays "...a relatively great constancy around a constant mean."[1] Kurt Goldstein (1963b) presents three major concepts which identify and explain this tendency toward organization, stability and order in the organism. These concepts are: 1. equalization, 2. preferred behavior, 3. centering.

The equalization process is a basic biological law of tension distribution whereby the points of higher excitation (locale of stimulis) and points of lower excitation are equalized and there is an ordered return to a "mean" level of excitation. The organism, over a period of time, has the tendency to remain in a state of tension which lies near this mean (Goldstein, 1963b). The organism also achieves and sustains equilibrium by means of a tendency toward preferred behavior, a selective range of modes of behavior which enhance the adequacy of the organism's performance in a given environmental situation. Preferred behavior is comfortable

---

[1]Goldstein, Ibid., p. 112.

and natural for the organism and represents "...the greatest accuracy of performance..." and the "...least possible expenditure of energy."[1] Goldstein considers preferred behavior as a good Gestalt, reflecting the holistic unity of the organism, since preferred behavior in a single field always signals preferred behavior of the whole organism. In the organism's capacity for centering, Goldstein introduces a third concept of organismic integration. Goldstein speaks of centering as the criterion of maturity. It requires the abstract attitude "...by virtue of which all mental and behavioral aspects can be properly integrated and thus adequately centered in the personality as a whole."[2]

Goldstein's three concepts and forms of personality integration, equalization, preferred behavior, and centering, are difficult to interpret since he makes no evaluation of their respective roles in personality development. A cursory examination would invite the conclusion that they are synonomous terms and used interchangeably to represent Goldstein's integrating principle. While they each refer to the organism's trend toward ordered behavior and capacity to achieve a unity

---

[1]Goldstein, Ibid., p. 347 ff.

[2]Kurt Goldstein, Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology. New York: Schocken Books, 1963. (Harvard University Press, 1940). p. 157.

of the personality, a more careful study reveals a hierarchy of organizational complexity. The equalization principle represents a neural base, a basic biological law, for the distribution and equalization of energy within the nervous system and perhaps serves as a base for future organization. Preferred behavior represents another, higher level of organization and unity. Goldstein (1963b) indicates that it reflects both psychological factors and the experiences of the organism as well as innate characteristics and potentials. The third level of unity or centering represents the highest form of integration that the human being can achieve or aspire to. Our evidence for this interpretation comes from Goldstein's own brief statements on the nature of centering. "...the vigor and cohesion of centering reveals itself as a measure for the level of organizational life. The highest form of centering manifests itself in a number of formal attributes which ultimately represent one and the same thing, but which are, as a rule, named differently: freedom, meaningfulness, action springing from the whole personality, productivity, capacity to meaningful actions, capacity to adequate shifting in attitude, and capacity to absorb milieu expansions or modifications, etc..." Goldstein adds that...

"we rank an individual the higher, the greater his power is of cohesive centering in encompassing "world," i.e., the milieu corresponding to human nature."[1]

Goldstein deals almost exclusively with the unity, integrity, and essential wholeness of the organism and we must agree, with some reservations,[2] with Hall and Lindzey (1957) when they observe that "Goldstein treats the organism as a segregated unit which is set apart from the rest of the world."[3] For Goldstein, the environment is a force that the organism must have transactions with and "come to terms" with. And while the environment must be adequate for the organism's ordered development and self-actualization it is, at the same time, often treated as a separate realm. At times, Goldstein seems to perceive the organism as being in competition with the environment as the organism strives for self-actualization. "This tendency toward actualization is primal; but it can effect itself only in conflicting with, and in struggling against the opposing forces of the environment."[4]

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein, The Organism. Boston: Beacon Press. 1963. p. 491.

[2]e.g., See chapter V of Goldstein's theory of healthy personality.

[3]Calvin S. Hall, and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1957. p. 330.

[4]Goldstein, The Organism, p. 305.

II. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive, or drive.

> "...the drive which sets the organism going is nothing but the forces which arise from its tendency to actualize itself as fully as possible in terms of its potentialities.[1]

Goldstein rejects the theory of separate or multiple drives since it requires the additional concept of a higher authority or agency to govern the relationships between the various drives. He asserts that an organism is governed by one drive and one drive only. All other characteristics and motives, according to Goldstein, are in the service of this sovereign tendency toward self-actualization which can only be expressed and achieved through a dynamic process of "coming-to-terms" with the environment; meeting the demands of the environment with preferred behavior in such a way that the capacities of the organism are realized as fully as possible. The needs and potentials of the human organism demand expression and fulfillment. The drive for the fulfillment of these needs and potentials is the self-actualizing tendency of the organism.

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein, Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology. New York: Schocken Books. 1963. (Harvard University Press. 1940). p. 172.

Goldstein (1963a) asserts that the motivation of the human organism is contemporary and he is critical of theories that establish the unconscious forces of childhood as the chief determiners of adult motives.

III. Process: The growth of personality is directional, always evolving, and undergoing change.

> "...direction is what we actually find as the outstanding characteristic in the performances of an organism..."[1]
> "...the basic phenomenon of life is an incessant process of coming to terms with the environment."[2]

Goldstein views the life process as dynamic and directional and he states that it is characteristic of the sick life to strive to maintain the existant state. It is on this basis that Goldstein (1963b) also rejects the implications of Freud's pleasure principle and the death instinct. Ordered behavior, he assures us, is not tensionless and does not strive to become so. Rather, the result of a normally ordered process is a formation of tension that enhances growth and the further ordered activity of the personality.

---

[1] Kurt Goldstein, The Organism. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963. (American Book Co. 1939) p. 86.

[2] Ibid., p. 333.

The ability to cope with the environment, to come to terms with it in a creative process, necessitates tension levels appropriate to the tasks. This can be seen to be a "productive disequilibrium" leading the process of self-actualization (Goldstein, 1951).

How is it, Goldstein asks, that the human organism, being endowed with a drive for self-actualization and a high capacity for the development of the abstract attitude, can create a society so alien to its own needs. The answer for Goldstein lies in the dynamics of organismic direction and process. Although factual accounts of historical events freeze the characteristics of process, the events represent, in reality, only transitory states in the human beings' process of coming to terms with the world.

Prescott Lecky[1]

I. and II. Organization and Motivation: Self consistency

---

[1]This account of the major holistic themes in the writings of Prescott Lecky will, of necessity, be brief. Lecky's only book length publication, a small collection of papers and essays, was published posthumously following his premature death in 1941. In addition, Lecky published two minor articles but both are irrelevant to this discussion. Lecky, however, was an original and seminal thinker and notwithstanding his meager volume of production, he holds an established and respected place in the literature of holistic theory.

the sovereign motive.[1]

> "We propose to apprehend all psychological phenomena as illustrations of the single principle of unity or self-consistency."[2]

Prescott Lecky rejects the mechanistic, stimulus determinants of the organism's behavior. Such mechanical connections are anathema to Lecky and he considers this identification of science with description to be one of psychology's most serious errors. Such a focus upon isolated connections and acts as the primary units of behavior negates the organism's essential character of wholeness and ignores the unity of behavior. Lecky also attacks the doctrine of specificity that developed out of the studies of Hartshorne and May (1928), studies that were used to contradict trait theory and the concept of faculties. While countering the extremes of trait and faculty theory, the doctrine of specificity also went to the extreme of concluding that the individual's behavior was largely a function of the situation.

---

[1] In Lecky's theory the holistic principle of personality organization also forms the sovereign motive in human behavior and development. For this reason these two themes will be treated together.

[2] Prescott Lecky, Self Consistency: A Theory of Personality. Island Press Co-operative, Inc. 1951. p. 82.

Lecky does not accept this view of the individual as a passive, unstable creature at the mercy of environmental caprice. In contradistinction, Lecky (1951) conceives of the personality as an organized and dynamic system.

In rejecting the theory of mechanistic, external determiners of behavior, Lecky does not abandon the environment as an important force in the organism's task of adaptation, although he does not give much attention to organism-environment integration. At the core of the theory of self-consistency, however, lies the capacity for self-determination. The individual does not strive for consistency with environmental demands. His only aim is self-consistency.

The theory of self-consistency interprets the personality as unified by a single, sovereign purpose; the organism's attempt to maintain its own organization. The aim of self-consistency revolves around values, ideas, and the concept of self. Behavior is usually "in character" because the organism pursues the goal of maintaining a structure of values, and developing a system of ideas that are consistent with one another, so that both are readily assimilated into the concept of self (Lecky, 1951).

III. Process: The growth of the personality is directional, always evolving, and undergoing change.[1]

We cannot altogether deny the fact that Lecky valued the unfolding, process character of personality and yet, in considering the organism in process, Lecky's central theme of self-consistency presents us with some conceptual problems. As we have seen, the process conception implies growth and change; an evolution of new relationships and directions, the emergence of unknown aspects of the personality interacting with the environment to form new wholes. There is a conflict, then, between a theory of self-consistency as pursued by Lecky and the personality seen as an open, growing, and expanding system. Lecky reflects this conflict in the development of his own theory but, more than this, he anticipates a basic conflict within the larger arena of holistic theory.[2]

In support of his sovereign motive of self-consistency Lecky states: "The loyalty to individual values may interfere with efforts to change them, but this loyalty is also a source of honesty and integrity..." "According to the

---

[1]We could discover no appropriate passage in Lecky's work to clearly illustrate his commitment to a process conception of the personality.

[2]Cf. Chapter V.

theory of self-consistency, we seek those experiences which support our values and avoid, resist, or if necessary forcibly reject those which are inconsistent with them."[1]

In a number of statements Lecky identifies resistance to change, in contrast to Freud's interpretation of resistance, with strength of character and integrity and he speaks of such resistance as "...essential for the maintenance of individuality."[2] At times, therefore, Lecky's interpretation of self-consistency is unusually security centered, static in its conception, and antithetical to a view of personality in process. Learning, he suggests, is basically a unifying process whose goal is an attitude free from conflict. The capacity to predict one's environment, to understand the world one lives in, to prevent the necessity for sudden readjustments are all prerequisites for the maintenance of unity (Lecky, 1951).

Other statements, however, indicate Lecky's partial recognition of the conceptual difficulty inherent in such unreserved commitment to the theory of self-consistency.

---

[1]Prescott Lecky, Self Consistency: A Theory of Personality. The Shoe String Press, Inc. 1961. p. 162ff.

[2]Prescott Lecky, Self Consistency: A Theory of Personality. Island Press Co-operative, 1951. p. 119.

Addressing himself to the problem of maintaining unity and preserving the integrity of the habit system Lecky adds, almost as an afterthought, "And yet the organism cannot continue to develop or succeed in maintaining its unity, except by repeatedly facing new conflicts and risking the security it wishes to attain."[1]

How, then, we must ask, with one's integrity and identity almost exclusively dependent upon the development of a mutually reinforcing system of values and the actualization of the master motive of self-consistency, does direction, process, and change enter into personality development? Self-consistency seems to involve a process of increasing resistance, or, at best, an incorporation of more and more elements into an existing and static organization.

Certainly, Lecky does not ignore the difficulties that his theory creates for a concept of change and growth and he appears to struggle with the conflict. In speaking of the importance of problem solving to the psychological and physical development of the organism Lecky states that "Independence and freedom are attained in proportion as the individual is prepared to maintain his normal organization

---

[1]Lecky, Self-Consistency, The Shoe String Press, Inc. 1961. p. 147.

in a greater variety of situations."[1] This strongly suggests an incorporation of environmental compatibles rather than a changing and extending organization of the self. On the other hand, in addressing himself to the assimilation of values into the system, Lecky (1951) observes that this process involves one of general revision and reorganization rather than one of addition. Lecky reaches the ambiguous conclusion that; "As a person grows older, and as situations change, it is expected that new values will be assimilated into the organization and old values eliminated; meanwhile the organization must be kept consistent as well as may be the process. For this reason the normal life is never free from problems."[2]

Lecky appears to be aware that if his theory of self-consistency is not to represent a defensive and static organization of the self that precludes growth, it presupposes a concept of conflict. He observes that "Conflict... is a necessary accompaniment of personality development, and the progressive assimilation of disturbing stimuli the only practical means by which a stable organization can be attained."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 115.

[2] Lecky, Self-Consistency. Island Press Co-operative, Inc. 1951, p. 112.

[3] Lecky, Self-Consistency. The Shoe String Press, Inc.

It is clear that there is some inconsistency in Lecky's attempt to deal with the conflict between his sovereign purpose of self-consistency and the continuing growth and change of the organism and though he does suggest the inevitability of conflict as an accompanying or concomitant feature in the process of achieving self-consistency, he does not provide us with a clear theoretical and conceptual account of the way in which growth and change in the personality takes place and its repercussions upon self-consistency. Neither does he deal with the problem of neurotic organization nor distinguish between a defensive, neurotic self-consistency and a healthy one. When does self-consistency become character armor? While it may be true that self-consistency is a "prerequisite to integrity" it is also true that it can be a precursor of immaturity.

Between the stability of self-consistency and the reality of the organism as an open system in process, characterized by change and growth, we need an interposing concept, a conceptual bridge, to validate and integrate both principles. We will address ourselves to this problem in chapter V.

Abraham Maslow

I. Organization: The personality is an organized, dynamic, and open system.

> "...The individual is an integral whole."[1]
> "Isolated behavior tends to be on the fringe of life's main concerns. They are isolated simply because they are unimportant, i.e., have nothing to do with the main problems, the main answers, or the main goals of the organism."[2]

A persistent critic of scientific orthodoxy, Abraham Maslow (1954, 1966) has relentlessly stressed the dangers inherent in a technique and means centered science where real problems, goals, and values are ignored in favor of techniques, methods, and apparatus. The consequence of means-centering is a timid, value-free science, unable to discriminate between the relevant and the inconsequential, peripheral problems and imposing arbitrary limits on its jurisdiction and responsibility. In the scientific study of personality this frequently means a refined technology geared toward highly reductive efforts to discover the convenient units that can be managed and manipulated by its sophisticated methodology. Science quickly becomes a closed and protective

---

[1] Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row. 1954. p. 63.

[2] Ibid., p. 55.

circle rather than engaged in a creative process of discovery in the realm of genuine and challenging problems and comprehensive human concerns.

Maslow (1954) favors a problem centered science that is less concerned with technology and reductive analysis and more committed to a holistic view that is both functional and dynamic. Maslow refers to this latter emphasis as the holistic-dynamic point of view. The holistic-dynamic point of view may be contrasted with the general-atomistic approach and its tendency to compartmentalize and oversimplify the basic units of personality and their relationships.

Maslow's holistic-dynamic emphasis suggests a syndrome concept of personality defined as, "...a structured, organized complex of apparently diverse specificities (behaviors, thoughts, impulses to action, perception, etc.) which, however, when studied carefully and validly are found to have a common unity..."[1] Each syndrome tends to be related and, behaviorally, an expression of the whole, integrated personality.

The human organism, Maslow asserts, is not a collection of separate organs and functions. When we study a given act

---

[1] Ibid., p. 32.

or behavior it must be viewed as an expression of the whole organism rather than as a discrete entity to suit the convenience of methodology. There are no closed systems within the organism.

II. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive or drive.

> "The single holistic principle that binds together the multiplicity of human motives is the tendency for a new and higher need to emerge as the lower need fulfills itself by being sufficiently gratified."[1]

As a preface to motivational theory, Maslow abandons the multiple drive concept of human motivation as theoretically unsound. Such an atomistic listing of drives isolates one drive from the others, suggests a discreteness and mutual exclusiveness which does not exist, and neglects their dynamic role in human behavior.

Consistant with other holistic theorists, Maslow (1954, 1962a) also rejects a definition of motivation based on concepts of equilibrium, homeostasis, or drive reduction. According to Maslow, recent years of research and experience

---

[1] Abraham Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1962. p. 53.

in psychotherapy, creativity, child psychology, and work with brain-injured soldiers have strongly repudiated these theories. To supplant these inadequate and outmoded concepts of human motivation Maslow posits an inherent tendency to growth and self-perfection. We shall hereafter refer to Maslow's sovereign motive as the Positive Growth Tendency. This term is considered to be free of the ambiguities found in the term self-acutalization, since it encompasses the entire developmental "process-character" of motivation and therefore includes both the deficiency motives--strivings to meet the more basic needs--and the growth motives. Maslow defines growth as "...the various processes which bring the person toward ultimate self-actualization..." "Growth is seen, then, not only as progressive gratification of basic needs to the point where they "disappear," but also in the form of specific growth motivations over and above these basic needs, including talents, capacities, creative tendencies and constitutional potentialities."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 24.

Maslow (1954, 1962a) conceives of human motivation as functioning along a hierarchy of instinctoid needs.[1] These needs, listed in order of prepotency, are: 1. The physiological needs, 2. The safety needs, 3. The belonging and love needs, 4. The esteem needs, 5. The need for self-actualization. The basic physiological needs must be satisfied before the organism can turn his attention to his safety needs. The safety needs, in turn, are prepotent over the organism's pursuit of his love needs. Thus, the gratification of each need in the hierarchy is a prerequisite for attention to the next.

While this hierarchy is ordered in a decreasing degree of instinctoid control it represents, as the positive growth tendency gains momentum, an increasing degree of psychological health, movement toward full-humaness, and a qualitative change in the nature of the movitation (Maslow, 1954). The progression is toward that ultimate value for mankind, self-actualization or toward "...becoming fully human, everything that the person can become."[2]

---

[1]Maslow distinguishes between instincts and the instinctoid nature of basic needs. See chapter 7 Motivation and Personality. Refer also to the interview with Abraham Maslow, Appendix A.

[2]Abraham Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being, p. 145.

The needs below the level of self-actualization represent the deficiency motives and present the individual the task of working through the problems and frustrations in achieving gratification within these basic need areas. At the level of self-actualization, however, the focus and quality of human motivation shifts from a deficiency motivated organism struggling to meet the dominant, prepotent needs in life, to an organism that is freed from lower-need bondage so that he can be concerned with satisfying the higher, though less dominant, needs.

III. Process: The growth of personality is directional, always evolving, and undergoing change.

> "The process of healthy growth is made up of a never ending series of free choice situations, at every point throughout life, in which he must choose between safety and growth."[1]

Maslow's need hierarchy emphasizes personality as process, directed by the positive growth tendency and evolving toward the ultimate values of the human organism. Following the existentialists, Maslow stresses the importance of the concept of future time in personality development where the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 45.

present exists as potential and the future plays a dynamic role in its actualization. "...self-actualization is meaningless without reference to a currently active future."[1]

In a discussion of direction and process in personality development, it is important to point out that Maslow, in trying to capture the essence of the nature of self-actualization, distinguishes between the process of becoming and the pure states of "being" as found in the fleeting "peak" experiences and in other complete states of self-realization. In these latter "episodes" there seems to be almost a complete break with goal direction, struggling, striving. The needing, coping behavior and other characteristics so typically associated with the lower-level deficiency motives are absent. The more traditional motivation theories tend to lose their significance or relevance since motivational life appears to be different for self-actualizers. However, Maslow's concepts of the process of becoming a person and the achievement of the states of being a person are not altogether compatible and represent some minor theoretical problems.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14.

If self-actualization represents the human being at the apex of his development in the form of integrated, non-striving states of "being," does the stage of self-actualization in human development also represent or imply a static state that marks the end of further growth and evolution of the personality? It is clear that Maslow acknowledges the conflict between a process-becoming psychology and an ultimate "being" psychology. "The danger with a pure Being-psychology," states Maslow, "is that it may tend to be static, not accounting for the facts of movement, direction, and growth."[1] In another statement Maslow (1962a) suggests that self-actualization may be both an end goal and a penultimate stage in the process to reach the ultimate in self-transcendence, i.e., ego-transcendence and the loss of self in the peak experiences. Maslow, at times, speaks of the states of "being" as static states of perfection, a pinnacle of human development that transcends process and marks the end of becoming. Maslow is reluctant, however, to discard the concepts of process and growth throughout the life span, even if some

---

[1] Ibid., p. 42.

stage or level of self-actualization is reached. He seeks to purge the term of its static connotations and redefines self-actualization to refer to a "spurt" in the coalescing of the person's powers and representing an intensely efficient and enjoyable episode in the life of the person. Maslow (1962a) also indicates that an experience in pure _being_ can promote further _becoming_ and he suggests that they may be aspects of the same process.

Finally, we must say that it would be extremely inconsistent for Maslow to conclude that _being_ and _becoming_ were mutually exclusive or contradictory and although he does, at times, express some confusion over their relationship we find no basis to assert that he supports such a conclusion. Rather, his position seems to be that human growth never ceases to be a process, an engagement with the future, as new directions are discovered, as new wholes emerge and as previously unknown facets of the self come into being. During the episodes of self-actualization, however, there are more frequent experiences of pure _Being_ that transcend, for rare, but intense moments, the life-long process character of human development.

Gardner Murphy

I. _Organization_: The personality is an organized, dynamic and open system.

> "Unconscious dynamics...call our attention to conflict, disunity, but personality also achieves a kind of genuine unity or wholeness... From this point of view, traits are not individual parts, but aspects of a totality. Each trait has "membership character" (to use the language of Gestalt Psychology) which places it in a contextual system..."[1]

Man has always imposed a primitive, internal organization upon the demands, vicissitudes and caprice of its environment. However, the achievement of a creative unity and wholeness, according to Murphy, is not gained easily or quickly. He conceives of personality as passing through three rather distinct developmental phases, a hierarchy of organization and development. This hierarchy includes: 1. An early and undifferentiated, global mass, 2. A period marked by the appearance of differentiation, as recognizable parts emerge. 3. Finally, there is the development of an organization of the differentiated parts "so as to constitute a system."[2]

Global, undifferentiated qualities would include motor, sensory and affective dispositions; metabolic rhythms, various thresholds of response, and all of the more primordial dispositions that characterize the organism (Murphy, 1947). These global qualities, the ubiquitous dispositions, express

---

[1] Gardner Murphy, Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1947. p. 20.

[2] Ibid., p. 619.

themselves in every new response and transition. The differentiated parts of stage two reflect aspects of its global heritage. There is a "phenomena of correspondence" obtaining between the original global dispositions and the characteristics of the differentiated parts as well as a formal relationship between the parts themselves since "...they are all traceable to the same global matrix."[1]

Finally, in stage three there is an emergence of congruence, an integration of the relatively discrete aspects of personality around goal-directed behavior. "Traits appearing at stage two when integrated with others at stage three have such membership character that they can no longer be understood at all outside their full personality contexts."[2] True "architectural wholeness" is demonstrated when the second and third level traits achieve interdependence.

With congruence, then, comes a unity and harmony revolving upon central values or goals that characterizes the entire pattern of life. This complex and sophisticated system, the "architectural whole," while representing a synthesis is not a closed and rigid structure. Murphy (1947) stresses that it

---

[1] Ibid., p. 621.

[2] Ibid., p. 627.

is in constant motion and retains the capacity for internal reorganization as well as free adaptation to new situations and circumstances.

Murphy's interpretation of the personality system and evolving holistic unity goes beyond the internal organization and processes of the organism and includes the possibility of more supreme integrations as man fashions new relationships with his environment. There is, in fact, no real distinction made between man and his environment and Murphy views man as "...a nodal region, an organized field within a larger field, a region of perpetual interaction, a reciprocity of outgoing and incoming energies."[1] So interlaced is man and his environment that man not only imposes structure upon his environment but the environment, through its function-controls, alters the structure of the organism (Murphy and Spohn, 1968). In this intimate reciprocity, the inner moves toward one with the outer. "It is a movement toward isomorphism."[2]

II. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive, or drive.

> "The term motivation...does not define a box that contains a few distinct tools for our use, but the abstraction of one of the properties of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

[2] Gardner Murphy and Herbert Spohn, Encounter with Reality. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin. 1968. p. 49.

> the living process—its stability, push, or as Bergson liked to call it, élan. Even if we could find where the push "starts" we should find other pushes cooperating...through a process of fusion rather than one of mechanical addition."[1]

While Gardner Murphy is a pronounced holistic theorist, he is also a thorough-going eclectic and his depth and breadth as a psychologist permits him an articulate, integrative view of the broad and sweeping domain of psychological knowledge and wisdom. Thus, as an eclectic, he is not a purist and does not take a dogmatic stance toward personality theory nor become a demanding proponent for a single point of view. We must refer to his works as representing an integrative eclecticism. In terms of motivation theory, therefore, Murphy's biosocial theory does not explicitly lend its conceptual support to a sovereign motive for human behavior. In fact, Murphy considers his entire work (Murphy, 1947) to be concerned with motivation.

The basic motive structure, for Murphy, are the interacting tissue-tension systems within the organism. Thus, concentrations of energy promote tension-gradients—up or down—and become the motives of the organism. Murphy recognizes, therefore, that increasing tension in the form of "anticipation, expectancy, and appetites"[2] can be as important

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1947. p. 89 ff.

[2]Ibid., p. 108.

to the motivation of the organism as tension reduction. He is critical of the atomistic, simplistic approaches to human motivation in the form of mechanistic theory and the emphasis in psychology on the tension reduction of visceral drives. Although Murphy recognizes tension reduction to be a primary force in infancy, he emphasizes that the conative goal of the organism is to keep activity going and to maintain the energy system. While he regards the infantile energy systems as "patterned bundles of motivation"[1] Murphy feels that they must undergo a long process to become the complicated motivational patterns found in the adult organism.

Murphy, on the other hand, does not support a theory of distinct and separate motives. In his holistic approach to motivation, the biological and the social form one sphere, one large and encompassing motivational structure. Therefore, while strongly emphasizing the biochemical base for motive structure, including aesthetic needs, or the "aesthetic and cosmic cravings,"[2] Murphy also stresses the marked effects that the behavioral world and the cultural world can have upon the biochemical system. Thus, motivation is set squarely within a larger context; in an interacting organism-environment

---

[1] Ibid., p. 86.

[2] Ibid., p. 107.

field.

Murphy (1959; 1958) has been critical of the goal of self-actualization as a sovereign motive of the organism. The human being, Murphy argues, has an infinite number of selves, or natures to realize and there is never just one goal toward which the organism is aiming. "No single drive could ever pre-empt the orchestration of the total without leading us back to a simple catalogue of independent drives waiting each by itself to be fulfilled..."[1]

In summary, it may be said that, at times, Murphy seems to be in need of a more unifying motivational principle. He is repetitive in his emphasis on a plurality of "motives," "natures" and "selves" that evolve from the basic tissue-tension centers of the organism and the integration of these motives within the organism is, for Murphy, a central theme. What then, we may ask, serves as the integrating force or factor and gives direction and meaning to the tension gradients and energies? Is there no unifying force that guides and integrates the direction of these human energies and characterizes the life process? The only hormic principle that Murphy explicitly acknowledges is the conative character of all activity.

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1958. p. 321.

Murphy has made substantial contributions to personality theory with his integrative eclecticism and his synoptic biosocial approach to the understanding of the human organism. It may be an unfortunate consequence of his eclecticism, however, that precludes his serious consideration of a unifying trend or motivational force in organismic growth.

III. Process: The growth of personality is directional, always evolving, and undergoing change.

> "...personality is revealed more through its cycles and trends than through its cross section, more through its continuities and discontinuities, through change in its tissues and in the outer world than through any inventory of the traits of the moment, however subtle."[1]

Murphy emphasizes the importance of the time dimension to the theme of process. After surveying the life of William James he states the significance of "...the time dimension, the changing, growing, self renewing processes of personality evolution, of release of personality in a new way in each situation."[2] According to Murphy, man's symbolic powers are crucial to the process conception of personality. He is not bound to a past or to a dependence on the current, external

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1947. p. 71.

[2]Ibid., p. 25.

stimulus but may attend to the abstract and envision and plan for the future.

Murphy postulates three basic human natures that emerge within the process of human development.[1] His first human nature is the "raw" or "original" human nature. This original human nature is a direct product of evolution and reflects a general biochemical and nervous organization with the potential for individuality. Even at this raw and primitive level, however, there are catylists for process and change. Restless energy, curiosity, sensory hungers, and sensitivity are a part of the organism's undifferentiated biological core (Murphy, 1958).

The emergence of culture, with its imprint of acquired tastes and traits, and uniform modes of living on the original human nature, represents the established domain of the second human nature. This protective shield of culture is seductively attractive to man and meets his needs for order, safety, companionship and cooperation. Behind this protective cover man may undergo a process leading to rigidity, resistance to change and to the standardization of the personality. In conflict with this set of social-protective needs are other,

---

[1]Compare the three human natures to Murphy's three developmental phases previously discussed.

more profound attributes and needs of the original human nature that are not as readily satisfied. A given culture allows only a narrow range of the human potential to develop and flourish and man soon becomes frustrated over the uniformity of his habits and styles and the narrow scope of his existence. He is a restless seeker for his own uniqueness and individuality.

It is out of this frustration of certain important needs and potentials, Murphy suggests, that man actively pursues his quest for further fulfillment and is able to break through the mold of his culture. It is, in fact, this urge to discovery and a deeply embedded need to understand and encounter reality (Murphy and Spohn, 1968) that provokes man to step from his protective cultural shield and venture forth to meet his new requirements. It is this insistent urge to discover, explore, create and evolve that is Murphy's third human nature.

It is the unfolding, elaboration, and integration of the three human natures that characterizes the process component of human development. It should be emphasized here that Murphy rejects the perfection of man as a viable concept or goal. The perfection of man has meaning to Murphy only if we conceive of a static universe or some end goal that precludes further process. "...he becomes qualitatively a new

man as he grows; and there is no such thing as a society which will offer fulfillment to human nature..."[1]

This evolutionary process, culminating in the third human nature and marked by quantitative and qualitative changes in both man and society, does not imply a diminution and loss of the prior human natures. The crucial question is: How can all three natures be recognized, respected, and fulfilled? Murphy suggests that "Perhaps the three human natures, still in conflict with one another, can integrate in a new emergent whole."[2]

If new combinations and integrations are to evolve and if the three human natures are to integrate in a new whole the principle of emergence will have to obtain. The principle of emergence requires new conceptual tools as a base for the new forms of integration (Murphy, 1958), in contrast to trial and error methods or poorly integrated changes that must conform to an outdated, existing structure. "Emergence defines the process by which co-working factors result in a new form of organization."[3] Ideally, these new forms of organization, as indicated before, are not exclusive within the

---

[1] Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1958. p. 311.

[2] Ibid., p. 252.

[3] Ibid., p. 258.

organism but includes a larger field that extends beyond the organism.

"...human nature and society are evolving together not only along a line indicating quantitative increase in this or that but into ever new qualities."[1]

Carl Rogers

I. Organization: The personality is an organized, dynamic, and open system.

> "The most impressive fact about the individual human being seems to be his directional tendency toward wholeness..."[2]

The holistic emphasis in Carl Rogers' theory of personality, as do all of his basic propositions, centers around the development of the concept of self, defined by Bischof in his interpretation of Rogers, as "being the strivings, emotional feeling, and ideas that the individual recognizes, interprets, and values as his very own."[3] The human infant

---

[1] Ibid., p. 311.

[2] Carl R. Rogers, "The Actualizing Tendency in Relation to "Motives" and to Consciousness. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Marshall R. Jones, Editor. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963. Vol. XI. p. 4.

[3] Ledford Bischof, Interpreting Personality Theories. New York: Harper and Row. 1964. p. 433.

quickly becomes the center of a phenomenological field, the guardian of a private world of experience. Gradually, this experienced and perceived field becomes "reality" for the organism. The differentiated self, the perceived reality, gradually emerges out of a portion of this perceptual field. As the growing person encounters and interacts with his environment, perceives his reality, and as a self-concept comes into being and evolves, there is, according to Rogers, a persistent effort on the part of the organism to protect his "reality" and to achieve a unity and wholeness of the self; a self-consistency (Rogers, 1951, 1959).

Convincing evidence of Rogers' thesis concerning the self-consistent strivings of the personality was obtained in the observation of clients undergoing psychotherapy. In the course of their therapy, there were many eratic changes and shifting characteristics in the personality as clients explored significant dimensions of the self and struggled to reconstruct various aspects of their experience. Rogers' observations indicated, however, that "...the product was clearly a gestalt, a configuration in which the alterations

of one minor aspect could completely alter the whole pattern."[1] The configural nature of the self-concept seemed to be confirmed in these studies.

One of the primary needs of the organism, then, is to maintain an internal order and consistency of the self and achieve a state of congruence; an accurate matching of experience and awareness.[2] For optimum growth this not only demands a progressive revision of the self-concept, based on an openness to experience but an accurate symbolization and assimilation of these experiences in the Gestalt of the self structure.

Additional propositions, taken from Rogers' (1951) theory of personality and behavior, that extend the concept of integration and its important role in the formation of the self-structure of the personality include: XI. "As experiences

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework." in S. Koch (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, Vol. 111, Foundations of the Person in the Social Context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. p. 209.

[2]This term was first used by Rogers to describe a condition of openness to experience on the part of the therapist and a matching of his genuine feelings with his behavior in relating with the client. This accurate reflection of experience and awareness by the therapist is believed by Rogers to be one of the conditions facilitating growth in the client.

occur in the life of the individual, they are either a. symbolized, perceived and organized into some relationship to the self, b. ignored because there is no perceived relationship to the self-structure, c. denied symbolization or given a distorted symbolization because the experience is inconsistent with the structure of the self." XII. "Most of the ways of behaving which are adopted by the organism are those which are consistent with the concept of self." XVI. "Any experience which is inconsistent with the organism or the structure of the self may be perceived as a threat, and with the more of these perceptions there are, the more rigidly the self structure is organized to maintain itself."[1]

One's interpretation of "science" and its appropriate role in the study of man often reflects the image of man that prevails. Rogers' view of the person as an essentially integrated being striving for increasing unity or "congruence" asks for a behavioral science that will respect this attribute of wholeness. Rogers (1961, 1964b) is critical of "modes of knowing" that are limited to a study of the peripheral acts and external behaviors of man, while ignoring the richly patterned and genuinely heuristic phenomonlogical variables.

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co. 1951. p. 503 ff.

II. Motivation: The development of the human personality unfolds out of one sovereign need, motive, or drive.

> "...I would reaffirm my belief that there is one central source of energy in the human organism; that it is a function of the whole organism rather than of some portion of it; and that it is perhaps best conceptualized as a tendency toward fulfillment, toward actualization, toward maintenance and enhancement of the organism."[1]

Carl Rogers postulates an all-embracing motive, the actualizing tendency, to account for the full range of human behavior and development. It is a positive directional tendency underlying all behaviors including those expressions that seem to contradict such inherent positive strivings for self-enhancement. In these latter instances, Rogers expresses the conviction that they are neurotic or perverted expressions of the actualizing tendency growing out of a state of incongruence, i.e., a discrepancy or dissociation between the organism's experience and awareness. Such experiences have been inaccurately symbolized thereby encouraging maladaptive or self-defeating expressions of the basic actualizing tendency. Thus, the matrix for all human motivation and behavior is the

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "The Actualizing Tendency in Relation to "Motives" and to Consciousness." Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Marshall R. Jones, Editor. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963. p. 6.

tendency toward growth, maintenance and enhancement of the organism.

Rogers (1963) seriously questions the value and necessity of postulating additional motivational constructs. He does not deny, of course, the existence of a variety of motives and drive states in the human organism but he feels that to pursue these discrete motives would distract from significant research and be of little heuristic value. The actualizing tendency, as the sovereign motive, encompasses all such discrete motives and drives and lends itself to the interpretation of the organism as a complex being with a tendency toward self-consistency or wholeness. Rogers believes that a great variety of motives and behaviors could be subsumed under the actualizing tendency but the tendency exerts itself largely in "...the actualization of that portion of the experience of the organism which is symbolized in the self."[1]

There are strong autonomous concomitants within Rogers' actualizing tendency. The trend is "...away from heteronomy,

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework;" in S. Koch (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, Vol. 111, Foundations of the Person in the Social Context. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. p. 197.

or control by external forces."[1] Philosophically, this discounts the declining "empty organism" school of thought and places man at the helm to chart his own developmental course.

III. Process: The growth of personality is directional, always evolving and undergoing change.

> "Life, at its best, is a flowing, changing process in which nothing is fixed...it is always in process of becoming."[2]

The natural trend of the organism is to engage itself in a directional process "where past and future are both in this moment..."[3] Organismic life moves in a direction characterized by flexibility and change and it is not a fixed system. It is a process of increasing wholeness and enhancement of the organism: a process of becoming.

Rogers' research in psychotherapy and his concern and search for the substantive attributes of the helping relationship have served as the basic foundations for his self-theory

---

[1] Ibid., p. 196.

[2] Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961. p. 27.

[3] Carl R. Rogers, "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 1964, vol. 69; no. 2. p. 164.

of personality. The major theme of process, too, grew out of Rogers' experiences with clients in psychotherapy. He came to view his clients' experiences in psychotherapy as experiences characterized by process. Rogers observed that clients began this process of therapy "...from a point of fixity..."[1] but they soon became engaged in an emerging continuum characterized by a gradual loosening of feelings, an increase in the flow and openness of expression, a greater capacity for immediacy of experiencing and an increased clarity of communication both within and outside the therapeutic relationship. It was not this important process character of the clients' therapeutic experiences, per se, however, that was regarded as most significant. It was the fact that the clients did not move from their original point of fixity to another level of fixity. Instead, Rogers observed that his clients had become "...an integrated process of changingness."[2]

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co. 1961. p. 158.

[2]Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

THEORIES OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY[1]

Before we present the individual theories of healthy personality, one of the four major themes of the holistic personality theorists, it is important to stress the fact that our statements will reflect variations on the three other themes of holism discussed in chapter III. Any holistic theory of healthy personality will reflect the important holistic principles of personality organization, motivation, and process.

Gordon Allport's Theory of Healthy Personality

Man possesses a unique inner nature that seeks fulfillment and actualization. There is a strong disposition and "demand character" within the organism to realize these inherent possibilities and to strive "to become characteristically human at all stages of development."[2] Allport observes that the unfolding of man's inner nature is not unlike the bamboo and wild cherry in its persistence to fulfill the destiny of its kind.

---

[1]Prescott Lecky will not be included in this chapter. We have already covered Lecky's theory of self-consistency in chapter III. In view of his limited number of concepts and publications, it would be redundant to include another discussion of Lecky's theory.

[2]Gordon Allport. Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1955. p. 27.

Allport regards our essential nature as basically good and following a positive course of development to actualize those attributes that are "characteristically human." Negative developments in the personality, the release of hostile, destructive forces, are reactive protests of the organism and represent the presence of deleterious circumstances in life or a primary deprivation of basic needs that inhibits the natural and positive developments. These cries of protest, then, that eventuate in negative, destructive behaviors are pathological trends in the organism and do not reflect basic drives or tendencies. The development of Allport's theory of healthy personality must be based, therefore, on an elaboration and interpretation of the meaning of "characteristically human" development since man's hostile, destructive potentials are regarded as secondary and reactive in nature.

I. Autonomy: A Valued Direction of Development

An integral feature of Allport's concept of propriate striving is the growing expression of autonomy, the self-assertive strivings and behavior designed to enhance one's independence and individuality while making an impact upon the environment. The process of autonomy and self-reliance is initiated at birth and increases thereafter (Allport, 1961). Allport sees the individual as being in a confrontation with

the stencils of cultural constructs[1] and with ubiquitous situational demands and role prescriptions. He does not deny the influence of these social forces upon personality development and behavior but regards them as secondary to the propriate strivings and tangential to the process of becoming (Allport, 1955). While the child may be inclined to adopt his cultural models for his behavior, Allport (1961) suggests that autonomous strivings will later bring about individuation and rebellion. Although there is nothing personal that is not in some sense a reflection of the physical, social and cultural environment, the healthy personality will seek out and exploit the latitudes and wide range of variability which the "real culture" and its role expectations allow. Allport, then, does not place the "personal" and the "social" in locked combat. Essentially, they are compatible. He does caution, however, against the generalization that personality is merely a mirror-image of the culture, maintaining that the healthy personality will sustain a kind of "stubborn integrity."[2]

---

[1]Allport adopts Linton's (1945) distinction between real culture and cultural constructs. Real culture is flexible, allowing a wide range of freedom. Cultural constructs are concerned with the usual, modal practices and are inclined to be stereotyped, oversimplified representatives.

[2]Gordon Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961, p. 187.

While culture is accepted as a condition of becoming, Allport (1955) supports personal autonomy as the more basic principle.

In support of the open system principle in personality theory, Allport (1960b) recognizes the four criteria of open systems. He cautions us, however, that criterion number four, extensive transactional commerce with the environment, must be interpreted with reserve so that we do not define personality in terms of cultural roles and lose sight of the basic integrity of the personality system.

In discussing his theory of common traits, Allport states that, "It is never safe to characterize human personality in terms of role, occupation, social status or any other cultural or sociological rubrics."[1] As an added expression of his fear of defining the personality in terms of the social and cultural system to which the person belongs, Allport (1961) emphasizes that the neuropsychic system is a system of integrity and a legitimate object of our study. This system is in constant transaction and intercourse with larger systems but for all these transactions the individual retains his autonomy and his wholeness.

Autonomy, therefore, is seen not only in terms of a generic motivation of the organism but also as a feature of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 353.

the healthy organism's relationship with the environment: the organism as a system of autonomy and integrity vis a vis the environment.

Autonomous development in healthy personality extends to the field of cognition where individuals vary considerably in their cognitive fixedness or flexibility. Allport acknowledges the research in this area to support the relationship between autonomy and healthy personality. The two groups within this cognitive dimension have been called the field dependent and the field-independent respectively. The field dependent personalities, bound to the constraints of the immediate experimental situation and unable to shift their sets, have also been found to be extremely dependent on environmental supports. The more flexible field-independent persons were found to have more initiative, stronger autonomous strivings, and were higher in self-esteem and self-acceptance (Witkin et al., 1954).

Tests of suggestibility (Persuasibility and conformity) have turned Riesman's concepts of "other-directed" and inner-directed" into empirical problems and, in general, these experiments have shown that trends toward conformity appear to be, in large measure, a function of the personality.

The development of the mature or generic conscience

provides another excellent illustration of Allport's emphasis on the expanding, growing autonomy of the personality. Allport asserts that early development and immaturity is characterized by a "must" code of behavior, consisting of the internalized teachings of childhood. In the healthy personality, by contrast, the conscience achieves a disassociation from these imposed sanctions and gradually assumes an "ought" character that becomes functionally autonomous of the dependent habit structure of early childhood. Thus, the conscience of the mature adult, freed from the bondage of the injunctions and super ego structure of childhood, can respond appropriately to one's own value system and to the issues and demands of adult living (Allport, 1960a).

In the interests of healthy personality development and the achievement of autonomy, Allport (1961) considers it imperative that the attributes of uniqueness and individuality are discovered and developed. He recognizes that all people are conventional in some respects. What is important, however, is that they break through the prescriptions of training and convention to develop their own unique characteristics. Allport implies that, although the urge to enhance the unique attributes of the personality is an inherent feature of our "inner" nature, the individual must work at the task of

achieving individuality. The demands of the environment, the role prescriptions and the cultural constructs must be reckoned with. The mold of the culture may direct our energies into opportunistic modes of adjustment and behavior that result in nothing more than well-learned tribal habits. These opportunistic adjustments are concessions that reflect a minimal level of personality development and organization and they are on the periphery of the propriate system of major concerns, intentions and strivings of the mature person (Allport, 1955). In the healthy personality this peripheral system is subordinated to the more unique, individualistic features that emerge from the propriate core of the personality.

Much of one's uniqueness is reflected in the largely unconscious and spontaneous expressive components of personality and in the complex stylistic patterns of these components. In contrast to opportunistic modes of adjustment, style represents the deeper currents of the personality. "There is, then, an esthetics of being oneself. A person himself is the fundamental and unique unit of all activity."[1]

Even in healthy personality no expressive behavior or personal style stands alone. It must be integrated into the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 492.

total repertoire of behavior including the adaptive, conscious, reality-centered systems and techniques of coping behavior. Coping behavior is elicited by the environment and determined more by the needs of the moment while expressive behavior or style reflects deeper personality structure. Both expressive and coping components, however, are found in all acts and behaviors of the healthy personality. Allport (1961) sees the opposite of coping as defense and in the healthy personality coping behavior predominates. The basic purpose of coping behavior seems to be to satisfy the basic human needs in concert with the realities of the environment and in most respects effective coping gives support to the autonomous strivings. Allport likens this coping function to Freud's ego and gives it high priority as an attribute of healthy personality.

Coping and Perception

Effective coping behavior depends upon accurate perceptions and cognition. Hence, Allport's healthy personality will display a keen perceptual accuracy and an openness or readiness to perceive. The mature personality, therefore, is relatively free from the rigidity of perceptual defenses and from the perceptual distortions brought about by self-centered, autistic perceptions (Allport, 1961; Barron, 1954).

II. Extension of the Self:

While the infant gives evidence of an early and continuing struggle for autonomy, Allport's next major criterion of healthy personality, extension of the self, or ego-extension appears to be a somewhat later development in the evolving personality. According to Allport the growth and expansion of "other regarding sentiments"[1] with its large learned component, cannot be in evidence to any appreciable degree in the unsocialized young infant.

The development of the healthy personality, having achieved sufficient autonomy, is characterized by expanding identifications and new and more inclusive systems of ego-involvement. System boundaries are in flux as the self reaches out to form new relationships. In this process, prior propriate involvement recedes into the background to integrate within a peripheral system while latent capacities for growth and relatedness emerge to replace the satiated needs and strivings. Such is the process of maturity.

In the healthy personality the extension of the self demands genuine participation; an ego-involved, intimate interaction with other human beings and the important affairs of the

---

[1] Allport. Becoming. p. 30.

world, as opposed to involvement in meaningless cycles of activity or abstract commitments that touch only the periphery of our being. Allport suggests that the healthy personality needs "deep rooted participation" in six primary areas of living: political, economic, recreational, religious, educational, and domestic. "The democratic personality needs to influence some but not all of the factors that influence him in representative fields of his activity."[1]

III. A Unifying Philosophy of Life: The Religious Sentiment

A healthy personality requires, in later years, a unifying theory or philosophy of life. "...something quite special to live for, a major intention."[2]

In its deepest generic sense the quest for some ultimate meaning and philosophical unity is profoundly religious but not necessarily compatible with traditional concepts or measures of the "religious" life or requiring participation in an organized religious body or institution. Individuals active in some organized religious pursuits may or may not exhibit religious or philosophical maturity. Allport (1960a),

---

[1]Gordon Allport, Personality and Social Encounter. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964. p. 195.

[2]Allport, Pattern and Growth. p. 294ff.

while cautioning us that religion should not be considered as representing the only unifying sentiment, offers the mature religious sentiment as the region of mental life most capable of conferring unity and integration upon the personality and directing the quest for an all-embracing philosophy of life. Allport considers the achievement of maturity in this area of philosophical-religious integration to be extremely difficult.

In no other area of development, he observes, does the individual find more comfort in maintaining the status quo than in religious beliefs and attitudes. It is the area of life most vulnerable to arrested development and immaturity, seldom keeping pace with the flow of life while retaining large residues of childish beliefs (Allport, 1960a).

Allport (1960a) identifies three stages in the progressive maturity of the religious sentiment:

1. Raw credulity. The child accepts religious teachings indiscriminately, without question.

2. Religious doubting floods life and the improbabilities and conflicts in one's beliefs are considered and faced.

3. A new synthesis and maturity emerges out of a conflict between affirmation, doubting and rejection.

The healthy personality develops a religious sentiment that is highly differentiated in its richness and complexity. It is both reflective and critical. As an organization develops and as differentiated aspects are woven into a pattern, the mature individual may experience an overwhelming sense of unity, wholeness, and oneness with the world. These experiences often yield a profound sense of immediacy, as all dimensions of life coalesce into one ineffable moment. Although not a sufficient condition to identify the mature religious sentiment, Allport (1960a) believes that the healthy personality has a greater capacity to experience such "mystical" moments that provide these intense experiences of unity, immediacy, and fulfillment.

Perhaps the most important distinction between the mature or healthy religious sentiment and the immature one lies in the dynamic character of the former. The person possessing the immature religious sentiment is tied to its organic origins expressed in "magical thinking, self-justification, and creature comfort. Thus it betrays its sustaining motives still to be the drives and desires of the body."[1] Here, Allport obviously stresses the importance of

---

[1]Gordon Allport, The Individual and His Religion. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1960. p. 63.

the functional autonomy of the religious sentiment in the healthy personality. In the healthy personality the religious sentiment undergoes revision, gradually acquiring new vitality, new meanings and relationships, and keeping pace with the growing personality and a changing world. A healthy religious sentiment will be "co-scientific" and will parallel the mainstream of experience and reality rather than provide mechanisms of escape from the facts of life. The mature religious sentiment enlarges life rather than delimits new growth. The religious sentiment in the healthy personality integrates the propriate strivings, provides a leading motif to existence, and answers the mature person's need for a comprehensive philosophy of life. Allport (1960a) suggests that only mature religious sentiments can best serve the integrative function and provide this all-embracing philosophy.

Notwithstanding the unifying, integrative function of the religious sentiment, it must be emphasized that the philosophy of the healthy personality will never solidify into a rigid structure. It will retain a tentative character, an openness to new possibilities that provides the freedom for new growth. In the healthy personality, therefore, the philosophy of life, the religious accomplishments, as in all other areas, remain incomplete. Yet, it is this incompleteness

to our pursuit of meaning and order that adds zest to life and encourages new growth. Thus, Allport's mature religious sentiment suggests one of the basic conflicts of human existence. On the one hand, it must represent an open system and offer an evolving program for self-renewal. On the other, it confers a profound integration and stability upon the personality with the possibility of achieving some supreme union, however fleeting, with the cosmos. "A man's religion is the audacious bid he makes to bind himself to creation and to the Creator. It is his ultimate attempt to enlarge and to complete his own personality by finding the supreme context in which he rightfully belongs."[1] The final task, therefore, in the process of becoming, the final phase in the development of the healthy personality, is relating one's self meaningfully to creation.

Andras Angyal's Theory of Healthy Personality

I. The Double Orientation of Health: Autonomy and Homonomy.

A double orientation to life marks the healthy personality: The strivings for autonomous and homonomous development.

Autonomy, a tendency to achieve, to dominate, and master the environment, incorporating it into the person's own orbit

---

[1] Ibid., p. 142.

of influence, must gradually emerge and be sufficiently developed to reduce the chance factors in heteronomous determination (Angyal, 1941). In the course of life, the autonomous strivings of the healthy personality have been abundant and successful and have led to a pronounced resourcefulness, self-reliance, and competence, all of which are important aspects of Angyal's "ideal of maturity."[1] As an outcome of these developments, the individual becomes the subject of his existence.

With the advent of the capacity for symbolization, and its great economic value to the perceptual and adjustive capacities of the organism, the individual obtains new tools and an increased ability to further his autonomous development. Factors standing largely under autonomous control are symbolically elaborated into self-awareness (Angyal, 1941). These symbolic functions, utilizing rationalistic supports, are largely conscious and govern the "will processes" of the individual. In its pure form, the autonomous trend is found as a major moving force in technology. Autonomy, however, is not to be interpreted as an isolated and discrete entity, a

---

[1]Andras Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. (E. Hantmann and R. M. Jones, eds.) New York. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1965.

mysterious force that rises up to conquer the environment. Autonomy is achieved via a tensional relationship maintained between the organism (subject) and the biologically relevant object (the environment) within the arena of the biosphere.

The movement toward autonomy is always progressive in healthy personality with no large scale regressions to impede its progress. Angyal, therefore, rejects the validity of the concept of the death instinct and its applicability to the motivations and development of healthy personality.

Notwithstanding the importance of autonomous development, the healthy personality must move beyond the concerns and goals of a unitary, individual organism. The healthy personality must gradually achieve an integration into superindividual units following an organismic trend toward homonomy (Angyal, 1941, 1965). In the trend toward autonomy the person subordinates the environment to his own design. The homonomous attitude fosters the submerging of one's individuality in favor of superindividual goals. The healthy personality seeks to become an integral part of superindividual wholes; to participate and share in family life, the social group, the culture, and in a meaningful world order. Man's homonomous strivings may even lead to the development of religious, ethical, or esthetic attitudes culminating in

a feeling of harmony with God and nature or in experiences of membership in a meaningful cosmic order thereby profoundly transcending the scope of a purely individualistic life. In healthy personality there develops a "metaphysical obligation" to serve more comprehensive wholes. Unlike the rational base for the development of autonomous strivings, homonomous behavior is deeply rooted in man's non-rational nature (Angyal, 1941). Angyal stresses that in the fully functioning human being, the healthy personality, homonomy is fully as important an aspect of human development as the meeting of autonomous needs.

Angyal rejects, for healthy personality, a concept of the superego that is contrived and artificially imposed on the individual and viewed by psychoanalysts as a secondary feature of the personality. Angyal (1965) regards the superego as a basic ingredient of the healthy personality as it allows for the full expression of homonomous trends. In healthy personality, for example, real guilt emerges upon a violation of one's autonomous needs or homonomous bonds, resulting in constructive responses and improved self control. In contrast to this mature or "real" guilt, spurious or neurotic guilt is displaced and neurotically detached from its true source so that the person cannot act upon it constructively.

The use of guilt feelings, therefore, is perverted by the neurotic while the healthy person is in closer, more conscious touch with himself and his needs and is free to display a constructive sequence in response to guilt feelings.[1]

Angyal (1965) considers the supreme achievement of homonomous integration and the most complete experience and expression of the healthy personality to be those intense moments of self-abandonment, in the mystical or "peak" experiences. While there is a certain loss of self-awareness[2] there is, at the same time, a distinct feeling of uniqueness or individuality combined, paradoxically, with a sense of oneness and unity with the world. The segregation barriers fall and the experience becomes the ultimate expression of unity, wholeness, and integration. New wholes, new modes of reality emerge.

The two basic trends in the personality appear, on a first or cursory examination, to present a dichotomous relationship, incompatible in a single, self-consistent personality.

---

[1]For an enlightening discussion of the role of guilt in personality disorganization see Hobart Mowrer, The Crisis In Psychiatry and Religion. Princeton. D. Van Nostrand, Inc., 1961.

[2]In referring to a loss of awareness, it is helpful to consider Rogers' (1963a) distinction between the "reflexive" awareness of the healthy functioning person and the stark, sharply focused self-consciousness of the neurotic, seen when healthy functioning is disrupted.

Indeed, there are integrational problems that must be resolved in the development of the two trends and it goes without saying that the lives of neurotic and less mature personalities are dominated by conflicts, distortions, and arrested developments in their efforts to actualize these two intrinsic motivational forces. There are intra as well as inter-trend integration problems to be considered.

One of the greatest dangers to the healthy development of autonomy lies in its excessive use and dependence upon the symbolic function. The danger to the personality lies in the development of a symbolic or conscious dictatorship over the personality. Angyal (1941) stresses that the conscious, symbolic subject is not qualified for complete, autonomous control of the organism since it cannot present a complete picture of reality encountered in the biological total process. Non-rational, unconscious components, essential for rich homonomous development, cannot be disqualified in the well-integrated personality. This potential split between the conscious self and the total organism is considered by Angyal to be the most vulnerable point in the organization of the human personality.

The chief danger within the homonomous strivings lies in the possible loss or erosion of one's individuality or

autonomy. Consistent with system dynamics, it is clear that deficiencies or pronounced conflicts within one trend presupposes integration problems in the other trend. A symbolic dictatorship of the personality, centered in the autonomous strivings, will inhibit the development and utilization of important non-rational, unconscious forces vital to the health of the total personality and particularly to the meeting of homonomous needs, while excessive homonomous controls may inhibit important autonomous functions.

It is clear that integration problems are minimal or virtually non-existent in the mature personality. While autonomy and homonomy appear to be incompatible and, indeed, may be in competition in the neurotic, they are complimentary rather than conflicting in the healthy personality "...they logically presuppose each other in the well-integrated person."[1]

In the healthy personality the autonomous strivings for control and mastery of the environment are deeply embedded in a need for belonging and participation. The mature individual achieves a rapprochement between mastery and love via higher level integrations.

---

[1]Andras Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment, p. 29.

The Real Self

Angyal believes that the nucleus of healthy personality organization is formed in childhood and emerges as a natural consequence of an environment that allows for the open and direct pursuit of the two basic trends, autonomy and homonomy. The resulting pattern of authenticity is consistent with the principle of confident self-acceptance that governs the basic system of health. The real self grows out of an atmosphere free from threat and out of a respect held by significant others, for the two basic trends in human nature. Thus, the child is free to meet his primary needs without negation or distortion. The real self is not a "preformed mystical entity"[1] but results from an environment that allows for a healthy organization and channelling of the child's basic needs. Angyal (1965) considers "the real self" as characterized by greater perceptual accuracy and the absence of a need to make security the main issue in life. There is no fear of people and no mythical enemies to battle. The real self becomes free to experiment with constructive, system-consistent solutions to frustrating or threatening situations while the neurotic develops into an arrested and isolated self. The

---

[1] Ibid, p. 286.

real self, in sharp contrast to the neurotic, has the potential for growth. The healthy personality, therefore, emerges and takes shape out of this rich seed bed of the real self.

It follows that if the society is supportive and friendly to the basic needs or trends of the organism and assists in their channeling and expression, healthy behavior patterns will emerge. Bionegative development, an inclusive term denoting a failure to achieve part-whole integration, and pathological trends are secondary developments and alienated from the "real self." Angyal views human nature, therefore, as basically positive.

Integration Within the Dimensional Domains and the Implications for Healthy Personality

As we have noted, Angyal's theory of healthy personality is intimately related to successful integration. The dimensional domain with its three primary dimensions serves as the framework for personality organization and healthy integration.

In the verticle dimension of depth, the depths may become segregated from the surface (the overt expressions) resulting in a dissociation and incongruity between the wellsprings of the personality and that which is expressed. If this state of segregation obtains, behavior will be superficial

and the individual will be seen as "play acting" or role playing and in other ways avoiding expressions of the real personality (Angyal, 1941).

Healthy development and integration along the dimension of depth provides a "metaphysical anchoring."[1] There is a rather clearly defined philosophy of life and basic system of values that finds appropriate and system-consistent expression in overt behavior. The well integrated person along the dimension of depth will have developed a compatible and self-consistent axiomatic system and will be in conscious touch with the set of axioms that determines his behavior and culminates in a philosophy of life. There will, in fact, be few discrepancies between his professions and his behavior, and with the reality in which he finds himself. Angyal (1941) asserts that a good compatibility of axioms among themselves and with reality is the main characteristic of the "Harmonious person."[2]

Segregation along the means-end continuum, the dimension of progression, is evidenced in motivation disturbances. Aborted activity and immature fixation on subordinate goals

---

[1]Andras Angyal, Foundations for a Science of Personality. New York. The Commonwealth Fund. 1941. p. 356.

[2]Ibid., p. 146.

prevents closure and results in frustration. Thus, segregation along the means-end continuum cuts off any contact with the individual's major goals and purposes or prevents him from obtaining any satisfaction in their pursuit.

Good integration along the means-end dimension of progression results in an increased efficiency and productivity and leads to a free-flowing uninterrupted pursuit of the person's major goals and purposes. In such an integration there is a resolution of the dichotomy between means and ends whereby the means activity will be thoroughly enjoyed for its own sake. "In fact, in cases of good integration the "end" is the totality of the work process of which the means are as much a part as the outcome."[1] In healthy personality, therefore, the means-end dichotomy is transcended so that in doing the parts one is doing the whole. Following Angyal's lead, we might also speculate that the healthy personality, with good integration along the dimension of progression, would have also resolved the age old distinction between work and play.

Segregation in the dimension of breadth or in the transverse dimension involving the various expressions of a given tendency, will result in a lack of coordination or

---

[1] Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment. p. 13.

flexibility in a given performance or pursuit.

Healthy integration along this transverse dimension would expand the modes of expression and increase the flexibility and coordination of existing channels of expression.

Following Angyal's (1965) principle of the ambiguous Gestalt, the healthy personality will display integration and harmony within each of the three major dimensions or system formations, or else there will be a shift toward segregation and a disruption of continuity in each dimension. Segregation in one system usually predicts integration problems in the other dimensions while, conversely, healthy integration is usually achieved within and over a wide range of systems (Angyal, 1941; 1965).

Differentiation and the Problem of Integration: The Implications for Healthy Personality

One more problem in the successful integration of the personality concerns us: the problem of differentiation within the whole, within an otherwise balanced, relatively homogeneous system. Angyal devotes some attention to a number of integration problems faced by the personality but the issue of differentiation is of singular importance to this discussion since it bears directly on some crucial issues in the growth and development of the healthy personality.

Wholes, Angyal points out, may be diffuse and composed of deeply imbedded parts within a highly stable whole or they may be strongly articulated with highly individualized parts. Our perception of this state of affairs may be likened to an intricate mosaic with a well blended total pattern in contrast to a mosaic form with vivid shapes or colors sharply etched against a diffuse background.

In the former case, we will have a well integrated, stable but potentially rigid or static personality system while in a highly differentiated whole the outstanding parts have a greater autonomy and a greater independence from the whole. Since the differentiation process within an otherwise stable Gestalt may disrupt unity and coherence there is some danger of a disintegration of the whole, although Angyal does stress the importance of the synthesizing function of the system during the shifting of figure-ground relationships.

It is not any one isolated period of active differentiation or shifting within a given whole or system that concerns this specific discussion, however. It is, rather, the crucial fact that the normal evolution of wholes depends upon a process of successive differentiation and systematic reintegration. We may extend this principle of system evolution to the growth of the personality as a whole and conclude that

if personality is to grow and evolve it can do so only through cycles of system disruption and differentiation that bring about a new synthesis of freshly articulated and realigned components. There is, then, a higher level of integration achieved as the newly differentiated parts become reimbedded or assimilated to form another stable whole. The question we must ask is this: Remembering the major holistic principle of process, does healthy evolution of the personality necessitate disturbances in previously established levels of harmony, integration and system stability? The answer seems to point strongly to the affirmative and we will treat this question as a substantive issue in chapter V. "The concept of differentiation," states Angyal, "has not yet been as fully exploited as its significance would justify."[1] We would agree with Angyal's appraisal.

Concluding, it can be seen from the above discussion that healthy personality, for Angyal, represents an integrational status. Moving from an early foundation of "the real self" to increasing harmony between the autonomous and homonomous strivings, a genuine rapprochement between mastery and love, the healthy personality achieves the quintessence of health in the ultimate integration of self-transcending

---

[1]Angyal. Foundations. p. 278.

experiences reaching into unknown or little understood unions with the cosmos and, perhaps, in rare asscciations with the highest levels of cosmic reality.

Kurt Goldstein's Theory of Healthy Personality

For Goldstein, the most basic phenomenon of life is the interaction and the inexorable confrontation between the organism and the environment. This fundamental "coming-to-terms" with one's milieu must serve as the crucible for the study and analysis of any facet of Goldstein's organismic theory of personality. All phenomena of life are centered in this on-going interactional, bi-polar process. This confrontation, the coming-to-terms, is initiated by the organism's insistent need to actualize his nature; an inner necessity to bring to fruition his potentialities (Goldstein, 1963a). These strivings for self-actualization encounter the realities of a given milieu with its favorable and unfavorable conditions for existence and fulfillment. Under such circumstances "It is the organism's tendency to fulfill a task in such a way that its capacities are realized as fully as possible."[1] In this organism-world confrontation healthy personality is partially determined by a proper or adequate fitting of

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein, Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology. New York. Schocken Books. 1963. p. 133.

"performance potentialities" with the available life situation. This fitting Goldstein calls "responsiveness."

I. Autonomous Encroachment and Self-renunciation

In the initial efforts to come-to-terms with world, to actualize potentialities, the organism seeks a conquest of world and an expansion of the sphere of his activities and control. These autonomous strivings may manifest themselves as a strong self-assertion against inadequate milieu, i.e., an environment that thwarts or delimits self-realization. Such encroaching behaviors aimed at the self-expansion are the conquest of world do not suggest, however, an "asocial individualism."[1] Such an interpretation is antithetical to Goldstein's concept of human nature. While it is true that the urge for individuality and the successful gratification of autonomous strivings may imply the necessity or the inevitability of encroaching at times on the freedom of others there is, in the healthy personality, at other times, a passive mode of "letting others be" and the freedom to choose self-renunciation and self-denial in the interests of others. Thus, the need for renunciation or self-restriction and the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 201.

self-assertive activity of autonomous encroaching are both inherent in human nature. Goldstein (1963a) views the healthy personality as striving for and ultimately achieving a balance between renunciation and encroachment. In their most noble, magnanamous expressions these two forces achieve a singular harmony in the personality. The highest forms of love and friendship require a mutual opportunity to realize and share both of these aspects of human behavior. Thus, both renunciation and encroachment belong to every healthy relationship and they are fully integrated in the healthy personality. We shall return to these important issues when we present Goldstein's more specific consideration of individual and group relationships.

II. Centering

As we have seen, the process of maturity in the healthy personality moves beyond a constant struggle and debate between the self-centered, autonomous needs and the desire, in an inherent ethical sensitivity, to foster self-realization in self and others through self-renunciation or self-restriction (Goldstein, 1963a). The healthy personality achieves a higher level of integration, a degree of centering that serves as Goldstein's (1963b) chief criterion of the mature personality,

the apex of healthy functioning. True centeredness in the personality is a highly evolved integrational status and represents the melding of the higher attributes of human nature into a highly stable Gestalt.

Centering requires a highly developed abstract capacity and attitude which permits the organism to deal with the possible, thus integrating life's time dimensions in the interests of the whole personality. Consequently, the well-centered personality is less bound to milieu and less influenced or disturbed by its vicissitudes. In the healthy personality there is little concrete, stimulus-bound and stereotyped performance as we typically find in Goldstein's brain damaged patients and in many minimally functioning individuals. Thus, without such a dependency upon environmental cues, there is a greater range of personal freedom for flexible behavior and choice making. Yet, while the abstract capacity lends a potential for freedom and flexibility there is also an ordered character to behavior in healthy personality, an ability to enter into the shifting of sets and altering figure-ground configurations with regard for the total organism's purpose in achieving self-realization and successfully coming-to-terms with world.

In Goldstein's (1963b) well-centered personality there

is also a transcending of dichotomies, an organismic unity of body and mind and an integration of the three major patterns of centering: 1. The thinker (Cognitive mode); 2. The poet (Affective mode); 3. The man of action (Somatic mode). Such dichotomies are not natural expressions or requirements of the organism but suggest themselves because only in rare moments does full centering manifest itself. This completeness of organismic unity is encountered and fully experienced when the organism achieves a "sphere of immediacy" which "...makes unity possible between the world and ourselves particularly in our relationship to other human beings."[1] While the autonomous strivings represent a conscious and determined effort at conquest of world, a voluntary "grasping" of world leading to a confrontation between organism and environment, immediacy is achieved only by "letting go" and surrendering self to the world and, thus, to a higher level of consciousness and integrated experiencing. In this sphere of immediacy there is a resolution of the subject-object dichotomy and we are in touch with self and with world in their deepest meaning and character. In this new mode of encompassing "world" a new dimension of "richness" has been

---

[1] Ibid., Foreword, xi.

added to the vigor and cohesion of centering. "We are here involved in our totality while in the subject-object world we experience only isolated parts of ourselves and the world."[1] Goldstein suggests that we often use the language of poets to communicate this experience.

Entering into the "sphere of immediacy," the quintessence of centering, has far reaching consequences for the organism. Goldstein conceives this sphere to be the prime source of all creativity, love, and religion, but, paradoxically, this richness of centering also offers us the frightening possibility of experiencing the full measure of our life in the form of "...failure, sorrow, and anxiety."[2]

The erotic sphere is used by Goldstein to illustrate true centering in contrast to performance on a lower level, isolated and detached from the rest of the personality. Thus, one's sexual expression can be reduced to the satisfaction of an isolated drive, "...to bare sexuality,"[3] or it can embrace the totality of one's being in an integration of the physical, mental and spiritual contents. The more centered the organism the less it is controlled by partitive phenomena

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., xii.

[3] Goldstein, The Organism. Boston. The Beacon Press. 1963. p. 498.

and the more it is guided by the attitude and needs of the whole organism, allowing for the free operation of the principles of optimal performance, strivings for perfection, and the law of pregnanz (Goldstein, 1963b). Damage to centering brings about a functional isolation from the whole and a return to the segmental functioning of drives. In the well-centered personality, therefore, every behavior, every response is a "Gestalt reaction" of a figure-ground configuration.

The conquest of world is never fully achieved and the sense of immediacy and a richness of centering are, at best, transitory states of being. Thus, we cannot escape the reality of catastrophic shocks and concomitant anxiety that result from our inadequacy in coming-to-terms with world and our inability to successfully cope with our milieu. We are not always capable of maintaining an adequate milieu, i.e., one that will insure our continued self-realization, allowing for a proper "fitting" between our biological requirements and potentialities and the environmental possibilities. Goldstein attributes anxiety not only to an apprehension of failure, of not being capable of coping with our milieu but to a more profound apprehension of nothingness, a perceived threat to the continued actualization of our intrinsic nature,

to the loss of the basic values upon which rests our existence. He makes it clear that such shocks to our existence and the resulting fear, anxiety,[1] and catastrophic reactions are undeniable and inexorable components of the normal life process. The drive to escape tension, to avoid the encounters that may provoke anxiety, and the tendency to self-preservation are only true in the constricted lives of organic patients or damaged personalities. Goldstein stresses Freud's failure to recognize this process of "coming-to-terms" as the primary phenomenon of life and he criticizes the limited vision that ignored or precluded the pleasure and excitement in tension.

It is important to emphasize that the emotion of anxiety and the catastrophic shocks to our existence are, for Goldstein, more than mere concomitants in the process of coming-to-terms with world. They are prerequisites for growth. Goldstein (1951) suggests that movement to higher levels of self-realization must be preceded by shocks to one's existence and that such temporary states of emotional disorder to the threats of losing one's ordered existence are inevitable if

---

[1] Goldstein distinguishes between the terms fear and anxiety. Fear is more concrete and an emotional response of apprehension to the possible onset of anxiety. Thus, for Goldstein, anxiety is the more basic emotional response that underlies the various manifestations of fear.

new tasks and new challenges are to be met and if new relationships are to be worked out between the organism and the environment.

The neurologically diseased and emotionally disturbed are reduced by necessity or by seduction to concrete, non-threatened states of being. "Pleasure is equilibrium, elimination of danger, quietness,"[1] and to Goldstein such conditions represent the decadence of life. The healthy personality, like a child, is adventurous, active, and seeking to come to grips with the conditions of life which oppose or challenge his urge to self-realization. There is always a certain danger of personality disintegration in such risk-taking but present, also, is an excitement and attraction in this possibility since self-actualization can only be attained vis a vis conflict with opposing forces of the environment. "...it corresponds to the tension which is part of living to its very apex."[2] The healthy personality, therefore, cannot be primarily concerned with its security for it is through

---

[1] Kurt Goldstein, On Emotions: Considerations from the Organismic Point of View. The Journal of Psychology, 31, 1951. p. 48.

[2] Ibid., p. 49.

insecurity and shocks and threats to our existence, in productive disequilibrium, that we realize ourselves in the highest form. Emphatically, healthy life must take its course via uncertainty and shock. Above all, it follows that the healthy personality must possess courage, i.e., the capacity to bear anxiety. This capacity presupposes an abstract attitude, a perspective that is always open toward "the possible."

The human conflict, perhaps the unconscious dilemma within us all, becomes one of the urge for growth toward higher levels of self-realization necessitating periods of the painful experience of anxiety, of heightened tension and disorder within the personality vs. a more pleasant, ordered state of affairs with an adequate accommodation, a type of collusion as it were, between the organism and the environment; or, as Goldstein suggests, a relatively safe, conflict-free state representing "...a phenomenon of standstill."[1] It is a struggle between the urge for growth and the seductive attractions of security and order.

Health, then, is viewed by Goldstein (1957; 1959) as a value ascribed to the experience of adequacy between an individual's nature and potentials and his world. This value

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein. "Health as Value." New Knowledge in Human Values. Abraham Maslow, ed. New York. Harper and Row. 1959. p. 182.

consists of the individual's capacity to actualize himself to the extent that the essentials of his nature are realized. Loss of existence, "being sick," is seen as diminution of value. Goldstein (1959) emphasizes that this most basic of values is not a derived, secondary phenomenon and does not issue from judgments that are dependent on concepts externally determined. "Health appears thus as the prototype of value. It may even be considered the value, from which all other values experienced under special conditions become comprehensible."[1] The nature of value, therefore, can only become intelligible through an understanding of the intrinsic nature of man. Goldstein's (1959; 1957) concept of health as value is far-reaching for it implies that upon man's intrinsic nature and yearnings can be built a naturalistic system of values.

The Individual and the Group

One basic question remains before us. How can the individual actualize himself in the world in the way that best corresponds to his basic nature and capacities?

To Goldstein, human nature, expressed through the potential wholeness and integrity of each individual, is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 188.

sovereign and profoundly and basically positive in its nucleus and evolution. Negative, destructive behaviors are viewed as reactionary protests to the environmental abridgement or distortion of human nature that thwarts adequate coming-to-terms with world and threatens the important tasks of self-realization. The only "we" that is genuine is one which guarantees natural ways of existence for individuals. The individual is the ultimate measure of the suitability of the "we" (Goldstein, 1963a).

There can be no doubt that, for Goldstein, the individual is sovereign and reflects the health of a given society. His view is similar to one held by Rollo May (1953), who suggests that the few sensitive individuals with the courage to face psychotherapy are, in fact, representatives of a larger society and mirror the latent pathology of the larger social organization. The charge by Hall and Lindzey (1957), however, that Goldstein's organismic theory treats the organism as an isolated unit, segregated and arbitrarily divided from the rest of the world is inaccurate or, at best, only partially true, perhaps as an expression of Goldstein's personal conflict over the role of society in the life of the individual and the relationship between them. However, Goldstein does not reject the existence of more highly evolved, super-individual

wholes. The individual, when compared to more comprehensive wholes, reveals the same flaws, imperfections, and rigidity that an isolated process within the individual reveals in comparison to the whole organism. Goldstein endeavors to explain his position by stating that he accepts the individual as a preliminary whole, simply because we arrive factually at a relatively satisfactory result. Such a position would seem to indicate that, conceptually, we are poorly prepared to investigate larger wholes and understand or establish the organism's relationship or role within their orbits.

Goldstein, as a matter of fact, does not isolate the individual from the rest of the world. We cannot draw artificial lines in the unitary pattern of life in which the person and his environment are so closely related. Self-realization, Goldstein asserts, is impossible unless the self-realization of the others is guaranteed. The only "we" that is natural for Goldstein, constituting a viable social organization, is one which guarantees authentic ways of existence for individuals. The point has already been made that the individual is primary in all social organization and the ultimate measure of the suitability of the "we." Nevertheless, Goldstein (1963a) recognizes that the individual is not wholly independent of the "we." He can realize his nature only within the group. The

individual and the "we" depend upon each other.

"We recognize further that a more nearly perfect realization can take place only through a process of mutual adaptation between peoples which will permit a fuller actualization of all the different factors that, harmoniously combined, represent human nature."[1]

A healthy society, therefore, must conform to the nature of man and, beyond this, reach a synergy between its goals and the requirements of the organism for self-realization. Only an adequate organization of group life can assure that both individuals and groups can actualize themselves without harming each other.

Goldstein (1963a) withholds judgment on the most promising, most genuine forms of social organization to provide for the needs of man and facilitate self-realization. He contends that the concepts of "tribe," "family," "species," "race," "nation," and "state," have not been adequately defined or determined to be "genuine forms of being" for the understanding, facilitation, and enhancement of the individual's self-realization with which he is ultimately concerned. Goldstein does, however, sketch the general characteristics and repercussions within a society that fails to provide for the adequate

---

[1]Goldstein, Human Nature. p. 236.

expression and development of human nature. It is a pseudo-social organization dependent upon anachronistic customs and habits to perpetuate erstwhile institutions and patterns of group life. There is an emancipation of these patterns from their original purposes along with a loss of vitality, as rules of conduct become detached from the real needs of the majority of the individuals in the group. Organizational prescriptions fail to keep pace with the flow of life and changing times. Under these conditions, and in an anxious society upheld by artificial, mechanical means, Goldstein believes that the society is open to totalitarian developments.

Abraham Maslow's Theory of Healthy Personality

Abraham Maslow's concepts of healthy personality are deeply embedded in the matrix of his theory of man's intrinsic nature and potentials for growth. In this respect, with the exception of the strength of emphasis upon genetic components, he is not atypical of other holistic theorists.

Man, as Maslow (1954; 1962a) views him, pursues life within the context of an instinctoid need hierarchy which covers the full range and spectrum of human desire and potential; from the hunger driven man seeking food to human joy in

the experience of esthetic ecstasy. The prepotent needs, respectively, for physiological satisfaction, safety, love, self-esteem, and self-actualization emerge in a relatively ordered and predictable sequence as each, in turn, is gratified. Thus, the unfolding of the human potential is viewed from a concept of progressive need gratification that provides theoretical support for careful attention to the facilitation, accommodation and satiation of fundamental needs while offering theoretical disapproval for their frustration or punishment. Instinctoid need frustration, in a real and lawful sense, produces psychopathology. The reasoned acceptance of the need gratification theory rests upon Maslow's conviction that the inner core of personality, in its nascent state, is good, trustworthy, and ethical and must be allowed to assert itself. Negative or destructive behaviors are epiphenomena, symptoms resulting from a denial or deprivation of these needs. In summary, if the gratification of the "lower" more basic instinctoid needs proceeds without serious interruption, they become secondary and lose much of their compelling and controlling force in the life of the organism. Attention, therefore, gradually moves beyond these deficiency motivations to a heightened awareness of "higher," though biologically weaker, urges as new demands and expanded

possibilities emerge from ground into figure. As these "higher" instinctoid needs emerge they give rise to basic changes in the motivational structure of the organism in the conative-affective and cognitive areas in respect to character traits and in the dimension of interpersonal behavior (Maslow, 1954).

Becoming and Being: Two Basic Health Modes

Once more, we need to distinguish between Maslow's (1962a) two basic health modes, becoming and being, and clarify their relationship. Both modes incorporate essential aspects of healthy personality. Becoming is a directional, growth-centered process, a process that may span and encompass the full hierarchical range of instinctoid needs, both "lower" and higher." In the healthy personality, it is a lifelong process of need transcendence; of increasing growth, change, and maturity. While both becoming and being are essential dimensions of healthy personality, becoming is conceptually subordinant since it facilitates, almost as a prerequisite, higher levels of self-actualization leading to forms of pure "being" (Maslow, 1962a). Becoming may contain some of the attributes of instrumental striving and coping behavior. For example, the individual's highly motivated efforts to achieve autonomy is often a means-centered struggle

with the environment. In the early stages of growth, too, there is often the ubiquitous frustration of deficiency needs that must be resolved. Becoming, therefore, is a life-long project that may transcend the deficiency motivations and enter into a more self-actualizing status while states of pure being are relatively temporary and unmotivated end-experiences. These experiences are rooted in immediacy and largely expressive and "useless." Such "episodes" of being often represent a passive, receptive state that allows the organism a fully integrated expression of his potentials and an expression of his most unique and stylistic features, as in art, music, nature, interpersonal communication, and sex.

The pinnacle of human integration, experiencing, and personality achievement are seen in the full emergence and expression of these metamotivations. Theoretically, in the hierarchical arrangement of instinctoid needs, this apex of personal development presupposes that the "lower" more basic and prepotent needs have been adequately gratified, taken for granted, and receded into the "ground" of motivational dynamics. "Higher" needs emerge as "figure" and represent an advanced stage of self-actualization, a fuller, more complete realization of the human potential. Healthy personality, therefore, gradually emerges as a consequence of the

organism's increased freedom for unmotivated experiencing and behavior.[1] The highest motives are, paradoxically, unmotivated.

In an interpretation of Maslow's theory of healthy personality, it is important to stress once more that these two basic modes of health, *becoming* and *being* are not mutually exclusive or antagonistic at the higher levels of human development. In the early stages of growth, moreover, a breakdown in the forward movement of the *becoming* process will certainly preclude a later realization of the higher instinctoid potentials for *being*. In most respects *becoming* and *being* are highly interdependent and mutually facilitating; healthy growth and becoming enhances or releases certain states of *being* which, in turn, stimulates further progress and the course of *becoming*.

---

[1] In a recent observation representing an important shift in his theoretical position, Maslow (1967) rejects an earlier assumption, based upon his hierarchical theory of needs, that metamotivation comes about automatically as deficiency needs are resolved. Maslow now feels that there are other requirements and that basic need gratification is a necessary but not a sufficient condition to release the individual for self-actualization. One major factor in determining the level of development reached lies, perhaps, in the strength of the individual's "impulse voices." The self-actualizing person exhibits a strong, "life positive" orientation that reflects the strength of the growth need throughout the entire need hierarchy. For a more complete discussion of this issue, see interview with Abraham Maslow, Appendix A.

"It looks as if human beings must be able both to affirm themselves (to be stubborn, stiff-necked, vigilant, alert, dominant, aggressive, self-confident, etc.) and also to be able to trust, to relax and to be receptive and Taoistic, to let things happen without interfering, to be humble and surrender."[1]

I. Autonomous Development

According to Maslow, the human being is in the possession of intrinsic laws that are distinguishable from those of natural reality, a non-human reality. While concessions must be made to the environment, these intrinsic laws of the organism deserve unconditional respect so that man is defined and understood intrapsychically rather than subjected to some extrapsychic, environment-centered criteria of mental health. Healthy personality, while including success in appropriate coping behavior, mastery, effectance, and competence must also include a transcendence of the environment, an independence of it, and a resistance to enculturation. A person who gives in too readily to the distorting forces in the culture may be less healthy than the ones who actively

---

[1] Abraham Maslow, "Lessons from the Peak-Experience." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 2, 1962; p. 16.

resist such forces. The instinctoid needs are not created by the environment and Maslow adamantly rejects the doctrine that one's conscience, rationality, and ethics are little more than an acquired veneer. These characteristics of man are an integral part of his instinctoid nature, however submerged, disguised, or distorted they may appear to be. Maslow emphasizes the autonomous nature of this inner character and ethical potential of man and he provides evidence to indicate that "...the organism is more trustworthy, more self-protecting, self-directing, and self-governing than it is usually given credit for."[1] Self-actualization and the accompanying metamotivations are genetically based, the culmination of an intrinsic growth process and successful movement through a hierarchy of latent potentials, values, and needs.

Maslow (1954) recognizes the Aristotelian and Spinozist parallels to this concept of human nature but he contends that some crucial distinctions must be made if we are to make a point of the comparison. He stresses that much more is known today about human nature than in Aristotle's time

---

[1]Abraham Maslow, Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954. p. 124.

and there is significantly more insight into man's potentials as well as more respect for the limitations of man's rational powers in achieving self-realization and the good life.

One of the important implications of Maslow's instinctoid need theory is that it points, quite logically, to a species-wide theory of psychological health, to the development of universal criteria, as Fromm (1955) also suggests, for mental health.

II. Health as the Transcending of Dichotomies

A total investment of human energy into the requirements of a given area of deficiency and frustration, i.e., a craving for love, a neurotic search for comfort and security, etc., leaves the individual compartmentalized and dissociated from crucial aspects of himself as a full and whole being. Living with such a deficiency status precludes personality process and integration. Gratification in these crucial need areas, however, releases the individual for more advanced stages of human development that is marked by a more total experiencing of the self and the environment. The organism is gradually freed from the dehumanizing influences of the anxious struggle for survival.

One of the hallmarks of achieving a more fully actualized level of development, free from the concrete, dictatorial demands of the deficiency needs, is an increasing resolution of stereotyped conflicts and the transcending of age-old dichotomies that have pathologized much of life but long accepted as a normal expression of human nature. All "opposites," suggests Maslow (1962a), are hierarchically-integrated in healthy people.

One of the chief criteria for the self-actualizing person, therefore, and a major theme in the writings of Maslow, is the resolution and transcendence of conflicts and dichotomies. In achieving this Gestalt, traditional problems become non-problems in the healthy personality.

The competitive and conflictual elements inherent in such polarities as rationality-impulse, means-ends, cognitive-conative, selfish-unselfish, primary process-secondary process, self-society, active-passive, masculine-feminine, duty-pleasure, work-play, spiritual-sensual, science-religion and the mystic-realistic, are problems only for unhealthy people. These **poorly** integrated conditions, however, are easily regarded as "normal" since they remain very much a part of the psychopathology of the "average" person. In addition to the

resolution of the above dichotomies many traditional role conflicts tend to disappear such as the issues of incompatability between age and youth, teacher and student, parent and child. These and many other conflicts are transcended in the well integrated personality. Significant channels for communication and relationship are thereby opened that are closed to most other individuals. In self-actualizing personalities these traditionally regarded incompatibles and opposites are resolved and the polarities disappear, leading to new levels of unity and wholeness. A newly ordered synthesis emerges and a synergic union of many apparent dichotomies is achieved.

These synergic developments are not abstract, "intellectual" achievements functioning in a compartmentalized fashion but, rather, become genuine and pervasive characteristics and expressions of the total personality; an integral part of the most basic dynamics and psychological processes of the organism. Qualitative changes, too, become apparent in cognition and perception. "Being" cognition replaces the deficiency-oriented cognitions (Maslow, 1962a; 1962c). Perceptions become less and less controlled by habitual "staticized" abstractions and are replaced by a more unique and

idiosyncratic cognitive system that can deal with a "flux-and-process" reality rather than forcing a dynamic-process world into fixed and static states with need determined, autistic perceptions (Maslow, 1954; 1962a). Increasing health, therefore, is reflected in perceptions of higher unity. Thus, the common practice of categorizing, prejudging, and stereotyping all flow from an ego-centered deficiency status with the need to force attributes of security, familiarity, and sameness, a certain manageability, onto a unique and dynamic world-in-process. The healthy personality is problem centered, open to both the unknown and the unknowable. His openness and his freshness of perception, like the naive, unspoiled perceptions of a child, are the foundations of creativity, a common attribute of the healthy personality. To the frustrated and deprived organism an openness to such cognitions and perceptions is too threatening. The deficiency motivated personality finds his solace and perhaps his strength in an artificially created, simplistic universe, in stereotypes, and in a static, polarized world.

One of the most pervasive conflicts throughout history, the individual vs. society, may represent the ultimate in conflict resolution and synergy if a rapprochement can be

effected. This would require a pluralistic society geared to the basic need satisfactions of its members and with a commitment to a philosophy that would offer not only a fundamental respect for the emergence of all attributes of self-actualization but a utilization of these attributes for its larger goals and purposes thereby creating a partnership between the individual and society. In such a synergic relationship the interests of the individual are compatible with the fundamental goals and interests of the society and vice versa (Maslow, 1964b). This relationship provides a good example of the resolution of the dichotomy between selfishness and unselfishness. Achieving such a synergic relationship between the individual and society would serve as one important measure of the healthy society.

III. The Peak-Experience

The supreme experience of pure "being" is discovered in the receptive phenomenon of the peak-experience. These ultimate expressions of healthy personality are unmotivated moments when self-consciousness is lost and "All fears, inhibitions, all tensions, all weaknesses...left behind."[1]

---

[1]Maslow. Lessons From the Peak Experiences. p. 9.

Accompanying this experience is some vision of the ultimate, a profound penetration of the truth and the essence of life, or a sense of complete gratification, feeling of perfection, and a validation of one's nature.

The peak-experience is an intense episode of self-actualization and, for Maslow, the sine qua non of healthy personality. Maslow (1962a) conceives of the peak-experience as the ultimate experience in unity and wholeness of the personality and a model of its highest potential. It is also a supreme identity experience when we are the most authentic and most deeply fulfilling the concept "human being." The peak-experience represents the emergence of latent aspects of a deeper inner nature that is seldom recognized and often persists unnoticed and undeveloped.

In their broadest significance, Maslow recognizes the peak, ecstatic moments in life as "core-religious" experiences but emerging as expressions of man's own instinctoid nature, the culmination of certain growth forces and a reflection of his higher need levels and potentials. In this manner, the peak-experience is seen as a naturalistic phenomenon, with biological sanctions, rather than interpreted within a super-natural context. In its deepest meaning, however, Maslow

(1964a) does place a religious connotation on the experience. The religious quests, the religious yearnings are deeply rooted in human nature and are, therefore, perfectly respectable scientifically.

Maslow hypothesizes that many individuals, including neurotics, have been participants in the phenomenon of the peak-experience though the experience is denied or unrecognized by many. Theoretically, however, the greater the degree of self-actualization along a continuum of _becoming_ the greater the frequency and depth of the peak-experiences. Here, again, we encounter the interdependent link between _becoming_ and _being_. The higher the level of _becoming_ reached in the organism's autonomous, ego-strengthening pursuits, in its successful coping and "coming-to-terms" with the environment, the freer and more open he or she becomes to transcend or "lose" the self in an isomorphic union with the world. Self-transcendence, therefore, presupposes ego-strength (Maslow, 1962a). Maslow (1964a) also suggests that frequent peak experiences, during which B-cognition takes place can lead to the heightened probability of B-cognition without peak-experiences.

The capacity to experience these profound moments of pure _being_ is the primary distinguishing feature between two

kinds or types of self-actualizing people identified by Maslow. In a recent paper Maslow (1969) contrasts the "merely healthy" self-actualizers who have had no transcendent or peak experiences with a more advanced group who find such experiences important and central in their lives.[1] Maslow suggests that this latter group, moving beyond the "merely healthy" level, will also reflect a different philosophy of life and will exhibit a more creative orientation to its possibilities. While this recent observation by Maslow represents a minor inconsistency with our interpretation of becoming and being, it gives added emphasis to our conclusion that the ultimate expressions of healthy personality are to be found in the depth and range of new modes of experiencing that the organism can achieve; in the expanded and integrated forms of relating and responding to self and the world.

Values, Health and Human Nature

All values that are inherent concomitants in the emergence of metamotivation, in the peak-experiences, in the most

---

[1]For a discussion of this issue refer to the interview with Abraham Maslow, Appendix A.

highly developed regions of self-actualization are intrinsic in the structure of human nature. Man's intrinsic nature is laden with value. In Maslow's theory of a psychology of being, an emerging transpersonal psychology, the values of self-actualizing people are considered as expressions of higher, more pervasive, species-wide needs. In a word, though culturally nurtured, they are instinctoid and embedded in the biogenetic material of human nature. The intrinsic urge to self-actualize, to grow toward a more complete realization of psychological health and "being," "...means pressing toward what most people would call good values, toward serenity, kindness, courage, honesty, love, unselfishness, and goodness."[1]

Maslow's "being" psychology is a study of ideal states, states of perfection, of unitive consciousness, and the God-like aspects of the human being. More specifically, <u>being psychology</u> interprets the B-values, i.e., the being values, as the metamotivations of the human being (Maslow, 1963). Maslow (1962c) lists the B-values, characteristics of the ideal, as follows: 1. Truth 2. Goodness 3. Beauty

---

[1]Abraham Maslow, <u>Toward a Psychology of Being</u>. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1962. p. 147.

4. Wholeness 4a. Dichotomy transcendence 5. Aliveness, process 6. Uniqueness 7. Perfection 7a. Necessity 8. Completion 9. Justice 9a. Order 10. Simplicity 11. Richness 12. Effortlessness 13. Playfulness 14. Self-sufficiency 15. Meaningfulness. Thus, the tasks of self-actualization, the metamotivations, are embodiments of intrinsic values, rather than means-centered culturally derived expedients. According to Maslow (1964a; 1967), spiritual and moral values have naturalistic meaning. We no longer need to rely on supernatural concepts to validate them.

A comprehensive definition of human nature, of the human potential, must include the intrinsic, instinctoid values, the components of the spiritual life. An actualization of these values is needed to avoid illness and to achieve full humanness. In a real sense, psychopathology is a value illness.

"The spiritual life is then part of the human essence. It is a defining characteristic of human nature, without which human nature is not full human nature. It is part

of the Real Self, of one's identity, of one's inner core, of one's specieshood, of full-humanness."[1]

The species-wide B-values, the metaneeds, are not merely epiphenomena accruing from the satisfaction of lower values. They exist, though with less potency, as biological and psychological realities. The failure, therefore, to live a life that promotes, encourages and gives expression to these higher levels of "being" results in the activation of our "intrinsic conscience" and leads to "intrinsic guilt." Both are biological danger signals of value starvation (Maslow, 1967). They are the natural and inevitable responses to self-betrayal, and serve as an internal warning to honor and respect one's nature.

Maslow (1962a) urges three directions of research to explore more fully the relationship between healthy personality and the nature of the B-values. First, he suggests that a greater number of psychologically healthy individuals be carefully selected for study as well as a study of the peak-experiences of a large number of individuals who may

---

[1]Abraham Maslow, "A Theory of Metamotivation: The Biological Rooting of the Value Life." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 7, 1967, p. 113.

be at various levels along the need hierarchy. The higher values, the eternal verities, will be the free choices of many of these individuals. Second, we need to look more carefully at the diminution of value and at the process of spiritual regression as a person moves away from health into illness. Finally, we must research the changing orientation of those individuals in psychotherapy specifically seeking to move from sickness toward health.

Healthy personality is achieving an articulation and actualization of one's inherent, naturalistic value system which must include the higher values, the B-values, in accord with the inherent spiritual sensitivity of human nature. The major expression of such an actualization is found in the peak experience.

Gardner Murphy's Theory of Healthy Personality

Healthy personality for Gardner Murphy must ultimately reflect man's curiosity, his ubiquitous urges toward self-world discovery and understanding. In the realization of Murphy's third human nature,[1] the experience of the urgency

---

[1]Refer to the discussion of Murphy's treatment of the holistic theme of Process, Chapter III.

to discovery and passion to explore and understand, the raw undisciplined energies and tension systems of man's most primitive nature are creatively channelled and given meaning and direction. The inertia and rigidity of cultural forms, "the chrysalis," is shattered, reshaped, and revitalized.

Against the evolutionary background of the three human natures, Murphy (1958) posits two basic or universal tendencies within the human organism which give intrinsic satisfactions without excessive conflict with other tendencies.

1. General affection. Out-going warmth, social feeling, generosity, and sympathy.

2. Cognitive-affective tendencies. An intense curiosity and interest in the world of discovery, a joy in creating, understanding and mastering. These cognitive-affective tendencies reflect an inherent reality-seeking orientation, a demand to apprehend the "real."

While recognizing the human need for safety, for ordered expression of the basic human tendencies, and a protection against the unknown, Murphy considers a significant part of the essential nature of humanness to lie in the organism's evolutionary growth trends toward unresolved balances and the creation of disorder and instability. Healthy personality as well as a viable society must remain an "unfinished canvas."

The great challenge today, Murphy feels, is to provide for the flow of drives and human expression without making "irrecoverable investments" in any one form or formula. Above all, the human mind must remain open, curious, and unsatiated. Vigilant effort is required to maintain such openness since it is a much more difficult achievement than developing order and stability and a comfortable point of view.

In judging the value of the vast array of human endeavors and pursuits, Murphy's criteria require that such involvements make one more sensitive to new experience and enrich capacities leading to deeper and deeper satisfactions in both the social sphere and the cognitive-affective world.

The various expressions of healthy personality, therefore, have a universal linkage with the nature and potentials of the human organism. The highest aspirations of man are, inexorably, "an expression of the kind of tissues of which he is made up."[1] Murphy suggests that the supposition of universal value directions deserves very serious consideration and study, the crucial question being "...what sorts of things does any species tend to learn; what are the lines of

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York. Harper and Brothers. 1947. p. 48.

development which it follows when it does what it wants to do."[1]

The healthy personality, sensitized to his craving for understanding and discovery, engages in new modes of experience and entertains new ways of feeling, bringing together those ingredients which constitute "independent, unconventional, non-routinized, original thought."[2] The healthy personality is thus engaged in the process of challenging assumptions, thereby adding new dimensions[3] and new systems of realities to an evolving never-to-be finished individuality. The healthy personality is free from the assertion that "there is nothing new under the sun" and is forever open to the emergence and recognition of new or latent potentialities. A "mood," a "feeling quality" provides an affective direction, a certain readiness for discovery, to movement toward these goals. Interests flow outward to include more and more attributes of the world (Murphy, 1958). To discover is fulfilling and it is this fulfillment via the sensory, motor, or intellectual modes which the emerging third human nature seeks.

---

[1] Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities. New York. Basic Books. 1958. p. 308.

[2] Ibid., p. 128.

[3] Dimension is defined by Murphy as a new perspective, a "way of grasping," a new world of meaning and value.

Healthy personality, therefore, can never be realized by a quantitative extension of current themes or trends.

I. Cosmic Consciousness

It is the openness to experience and commitment to an experimental orientation to life that frees man and puts him in touch with the universe and the ultimate realities such as an isomorphic union bestows.

Man is "a part of the sweep of the cosmos"[1] and it is this deep affinity with cosmic materials and structure that is the potential source of man's deepest and richest fulfillment. This organismic affinity can be seen early in the child's life as he responds spontaneously to cosmic patterns as an integral part of his self-structure. For Murphy (1947; 1958), therefore, one of the highest developments and expressions of the human personality is to become one with the cosmos, to become sensitive to and resonate with cosmic structure. It is achieved through a discovery of those harmonic links between internal needs, tensions, cycles, and rhythms and the outer cosmic realities. This heightened identification with the cosmos requires the development of one's

---

[1] Murphy, Human Potentialities. p. 23.

potentials, an intimate self-awareness and an ego equipped to deal with cosmic reality. There must be an exploration and discovery of the qualities of the self that resonate most deeply with world elements so that appropriate modes of interaction and integration can occur. "Personality is as much a way of becoming sensitive as it is a way of reacting upon the environment."[1]

According to Murphy, the achievement of cosmic consciousness may be expressed in states of selflessness and in a variety of loss-of-self phenomena exhibiting a freeing and extension of traditional ego boundaries. There is the apprehension of a higher reality as self becomes undifferentiated from world. A state of ecstasy is characteristic of most such experiences (Murphy and Spohn, 1968). Murphy interprets the process of achieving states of cosmic consciousness thus:

"...Along with the greatly increased sensitivity to many aspects of the universe there is a loss of the sense of contrast or opposition between the self and the world. The content of self <u>is</u>, then, the world content; one is caught up in the joy of union with the cosmos."[2]

---

[1] Murphy, <u>Personality</u>. p. 112.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 521.

All contacts and interactions with the environment, indeed, all reality has a self-reference. The person's experience of cosmic consciousness, therefore, will be a unique and selective one and not a facsimilie of all such experiences of others. "...rather he would become more individuated, selecting from the cosmos what is deeply significant of himself."[1] Isomorphism thus allows for the uniqueness of individual structure and autonomy while providing a resonance of inner with outer structure. Murphy (1958) suggests that such cosmic unions are often "unmotivated" states, "unproductive" moments of the relaxed, casual and exploratory.

States of cosmic consciousness represent an integration of the three human natures, the instinctual, the formal, and the sensory, giving rise to the most "profound arousal"[2] and the formation of a new emergent whole. Thus, the growth potentials and the power of the transforming character of such cosmic experiences is emphasized.

"It is because of man's capacity for intimate union with the stuff of this world through the methods of the arts

---

[1]Gardner Murphy and Herbert E. Spohn, Encounter With Reality. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968. p. 122 ff.

[2]Murphy, Human Potentialities. p. 184.

and through the methods of science that he may hope to do more than to transcend himself, may hope to become in each new emergent phase of his life a new kind of man."[1]

This supreme achievement of self-realization is not a hedonistic, self-indulgent development. Murphy considers it a positive phase of socialization since a craving for the social is a real and vital component of human nature. Man seeks to establish contact with reality. A failure in social communication and fulfillment, therefore, represents a major failure in the achievement of human nature itself. Murphy (1958) rejects any concept of self-realization that disallows this inexorable link between man and his environment and the social nature of psychological reality. He suggests that an experience of ecstasy may be achieved in an interaction and sense of communion between two or more selves and he states that "...a healthy personality is largely...a system of interpersonal relations involving acceptance, affection, encouragement, and belief in one another."[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 325.

[2] Gardner Murphy, "Self-Realization and Mental Health." Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic. Vol. 23., No. 3, 1959. p. 83.

Carl Rogers' Theory of Healthy Personality

Of fundamental importance in the life of the organism, any organism, is an active, progressive striving in the direction of maintaining, enhancing, and reproducing itself. This most salient feature in human motivation, the actualizing tendency, "the central source of energy,"[1] is defined by Rogers as "...the inherent tendency of the organism to develop all its capacities in ways which serve to maintain or enhance the organism.... Development toward the differentiation of organs and functions, expansion and enhancement through reproduction. It is development toward autonomy and away from heteronomy, or control by external forces."[2] In addition, a basic component of the actualizing tendency is expressed by the organism's need to establish a unity or wholeness of personality and maintain a self-consistency by keeping the self-concept congruent or compatible with experience and by the capacity to experience in awareness the discrepancies that develop between the self-concept and experience. It is

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers. "Actualizing Tendency in Relation to "Motives" and Consciousness." Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Marshall R. Jones, Ed. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press. 1963. p. 6.

[2]Carl R. Rogers. "A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework."In Koch, S. (Ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, Vol. 3. New York. McGraw-Hill, 1959. p. 196.

a veritable requirement for the healthy organism to symbolize experience accurately in awareness (Rogers, 1959). Beyond this sovereign directional tendency Rogers feels no need to postulate any additional or "higher" motives in his theoretical system. An unswerving commitment to this autonomous, selective direction of the organism supports Rogers' faith in the individual's capacity for self-guidance, self-direction, and competence. He views the natural expressions of the actualizing tendency as a reliable and constructive force in the life of the organism. The most organic, most basic strivings and needs of man are positive and constructive in nature.

In working out an expression of Rogers' theory of healthy personality, a second motivational tendency must be introduced. This additional motivational construct, the tendency toward self-actualization, is an auxiliary expression of the actualizing tendency of the organism and manifests itself, following early developments of the self-structure, by actualizing or enhancing those aspects of experience which are symbolized as a part of the self (Rogers, 1959; 1963a). As we shall see, these may be the learned constructs in experience leading to incongruence or it may represent more genuine values and directions emerging from the full-range of experiences of the organism guided by the actualizing tendency.

It is the relationship between these two basic tendencies that leads to the health process of the fully-functioning person or to the arrested development of the poorly integrated personality.

I. The Development of Congruence

The development of a relative state of congruence is essential to the development of healthy personality. Indeed, Rogers treats healthy personality and congruence as synonymous states. Congruence is defined by Rogers as a condition of the personality "when self-experiences are accurately symbolized, and are included in the self-concept in this accurately symbolized form."[1]

The personality ingredients for the development of congruence, in addition to the actualizing tendency and the tendency toward self-actualization includes an early acquired secondary need for positive regard. This need may be met in a manner leading to a congruent or incongruent state of the personality. In the normal development of congruence the child is "prized" and experiences the genuine expression and communication of unconditional positive regard from significant others in his life. There are no conditions attached

---

[1] Ibid., p. 206.

to his acceptance and worth as a person. The child is not confronted with bargains to make, or with demands for personal sacrifice in exchange for love. If these conditions are maintained the individual becomes free to evolve and develop from the deeply rooted base of the actualizing tendency and his own organismic experiencing so that there is, ideally, always an accurate matching of experience and awareness and virtually no need for the development of a defensive organization.[1] In this condition of congruence it is clear that the developing self-structure is highly compatible with the experiences of the organism. Thus, both the actualizing tendency and tendency toward self-actualization are in harmony and mutually supporting an evolving self-structure that is rooted more and more deeply in the organismic experiencing of the person.

In congruence, then, there is a high compatibility between the self as perceived and actual experience. Experiences are accurately and clearly symbolized in awareness, recognized and acknowledged as facets of the self, and appropriately incorporated into the self-structure. Thus, the tendency toward self-actualization is in the service of the actualizing tendency.

---

[1] Compare with Angyal's concept of "the real self."

Rogers emphasizes the process character, the directional nature of the congruent personality and he characterizes the self structure of the fully functioning person as a "fluid gestalt"[1] always in the process of change and engaged in the assimilation of new experience. Thus, congruence is not a static state as Rogers sees it but requires periodic revision of the self-concept to bring it in line with accurately symbolized experience.

"Optimal psychological adjustment is ...synonymous with complete congruence of self and experience."[2]

Few lives, if any, approximate Rogers' ideal of congruence. More often, a condition of <u>incongruence</u> prevails so that there is some discrepancy between the organism's authentic experience and what he feels free to symbolize in awareness as a part of the self. This state of incongruence comes about when conditions of worth are imposed upon the individual. Under this influence of <u>conditional</u> positive regard from significant others, the individual is encouraged to deny important aspects of his own experience in order to meet his need for positive regard and the requirements for

---

[1] Rogers, <u>A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships</u>. p. 234.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 206.

conditional love. He thus becomes alienated from the springs of his own being and two conflicting motivational systems become operative. The tendency toward self-actualization persists but becomes dissociated, estranged from the inherent actualizing tendency. The actualizing tendency is subverted and its energies lend support to learned behaviors, feelings, and values that do not actualize the individual. Rejecting the validity of his own experiencing he often becomes his own worst enemy, at war with himself. There is a deep conflict between the intellectual structure of experience and the unrecognized valuing process going on within. He loses contact with the wisdom of his own processes and basic tendencies (Rogers, 1963a). As the individual adopts, symbolizes in awareness, and actualizes more and more of those conditions of worth that are required or communicated to him he becomes increasingly estranged from the voices of his own experience. The developing self-structure and organismic experience have become incongruent. Rogers (1963a) sees this condition as the beginning of personality disintegration and the basis of all psychological pathology.

Concomitant with a high degree of congruence is an organismic valuing process guided by the actualizing tendency. Rogers compares adult maturity and the achievement of congruence

with the natural strivings and expressions of the human infant where every impulse, selection, and choice is in the positive direction of maintaining and enhancing the organism. Thus, in both the congruent, fully-functioning adult and the naturally congruent state of the infant there is a basic trust in one's experiencing.

This organismic valuing process in the mature person is not always a stable and fixed system but one that discriminates and establishes priority on the basis of the values facilitating the growth and actualization of the organism (Rogers, 1964a). In an internal state of congruence, the source of such a valuing process is clearly within the individual and in harmony with his own experience. Unlike the neurotic or dissociated personality, it is not a rigid, abstract, and intellectually structured value system based primarily upon arbitrary demands and expectations, upon "conceived values" introjected from the conditional positive regards of others.[1] Thus, according to Rogers, values of the healthy personality are changing and highly differentiated,

---

[1]Rogers employs "value" in the usage of C. Morris' "operative values," in which the behavior of organisms show preference for one object or objective rather than another, in contrast to "conceived values" where there is preference for a symbolized object, i.e., honesty is the best policy, and "objective value," that which is objectively preferable whether or not it is sensed or conceived of as personally desirable.

their reorganizations following the time, flow, and meaning of experience. In the congruent personality the rational selections and intellectual value choices are in essential harmony with the organism's intuitive and affective valuing process.

It is apparent that the issue of the universality of values is a substantive one in Rogers' theory and he suggests that "...we have the possibility of universal human value directions emerging from the experiencing of the human organism."[1] In individuals moving toward congruence, toward greater openness to their experience, there is an "organismic commonality" of value directions that (a) fosters the process of self-actualization, (b) enhances the development of others in the community, (c) strives to maintain the survival and the evolution of the species (Rogers, 1964a). It is clear, although Rogers has been misunderstood or misinterpreted on this point, that the actualizing tendency is not a hedonistic and self-centered process of development frequently acting at the expense of others (Rogers, 1961; Storr, 1963).

The healthy personality, Rogers' "fully-functioning" person, is the theoretical end-point of therapy. The observed

---

[1]Carl Rogers, "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 68, 1964. p. 167.

value directions of clients in psychotherapy, therefore, have served as a major source of evidence for universal human value directions and are considered to be important process or directional characteristics of the healthy growth of the personality. Rogers perceives his clients to be moving in the following directions:

1. Away from facades, 2. Away from "oughts," 3. Away from meeting the expectations of others, 4. Away from dependence upon others, 5. Toward valuing "being real," 6. Toward valuing self-direction, 7. Toward valuing one's self and feelings, 8. Toward valuing being as process, 9. Toward a greater valuing of others, 10. Toward a valuing of deeper, more intimate relationships, 11. Toward a greater valuing of an openness to all inner and outer experiences (Rogers, 1964a; 1961).

"I believe that when the human being is inwardly free to choose whatever he deeply values, he tends to value those objects, experiences, and goals which make for his own survival, growth and development, and for the survival and development of others."[1]

---

[1]Rogers, Toward a Modern Approach to Values. p. 166.

CHAPTER V

A HOLISTIC THEORY OF HEALTHY PERSONALITY

The time has come to address ourselves to the substantive and climactic portion of this study, bringing to fruition that statement of a holistic theory of healthy personality. A more comprehensive integration is now required and until this is accomplished, all past labors remain incomplete, partial. In this penultimate chapter we will strive, as does the human organism in its own process of growth, to fashion an architectural unity and design from the conceptual materials, our data, that have provided the foundations for this study. To aid us in this integrative endeavor, perhaps it would be appropriate to return to the original thesis and briefly recapitulate its rationale.

Prior to this study no discernable effort had been made to construct a theory of healthy personality based on an identifiable orientation to human life and growth, i.e., on the foundations of a personality theory. The more modest and conventional efforts in this area have been limited to explorations and comparisons of a variety of concepts of mental health and their counterparts in relevant theoretical supports.

In the present study, we sought an orientation to the human personality that accentuated the proactive characceristics

of man, his potentials for growth and change, his ability to transcend the tyranny of deterministic bonds and his willingness to accept the burden of freedom to fashion his own life via commitment and choice. For our purpose, we rejected personality theories that neglected the above aspects of man's nature as well as ones that tended to dehumanize man with reductive formulations, with mechanistic descriptions and interpretations of his behavior, and by viewing him primarily as a concupiscent creature with tension reduction at the forefront of his motivations and concerns. We have contended that these latter facets of the human personality, while partially true in a given instance and under various circumstances, are mere sentences in a much more complex and elaborate story of man and his potentials. Seven writers, identifiable as holistic personality theorists were selected as meeting our criteria. Thus, a strong holistic orientation to the study of human personality and its development was judged to be the single most promising theoretical perspective to render a theory of healthy personality.

The writings of the seven theorists selected as representatives of holistic theory of personality were analyzed for major themes. Four major themes were identified and presented in chapters III and IV. These chapters offer impressive

evidence that the seven personality theorists chosen to represent a holistic orientation to personality are theoretically united and virtually identical in their basic principles and thematic concerns. All seven writers view the human personality from a holistic perspective or frame of reference. Without exception, they see the personality as an organized, dynamic and open system tending toward closure, toward a more perfect organization or integration. There is such unanimity, in fact, that only three minor exceptions need be noted. In accepting a sovereign motivation for human behavior only two deviations are present among the seven theorists. Angyal posits two major or sovereign strivings instead of one central tendency. However, a qualifying statement must be recognized when he concludes that the broadest motivation, the most comprehensive and singular concern of the person, is to develop the personality into a coherent and meaningful whole. At this level of abstraction, Angyal could be considered as supporting a sovereign motive or striving. A second exception in the treatment of this holistic theme is found in Gardner Murphy's more eclectic approach to human motivation. It has been virtually impossible to discern a clear commitment to a sovereign motive or striving in the writings of Murphy. Again, however, his departure must be qualified, for neither does Murphy accept a set of discrete

drives or motives. Rather, Murphy sees a fusion of motivational processes derived from interacting tension systems. These integrated tension gradients are interpreted within the larger context of an interacting organism-environment field. Thus, human motivation for Murphy is a comprehensive biosocial structure and we must conclude that while Murphy does not satisfy us with the explicit acceptance of a sovereign motive, he does remain thoroughly holistic in his approach to human motivation.

A third deviation, more of an omission, is Prescott Lecky's failure to fully develop the theme of human potential and the concept of healthy personality. Self-consistency is sovereign. It is also the major organizational principle, the central striving and the primary characteristic of healthy personality.

With the exception of these three relatively inconsequential departures, the seven holistic personality theorists are virtually undivided in their major themes. This thematic homogeneity offers additional support to the major thesis of this study, i.e., that a holistic orientation to the human personality presents a consistent theoretical position, thus making it possible to achieve a synthesis and develop a holistic theory of healthy personality.

We have emphasized the fact that any theory of healthy personality must ultimately rest, in large measure, upon our image of man and upon our perception of his nature and potentials. We are, in each case, working with an ideal image or, as Allport prefers, with "theoretical man." We now review the holistic orientation to human life and growth as expressed in the writings of the seven holistic personality theorists selected for this study. The salient features of this orientation to the human personality are presented in the following propositions, extracted from the three major themes presented in Chapter lll.

The Propositions

I. The human organism possesses a distinct inner nature, an intrinsic nature of needs and directional tendencies. The holistic model for personality organization and growth is a biological one. There are inherent organismic directional tendencies that monitor and guide the development of the human personality. The organism must move in these directions to insure healthy growth.

II. There is a natural impetus toward self-actualization; to enhance one's organism, one's life and development; to explore and enlarge upon one's potentials and capacities. Ergo, the human organism possesses both the capacity and desire for self-determination. In the course of

growth the forging of a self-definition becomes a focal point of human striving.

III. The concept of self-actualization includes both the need to establish unity and self-consistency as well as the urge for new stimulation leading to change, growth, and self-renewal.

IV. The human organism's most basic strivings and directional tendencies are positive in nature. There is a distinctly social orientation to the character of human striving. Negative, destructive behaviors directed toward the self or toward others are the reactive consequences of frustration of needs closely associated with the basic directional tendencies.

V. There is an organismic valuing process within the individual. This process evolves into a value system and becomes the integrating core of the personality.

VI. These organismic species-wide value directions provide the base for universal criteria for healthy personality.

VII. There is a discontinuity in human motivation. There is an emphasis upon the distinction between motivational life at low or arrested levels of human development and behavior and the motivational life of the healthy, mature adult. The difference might be likened to the motivational characteristics of the child as compared to that of a mature adult.

Holistic theorists reject the unconscious determinants and the reinforced behaviors of childhood as legitimate paradigms for mature, adult motivational life. In the former instance there is a psychopathological condition of average man that remains largely undetected.

VIII. The human organism represents a dynamic time- Gestalt with heightened symbolic powers for integrating past, present, and future time in the interests of the whole personality.

IX. Healthy personality always exists as future possibility. Unfinished structure, a sense of incompleteness, gives the organism impetus and a future-directed orientation.

X. In healthy personality past experiences and future possibilities are of this moment, currently active in present time. Human motivation occupies a contemporaneous figure position within this time Gestalt.

XI. The human organism and the environment are integral components comprising a larger sphere or field. There is reciprocity, an intimate mutuality of interaction within this field.

XII. The human organism maintains sovereignty within this dynamic organism-environmental field.

XIII. Human motivation, in its healthiest expression, is endowed with purpose and value: To actualize the distinctly human features of the organism and bring fruition to the highest development of one's capacities.

XIV. Healthy personality represents the emergence and successful articulation of the organismic, species-wide directional tendencies. These directional tendencies, while innate expressions of the organism, must receive nurture and support from the environment.

XV. Self-awareness is an essential component in the healthy growth of the organism. It is only through a deepening awareness that the individual can maximize his potentials, select his course, and enter into his own growth.

It is within the contextual fabric of these propositions that a holistic theory of healthy personality must be woven and interpreted. Indeed, as was pointed out earlier in this study, in a very real sense the holistic theories of personality encountered in the writings of the seven holistic theorists are veritable theories of <u>healthy</u> personality. Each theory stresses the human potential to become, in actuality, a close approximation of a theoretical ideal. It must be remembered, too, that the latent strength behind these potentials

for emergence lies deeply embedded in the biogenetic core of human nature.

Stage I. FIRST ORDER INTEGRATION

Autonomous Achievement

The human organism first strives to establish control over his environment and extend his sphere of influence upon an ever widening number of events and relationships. He seeks to enhance his own independence and resourcefulness and to articulate and impose his own unique purpose and design upon the environment. In the healthy personality it is a process of growing self-reliance and self-assertion that results in the development of competence to encounter the environment in ways that enhance the expanding needs and potentials of the organism.

The individual does not establish his domain and express his autonomous needs and strivings in a defiant and alienated manner, artificially isolated from the environment of which he is a part. In its healthy course, personal autonomy develops out of close contact and interaction with the environment, expressed as "coping" behavior (Allport, 1961) or as "coming-to-terms" with the environment (Goldstein, 1963a, 1963b). Within the biosphere Angyal (1941; 1965) stresses the importance

of a tensional relationship between the organism and its environment.

The holistic personality theorists are in agreement, however, that the human personality, in its most positive manifestations, cannot be defined by the environment or cultural system. The individual must maintain his sovereignty and integrity and assert himself when necessary against inadequate milieu (Goldstein, 1963a) and against the conditions of worth imposed upon him that are alien to his nature and experience (Rogers, 1959). Maslow (1961) urges, too, that man be understood intrapsychically and not be subjected to various environmental-centered criteria for mental health. Maslow extends his concern to a criticism of the concept of competence, so succinctly outlined by White (1959), fearing the connotation that the organism's worth be related to the extent that he becomes "a means to some extrinsic purpose."[1] Maslow feels that the concept of competence is merely an extension of erstwhile expressions of "adjustment" theory and therefore neglects the individual's need and capacity to transcend the environment in a hierarchical-integrative sense; to become independent of it or fight it when necessary to

---

[1]Abraham Maslow, "Health as Transcendence of Environment." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, vol. 1, no. 1, 1961. p. 1.

preserve personal integrity and the autonomous gains. Man possesses intrinsic laws of development and must, therefore, be defined intrapsychically.

The coping, the explorations, manipulation, and all of the self-assertive strivings and behaviors that express the organism's directional tendency toward autonomy are successful for the individual to the extent that they are conscious phenomena. Healthy coping behavior, for Allport (1961), is carried out under the aegis of full consciousness while defensive behavior predominates under the cloak of neurotic repression. Angyal (1941) considers autonomous behavior to represent the conscious and rational "will processes" of the individual and Goldstein, too, stresses the "enormous significance of consciousness"[1] in the highest forms of "coming-to-terms" with the world. Similarly, Murphy and Spohn (1968) suggest that in interacting with the environment there is both a heightening of the sense of external reality and a heightening of the sense of self.

The holistic writers are unanimous and explicit in their position that the organism's thrust for self-realization via

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein, The Organism, p. 334.

the self-assertive, autonomous strivings does not suggest, in the healthy personality, an "asocial individualism."[1] Allport (1961), Angyal (1941), Maslow (1954, 1962a), Murphy (1958), and Rogers (1961) support this position taken by Goldstein. This issue in self-actualization theory has been an area of some confusion and misinterpretation on the part of some writers. Roger's position, for example, has often been questioned with the expressed fear and admonition that "to be that self which one truly is" would surely mean the release of destructive and selfish impulses upon others. To this reluctance to allow man to pursue his autonomous needs Storr responds with an answer that fairly represents the holistic theorists' position on the issue. "I believe," Storr says, "that the development of the individual and the maturity of his personal relationships proceed hand in hand, and that one cannot take place without the other."[2]

Stage II. SECOND ORDER INTEGRATION

Homonomous Extension

Angyal's term homonomy is deemed appropriate to serve as a generic term to identify a second major directional

---

[1]Kurt Goldstein, Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology. New York: Schocken Books, 1963. p. 201.

[2]Anthony Storr, The Integrity of the Personality. Baltimore: Penguin Books. 1961. p. 32.

tendency and second stage in the development of the healthy personality. With the exception of Rogers,[1] all holistic personality theorists place a high priority on homonomous development in the personality, a growing participation and ego-involvement in larger units and wholes. Compared to the conscious, self-assertive end-strivings of autonomy, the homonomous developments are more strongly rooted in man's non-rational nature.

Angyal (1941; 1965) sees this organismic tendency as one in which the individual submerges individuality in favor of superindividual goals. It is movement beyond individualistic limits. These homonomous goals are never random and meaningless attachments but represent meaningful wholes and relationships in the life of the individual. Angyal's homonomous strivings are represented by a wide range of identifications and involvements including unity between man and nature; social, artistic, or religious attitudes; or superindividual bonds with the family, social groups, and a meaningful world order. In a general sense, however, Angyal concludes that, "The whole concept of homonomy could be equated

---

[1]This is not to suggest that Rogers does <u>not</u> value the homonomous developments in the personality.

with love."[1] For Allport the concept of homonomy is synonymous with an inclusive system of self-extension involving more and more propriate investment in participatory activity. Allport's (1955) concept of self-extension includes the growth and extension of other regarding sentiments as well as self-involvement in abstract ideals. In Goldstein's highly evolved integrational status of centering the individual also reaches out to achieve higher levels of ego involvement. Maslow (1962a; 1964b) sees healthy life extending to new levels of unity and synergy while Murphy (1958) stresses the human organism's need and capacity for new forms of organization through emergence which includes new dimensions and relationships of organism-environment interaction.

Each holistic theorist has identified increasing homonomous involvement as a major attribute of positive mental health, a highly valued direction for personality development. It is also important to stress, once again, that these strivings for homonomous union, these urges for wider orbits of relatedness, are not interpreted by the holistic personality theorists as the motivational products of persistent reinforcement or

---

[1] Andras Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965. p. 16.

the sublimation of the more primitive needs but represent, rather, one of the directions of human development intrinsically or organismically most highly valued by the organism.

Admittedly, the role of the environment is not a simple one but it can be stated without equivocation that for the holistic personality theorists the environment is neither the initiator nor the navigator responsible for the homonomous direction of development. But while the environment does not create the autonomous and homonomous growth tendencies, it does enter into their various expressions and manifestations and in extreme instances will inhibit their positive developments altogether. It is the general consensus, however, that these innate strivings never really disappear but may manifest themselves in destructive, maladaptive, and self-defeating ways.

The relationship between these two directional tendencies, autonomy and homonomy, remains unclear. Do the autonomous developments take place first, serving as a prerequisite for later homonomous trends or do they emerge simultaneously and continue in such a juxtaposition from the initial months of life? Allport (1961) feels that extension of the self follows rather than parallels autonomous developments while Angyal (1941) considers them to be simultaneous and contiguous tendencies. Other than these brief observations by Allport and

Angyal the holistic theorists have little to offer in answer to this specific question.

In an exploratory study of the characteristics of healthy interpersonal relationships Frick (1967) offers some tentative evidence to suggest that in the healthy, growth-promoting interpersonal experience the successful developments of the self (strivings for autonomy and superiority) release the individual for a heightened appreciation of others and for decided movement into the realm of social interest. Adler gives theoretical support to this conclusion when he states that "nothing stands more in the way of the development of social interest than an increased inferiority feeling."[1] Erikson adds to this consensus, in speaking of the adolescent identity problem, when he states that "one cannot easily 'lose oneself' in an intimate or sexual relation before one has 'found oneself' - or before one is ready to find oneself by losing oneself."[2] There does seem to be some reasonable support, therefore, for the conclusion that while the directional tendencies toward autonomy and homonomy are never

---

[1] Alfred Adler, The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. H. L. and Rowena Ansbacher, eds. New York: Basic Books, 1956. p. 124 ff.

[2] E. H. Erikson, "Late Adolescence." The Student and Mental Health. D. H. Funkenstein, ed. London: World Federation of Mental Health, 1959. p. 86.

mutually exclusive in the healthy personality, the basic autonomous needs must receive some fulfillment before latent homonomous needs and strivings can assert themselves. It seems likely then that if the autonomous needs are not threatened but are nurtured and respected, the homonomous needs will emerge and assert themselves quite easily as a consequence.

The holistic personality theorists are in agreement, however, that in the healthy personality the individual is able to successfully integrate his autonomous and homonomous strivings, thereby transcending an age-old dichotomy that is part of the psychopathology of average man; the dichotomy between selfishness and unselfishness.

Stage III. THIRD ORDER INTEGRATION

Ego Transcendence: Loss-of-Self-Experiences

The quintessent expression of positive mental health, the supreme achievement of the healthy personality, are intense moments of selflessness that allow for the realization of the highest level of integrated experiencing of which the human organism is now deemed to be capable. In contrast to the autonomous demands of the organism, these moments are judged to be essentially non-rational, non-coping, non-striving moments of transcendence and self-surrender. As a hierarchical-integrative stage in human personality achievement, loss of

self experiences are more closely attuned to the homonomous strivings. Angyal, in fact, considers such "mystical" experiences as an amplified expression of homonomous development. Such moments of transcendence are relatively "unmotivated" in the traditional sense of motivation as goal directed strivings and they appear as metamotivated end-experiences, self-validating, and complete within themselves.

In contrast to the self-assertive, autonomous demands of the organism, the supreme moments of harmony and sense of wholeness represent an extension of traditional ego boundaries. Each holistic personality theorist describes the self-transcending nature of the experience. It is a mystical experience where "the sense of wholeness may be overwhelming."[1] It represents "self-abandonment" (Angyal, 1941), "self-surrender" (Goldstein, 1963), a state of "selflessness " (Murphy, 1947). Maslow (1962a) speaks of self transcendence as a phenomenon of the unmotivated episodes of pure "being" with the concomitant loss of self-consciousness. Certainly, Maslow's pioneering research on the "peak" experiences in life has advanced our understanding and appreciation of this human potential and his interpretation of these intense moments in

---

[1]Gordon Allport , The Individual and His Religion. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960. p. 61.

human experience as acute identity experiences has highlighted such phenomena as the highest expressions of healthy personality.

We believe that Gardner Murphy's term, "cosmic consciousness," adds another important dimension to our understanding of the value and significance of such fully integrated moments in living. Murphy's term highlights the new levels of internal and external reality that are realized and integrated in the changed and expanded contacts with the environment. New facets of self and new modes of sensory awareness open up and merge in a singular isomorphic unity with the rich potentials of cosmic structure. A new man emerges from such organism-environment intimacy. Murphy, we feel, fully articulates the profound affinity and potential for isomorphism which exists between man and his environment. He takes us beyond the purely sensual and self-indulgent connotation of such experiences and renders more clearly this added meaning and significance to the loss-of-self states of being.[1] He is more clearly holistic in his interpretation and his concepts are

---

[1]It is not being suggested here that the other holistic personality theorists interpret the loss-of-self experiences in a manner connoting hedonistic pleasure and self-indulgence. They do not interpret the experience in this manner.

highly compatible with McLuhan's (1967) emphasis on the new media and their revolutionary impact upon the sensory and perceptual modalities of man.

Traditionally, these self-transcending states have been placed in a supernatural context and considered to be esoteric religious or mystical experiences. Indeed, Allport (1960a) and Angyal (1941) do not exclude this interpretation. Allport discusses the "mystical moments" emerging out of the highly articulated religious sentiment and Angyal refers to these experiences as being in harmony with God.

Consistent with the basic tenets of holistic personality theory, however, these metamotivated experiences need not be placed within a supernatural context and discussed in this idiom. We have already established a strong biological base for the primary directional tendencies and strivings of the organism and for the values emerging as a direct consequence of these strivings. The valuing process in the healthy personality is clearly an organismic one. Thus, the experience and valuing of the "mystical moments" receive strong biological sanctions and scientific support (Maslow, 1964a). Taken out of its narrow and dogmatic connotations, however, the term "religious experience" would not confound or contradict this organismic base or its empirical supports.

There is every reason to suspect that the yielding, receptive, self-surrendering experience, the "letting go" to higher levels of commerce with the environment has, as a prerequisite in personality development, mastery of the environment via personal success in the strivings for autonomy followed by the progressive establishment of the socially centered homonomous bonds. It is unreasonable to assume the development of higher identifications with cosmic structure before the personality has achieved some sense of its own power and identity and before it can extend itself to the homonomous levels of participation and integrated experiencing.

We must interpret the biologically based directions of human development, representing the needs and ultimate values of the organism, as the unfolding of a hierarchically integrated sequence of needs and potentials, reaching a culmination in the progressive ability to yield to and resonate with world materials.

The three stages in the development of healthy personality are interpreted as developing and functioning in a hierarchically integrated manner. First order integration, the autonomous stage, represents the culmination of an infinitely complex integration of biochemical tendencies, primordial impulses, and germinal dispositions following a maturational

sequence within an environment which permits the child to function. The homonomous strivings emerge out of a well-developed autonomous system which yields, in turn, the highly complex integrations seen in the various loss-of-self experiences. Each fully developed stage represents a newly integrated personality at a higher level of perfection and complexity. While it is true that the antecedent stage loses its ascendency, it does not drop away and atrophy as some functionally irrelevant organ or appendage. The strengths and characteristics of the antecedent stage remain viable and active, becoming integrated into the next stage of development. A richer and more complex self emerges out of this new integration. The compatibility of the autonomous and homonomous strivings in the healthy personality can be explained on the basis of this hierarchically integrated sequence of stages in the development of the healthy personality. Each successfully achieved stage prepares the way for the next, and in unique and fundamental ways becomes integrated into the newly evolving stage to form a higher and more complex whole. It is the unfolding of this hierarchically integrated pattern that allows for both higher and more perfect levels of organization and unity and accounts for the growing richness of possibilities for differentiation and change.

Consistent with the principle of hierarchical integration, it would seem highly probable that developments within each stage would also follow such a growth plan. For example, the course of successful homonomous development would follow some hierarchical sequence leading from relatively simple self-extensions toward love relationships, and onward toward a devotion to a world community.

A Holistic Theory of Crisis

A major issue has arisen during the course of this study. It is an issue that, qua issue, deserves our attention. In considering a holistic theory of healthy personality, however, the issue is a crucial one that requires some approach to resolution, however tentative it may have to be.

It has been determined that the holistic personality theorists emphasize at least two major developmental or organismic characteristics of the evolving human personality:
1. The human individual seeks to create a self-consistent organization, to bring completion to incomplete structure. There is a drive for stability and a need to achieve perfect unity and order. In all dimensions of the organism's growth there is a striving for perfection, symmetry, and closure.
2. The human personality is never a static, unchanging phenomenon. Rather, the personality is always in flux,

evolving, and in the process of undergoing change.

If we pursue each of these growth principles individually, in isolation, we are taken in two very different, contradictory, and seemingly incompatible directions. There are some obvious conflicts between these two growth principles and we must pose the question: If developmental principle No. 1 is true, if the personality strives for unity and wholeness and the fashioning of a self-consistent personality system, what, then, accounts for the process character of personality change, growth, and becoming? If we anticipate the maximal efficiency of the former growth principle the inescapable consequence for personality development is a well organized and stable personality structure but, at the same time, a closed and rigid one. On the other hand, a maximally efficient trend of flux, change, and a continuing process of differentiation within the personality will inevitably yield an unstable and poorly integrated personality.

If we are to conclude, as the holistic personality theorists clearly suggest, that both of these organismic growth principles are valid for human personality development then we are faced with the task of forging some

conceptual bridge between these two developmental principles.

While these two growth principles serve as major theoretical components in the personality theory of each holistic theorist, there is little or no apparent recognition of the theoretical difficulties and potential incompatability between them. There is, however, an expressed awareness on the part of a majority of the theorists that some trauma and shock must accompany any significant personality change and growth. It has already been pointed out that both Lecky and Goldstein suggest the inevitability of conflict in human growth. Lecky proposes the necessity of conflict in an attempt to extricate himself from the static connotations in his theory of self-consistency. Goldstein views the experience of anxiety and shock as inevitable growth concomitants but in terms of their more positive contributions to personality development. He speaks of "productive disequilibrium" (Goldstein, 1951) and stresses the enhancement of growth via the formation of tension and experience of shock. Allport (1955), too, speaks of the traumatic recentering that may accompany the process of saltatory becoming. Maslow and Murphy also give attention to the importance of conflict, stress, and painful symptom formation, the latter being important to Maslow in the development toward a higher ideal.

Angyal (1965) recognizes the traumatic course of normal development as well as the value of stress and anxiety to the patient's progress in psychotherapy where the neurotic, for example, must experience periods of painful despair in the process of reconstructing his personality. Rogers is the only holistic theorist who gives no attention to the role of trauma and conflict in personality development. He does not deny its importance, however, as a concomitant in the process of growth.[1]

It is now the purpose of this chapter to extend these concepts of conflict, trauma and growth of the personality and reinterpret them in the light of a holistic theory of healthy personality. Why is conflict and trauma important to personality development? How do such essentially "negative" experiences function to enhance growth? How can we incorporate such concepts into a holistic theory of healthy personality?

Of all the holistic writers who support the value of conflict for personality development it is Angyal who gives us

---

[1]See interview with Carl Rogers, Appendix A.

the most incisive theoretical statements as a base for our own attempts to deal with the incompatibilities between the two growth principles. In addressing himself to the importance of adequate shifting of sets Angyal outlines the inevitable consequences of the successful polarization of each organismic growth principle:

> "The rigidity of a personality may manifest itself, for instance, not only in perseveration of minor sets, but also in perseverance in pursuing larger goals. At the other extreme is the flighty, inconstant, loosely organized type of personality which is not able to maintain a given set for a sufficient length of time."[1]

In another statement Angyal amplifies his concern:

> "The evolution of wholes is itself accomplished in steps of successive differentiation and systematic reintegration. The potential danger of disintegration implied in every form of differentiation, however, should not be minimized."[2] ..."Differentiation always involves a kind of disequilibrium because it is a stage which leads beyond the present status of the whole. The process of differentiation is normally followed by a process of assimilation or re-imbedding whereby the whole is changed to some extent."[3]

A concept of personality <u>crisis</u> seems to be the most reasonable and viable concept for a resolution of the conflicts

---

[1] Andras Angyal, <u>Foundations for a Science of Personality</u>. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1941. p. 139.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 275.

[3] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 360.

between the developmental principles we have identified in holistic personality theory. Crisis may be defined as a syndrome reflecting the disintegration or dissolution of existing patterns of personality integration or reactions to perceived threats to existing modes or styles of being. The symptoms of crisis are the various experiences and manifestations of anxiety under such conditions and may be precipitated by a variety of external threats or stimulations and reactionary internal conditions.

Two-track Theory of Crisis

If these two growth trends are truly organismic in origin, representing the intrinsic and inexorable designs of human personality development, there is severe frustration of intrinsic growth needs and a profound denial of human fulfillment if only one growth principle expresses itself. In healthy personality development both integration (stability, self-consistency, symmetry of organization, movement toward a more perfect order, etc.) and differentiation (change, articulation of parts, shifting of submission and dominance patterns between and within previously ordered systems, etc.) must be experienced by the human organism and provide the developmental structure necessary for the evolution of healthy personality.

There appear to be two major predisposing sources of crisis in the personality. As the personality fashions internal order and stability and achieves a self-consistent value organization, there is a growing rigidity of system and structure that impedes the flow and process character of personality and precludes further significant personality growth and change. A period of crisis emerges to bring about a shattering of established order and stability that has been preventing new and creative directions of growth from exerting themselves. Existing states of embeddedness are uprooted, thereby opening up new possibilities for growth and making the creation of new patterns and new directions possible.

Angyal observes that growth is inseparable from anxiety. "The anxiety felt at the prospect of the dissolution of one's current mode of living has been related by some to the fear of final dissolution.....Since growth requires the breaking of old patterns, willingness "to die" is a precondition of living."[1]

---

[1]Andras Angyal, Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965. (E. Hanfmann and R. M. Jones, eds.) p. 127.

Personality crisis may also result from a prolonged or intense period of change and differentiation. There is a value vacuum and an inability to create a unified structure. Life is disorderly and fragmented without the stabilizing force of a self-consistent value system. This episode in life represents a rootless and eratic existence without the unifying life commitments so vital to the spirit and vitality and the growth of healthy personality. Prior to such crisis there is apathy, a pervasive ennui, in one's life.

In the first instance, crisis emerges out of a state of rigidity and embeddedness achieved over a period of time in natural response to the organism's need for stability, structure and perfect form. Disintegration of these established patterns of organization cannot be prevented if further growth is to occur. There is irony and paradox in this achievement, however, for there is an inverse relationship between the perfection of order and achievement of synthesis and those developments serving the process and further growth needs in the organism.

In the second instance, crisis emerges after a productive period of personality growth and differentiation in

order to restore order and bring a completeness and integration to newly differentiated components of the personality. The fluidity of the personality during this period of growth is such that there is no period of integration and stability, and there may be a loss of significance and meaning. Crisis is the healthy organism's response to the need for a new level of harmony and integration. Thus, there is the development of a new whole; a more complex unity is created, a higher level of integration is achieved. It is essential to stress here that the process is a creative synthesis and not a mechanical one limited to a recombination of old components. The newly created personality organization emerges as a new and more complex whole representing new components as well as new and restructured relationships. During the restructuring process, some former components no longer of value in the newly created organization recede into the background.

Each stage of newly achieved integration and unity represents a closure cycle, the culmination of a period of growth and differentiation and the maximum level of integration achieved following a period of growth and change. The crucial issue of the continued growth of the personality vs. the attraction of increasing security and stability is one

that confronts the organism at the time of each closure cycle. The healthy personality, developing in accord and in harmony with the two major organismic growth principles, achieves a balanced, reciprocal relationship between the two growth trends through the crisis experience. The life crisis can be viewed as a bridge or communications center linking the personality with the two essential growth trends of the organism and preventing the explicative domination and exclusive control of one trend over the other. It appears to be both an organismic warning and correctional system responding to the human capacity to scan and monitor its own growth. Thus, a holistic theory of crisis views the life crisis as more than a crucible for conflict resolution and as far more significant than serving as a critical period for therapeutic intervention. A holistic theory of crisis regards the life crisis as a prerequisite for personality growth and health and views the crisis experience as being responsible for achieving more inclusive wholes and increasingly higher, more complex levels of integration and

unity.[1] The life crisis must be viewed as the healthy and natural response of the organism to maintain a balanced relationship between the two growth principles, thereby providing for periods of growth, change, and differentiation as well as for the more esthetic pleasures and rewards of symmetry, wholeness, and integrations of higher order and complexity.

This theory of the role of crisis in the hierarchically integrated organization and growth of the personality offers some pertinent implications for psychotherapy. The healthy evolution of the personality does not preclude the individual need for assistance during critical crisis periods in life. The view of crisis presented here necessitates the differential discrimination between those growth-centered personality disturbances that arise out of a period of rigidity and embeddedness or the need to consolidate the gains of a prolonged period of differentiation and those more serious maladies representing pervasive pathological conditions that

---

[1]It must be emphasized here that we do not propose crisis as the only viable model for personality growth. Ours is a holistic theory of crisis. There are, of course, exceptions to our theory and other models may be more appropriate to account for them. See interview with Abraham Maslow, Appendix A, for a discussion of this issue.

are inimical to the healthy development of the personality. In the former case, psychotherapy should be designed to appraise the source of crisis. If it is an insular condition representing a state of rigidity, the task is to free the individual for a period of growth and differentiation, while giving support and direction to the anxiety and insecurity that comes from the threat of disintegration of established patterns and forms. If the individual is in a prolonged phase of saltatory differentiation the therapeutic task is a different one; to aid the person in arriving at a stage of integration of apparently random and discrete elements, to help develop a pattern of meaning and value and establish a stabilizing synthesis leading to a renewed commitment of life's energies and potentials.

Psychotherapy with a person in a holistic growth crisis must be concerned with helping him appreciate the status of his development as a personality and the nature of the stage of growth he is in and the existential dilemma he faces. Above all, he must be helped to appreciate his own health potentials and the inherent value the crisis experience holds for his personal growth and maturity.

The individual in a growth crisis should be challenged to feel that the painful experience he is having, the

upheaval in his life, is essentially a positive one but crucial to his future personality development. He must be encouraged to make use of the experience by exploring and discovering its unique personal meaning and significance in his life.

To aid the person to take full advantage of the growth promoting qualities inherent in the experience of crisis, the psychotherapist must face and work through attitudes toward crisis in his own life and in the lives of his loved ones. In this way he can help bring more validity to the experience for someone else.

It is the experience of crisis that signals that something vital is happening in a life, that some significant struggle is underway, that something matters, that something critical for continued growth of the personality is taking place in the struggle within the psychic arena. It is felt that the holistic concept and interpretation of crisis presented here provides a viable theoretical base for interpreting the phenomenon of crisis and a rationale for its therapy.

A holistic theory of crisis may be a profitable way of conceptualizing the process of creative growth in marriage,

in the development of institutions, and a way of approaching the vicissitudes of growth and maturity of a given society.

CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION: THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CONCEPT

The holistic personality theorists have each given some attention to the concerns of education. However, it is not so much their specific observations, criticisms, and recommendations as their coherent and consistent picture of the nature of the human organism and his vast range of undiscovered potential that aids us in our discussion of the implications for education.

Rather than developing and laboring the more or less obvious generalizations that can be made concerning the relationship between a holistic theory of healthy personality and its implications for education, our major purpose, while neither rejecting nor minimizing these generalizations, is to develop an integrating concept that will provide a focus for our discussion. It is felt that this concept must not only integrate certain crucial dimensions of holistic theory but provide a conceptual bridge that will link the holistic theory of personality to relevant educational concerns. If successful, this unifying conceptual approach should permit us to identify some crucial needs and issues in education.

We propose to develop such a synthesis and critique around the concept of the symbolic growth experience. Our purpose, therefore, will be to develop a conceptual relationship between this integrated core of personality theory and the purposes of education. The symbolic growth experience is seen as one possible conceptual model to unite the relevant features of a holistic theory of healthy personality and education.

From the point of view of holistic theory the goal of all education is to enhance and guide the creative unfolding of the sovereign motivation of the human organism, that of self-realization and its hierarchically integrated components that comprise the healthy personality; to free the individual from unhealthy extrinsic forces so that he is able to draw deeply upon his own experiences and inner resources; and to develop an awareness of these intrinsic needs, resources, and directions of development so that he may be in personal command of their expressions and execution. Intelligent choice making and self-directed growth are crucial touchstones of our success in this endeavor.

If we accept self-actualization as the central concern of education, there is little to excite or encourage us on

the larger educational scene. Most recent critical appraisals agree in substance with Maslow's assertion that "... American education is conflicted and confused about its far goals and purposes. But for many educators it must be said more harshly that they seem to have renounced far goals altogether..."[1]

Many critics assert that contemporary education is devoted too exclusively to the following goals and emphases.

1. There is a priority on the transmission of knowledge to aid those coping functions in life that are instrumental in adapting to technological change and to a fully industrialized society. The focus, therefore, is upon extrinsic learning centered around fact-gathering and skill acquisition.

2. Education is too verbal and cognitive (Jones, 1968; Huxley, 1962). There is a primary focus on the intellect and a lack of appreciation for the value of non-verbal forms of knowledge and expression. Learning in the conventional classroom remains fact-centered and narrowly cognitive notwithstanding the rhetorical support for the concept of "the

---

[1]Abraham Maslow, Religions, Values and Peak Experiences. Columbus, Ohio: State University Press. 1964. p. 48.

whole child." Taylor, (1960) emphasizes the neglected value of dance, music, painting, design, and sculpture as experiences that provide important forms of non-verbal knowledge.

3. Most education, with the exception of isolated experiments, continues to proceed on an outdated and inaccurate image of man. There is a failure to view the learner in the most basic of holistic terms. The learner is seen largely as a learning machine operating on variations of a stimulus-response paradigm where students are plugged into isolated facts and events and become the passive recipients of teacher controlled stimuli. Elizabeth Drews supports this criticism and points out that there is a wide-spread commitment in our schools to behavioristic theories and to a mechanistic stimulus-response learning "... where the assumption is that repetition, reward and punishment (positive and negative reinforcement), will foster learning."[1]

The concept of self-realization, as developed by the holistic theorists, is not that of an indelible behavioral blueprint for human development. It is deterministic only in the general innate directions and tendencies of human

---

[1]Elizabeth M. Drews, "Beyond Curriculum." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, vol. 7, 1968. p. 97.

growth and only then if certain conditions prevail. "....
the metaneeds seem to me to be instinctoid, that is, to have an appreciable hereditary species-wide determination. But they are potentialities, rather than actualities. Culture is definitely and absolutely needed for their actualization."[1] Specific life styles, priorities, the personal expressions and manifestations of these general organismic tendencies or life forces - the biological givens - are selectively developed by the individual within the context of his experiential world. As Maslow (1954) has pointed out, we can either view man as possessing certain biological designs and supports for his development or see him as a dependent, reactionary creature at the mercy of the vicissitudes and caprice of external forces. The holistic personality theorists have unanimously adopted the former position. Maslow has also stressed the delicate, subtle character and genetic weakness of these innate growth forces and organic directions of development. Highlighting the importance of the environment and impact of personal experience upon human growth, Maslow (1962a) feels that the essentially constructive

---

[1]Maslow. A Theory of Metamotivation: The Biological Rooting of the Value Life. p. 114.

biological forces are easily inhibited, intimidated, or diverted in their natural course by unfortunate habits, cultural pressures for conformity or unhealthy attitudes toward one's nature and development.

"The lower life is prepotent over the higher life, which means that the higher is just less likely to occur. The preconditions of the metamotivated life are far more numerous, not only in terms of prior gratification of the whole hierarchy of basic needs, but also in terms of the greater number of "good conditions" which are needed to make the higher life possible, i.e., a far better environment is required, economic scarcity must have been conquered, a wide variety of choices must be freely available along with conditions that make real and efficient choosing possible, synergic social institutions are almost a requirement, etc. In a word, we must be very careful to imply only that the higher life is in principle possible, and never that it is probable, or likely, or easy to attain."[1]

We must conclude, then, that the nature and scope of the educational experience will be influential if not crucial in bringing recognition and fulfillment to the metaneeds.

---

[1] Ibid.

If healthy, self-actualizing personalities are to be the goal, education must respect and nurture the positive growth forces within the individual and address itself in fundamental ways to the innate tendencies and inner requirements of the organism. The need, it seems, is to design educational experiences in such a manner as to put the growing and learning organism more and more in touch with the depth and breadth of his humanity; its higher nature and potentials.

From Maslow's statements we may also conclude that the human organism requires some conceptual model or guide for the weak instinctoid needs to assert or express themselves in a positive manner. Without such a guide, these innate human yearnings are likely to remain impotent as a necessary but insufficient part of our equipment or diverted into destructive, self-defeating expressions. Even if a person has available to him all of the "right conditions" for growth, he may fail to appreciate or take advantage of these environmental prerequisites if he has failed to develop some concept of his own growth and development as a person.

There is virtually no material available in the literature dealing with the various concepts toward one's own personal growth and exploring the possibilities of developing

a sensitivity and perspective toward the growth of the self that would encourage a response of dedication to inner directions and processes. There is also reason to believe that few lives are influenced or directed by a philosophy or concept of personal growth. Charlotte Bühler concluded from her studies of the course of human life that among youths "...the concept of preparing the use of one's best potentialities is generally more or less unknown."[1] Sutich (1967), in an appraisal of important growth experiences in successful psychotherapy, feels that a variety of such therapeutic experiences should lead the client to a process conception of human development and to a growth-centered attitude toward the self. According to Sutich this attitude "...constitutes a full awareness of the need and capacity for more or less continuous emotional development."[2] This concept of the growth-centered attitude, although conceived as emerging out of successful psychotherapy, approaches in some respects our concept of the symbolic growth experience.

---

[1]Charlotte Bühler, "Human Life Patterns." Unpublished paper. p. 11.

[2]Anthony Sutich, "The Growth-Experience and the Growth-Centered Attitude." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, vol. VII. 1967. p. 158.

However, by limiting the learning of the process conception of one's growth to psychotherapy, it falls short as an integrating concept of the potentials for personality development in education.

The Symbolic Growth Experience

There are crucial times in one's life when the individual symbolizes his immediate experience in response to his inner needs and requirements so that he is able to utilize the experience for further growth and maturity. These significant experiences have symbolic value and meaning for him in the direction, flow, and style of his life. In this way future directions and new levels of personality integration can grow out of current experience. It is hypothesized that this ability to symbolize experience in the interests of one's growth is crucial to the achievement of self-actualization and the development of healthy personality since there must be an established unity between the organic, preconceptual resources and tendencies and the symbolic, conceptual powers of the organism. At the time of a symbolic growth experience there is an integration of crucial biological tendencies and experiential factors symbolically elaborated in the interests of one's growth and future direction as a personality. It is proposed that during these

moments of heightened awareness and sensitivity the individual achieves the highest level of integration possible of all of those forces and resources which he employs to determine his course of life and personal development.

In its fullest, most complete expression the symbolic growth experience utilizes the synthesizing forces of the organism as well as the process nature of personality expressed in constructive change and growth. More profoundly, the symbolic growth experience is in the service of the subtle instinctoid urges, often unconscious and preconceptual, toward self-actualization. In addition to these non-cognitive and preconceptual dimensions, the symbolic growth experience incorporates the sophisticated symbolic powers of the organism leading to the interpretation of experience and the creation of meaning. During a symbolic growth experience, therefore, the individual becomes a profound and sensitive interpreter of his inner-most life and experiences and a prophet of his own future directions.

There is, too, an integration of life's time dimensions in a symbolic growth experience. The wisdom of past experience, the vitality and flow of present experience, and the future orientation of the organism are united. The individual is not bound or guided by only one dimension. Rather,

the symbolic growth experience becomes a phenomenological nexus for time-dimension integration.

While psychologists have traditionally neglected such themes, the novelist has treated them with some frequency and seriousness. Without labels and psychological jargon, novelists have rendered a sensitive and perceptive treatment of the trauma and triumph of the growing-up process. One specific treatment of this theme, for our purpose, is the child's or adolescent's capacity to respond both to inner need and immediate experience and to integrate them into some symbolic significance for personal growth.

Two novels have been selected for illustration.

In The Heart is a Lonely Hunter by Carson McCullers, Mick Kelly prepares for her first party.

> The late afternoon had come and the sun made long, yellow slants through the window. If she took two hours over dressing for the party it was time to begin now. When she thought about putting on the fine clothes she couldn't just sit around and wait. Very slowly she went into the bathroom and shucked off her old shorts and shirt and turned on the water. She scrubbed the rough parts of her heels and her knees and especially her elbows. She made the bath take a long time.
>
> She ran naked into the middle room and began to dress. Silk teddies she put on, and silk stockings. She even wore one of Etta's brassieres just for the heck of it. Then very carefully she put on the dress and stepped into the pumps. This was

> the first time she had worn an evening dress. She stood for a long time before the mirror. She was so tall that the dress came up two or three inches above her ankles--and the shoes were so short they hurt her. She stood in front of the mirror a long time, and finally decided she either looked like a sap or else she looked very beautiful. One or the other.
>
> Six different ways she tried out her hair. The cowlicks were a little trouble, so she wet her bangs and made three spit curls. Last of all she stuck the rhinestones in her hair and put on plenty of lipstick and paint. When she finished she lifted up her chin and half-closed her eyes like a movie star. Slowly she turned her face from one side to the other. It was beautiful she looked--just beautiful.
>
> She didn't feel like herself at all. She was somebody different from Mick Kelly entirely. Two hours had to pass before the party would begin, and she was ashamed for any of the family to see her dressed so far ahead of time. She went into the bathroom again and locked the door. She couldn't mess up her dress by sitting down, so she stood in the middle of the floor. The close walls around her seemed to press in all the excitement. She felt so different from the old Mick Kelly that she knew this would be better than anything else in all her whole life--this party.[1]

A different type of experience is confronted by the young protagonist in C. P. Snow's early novel, "The Search."

> When I was a child of about eleven, a new excitement suddenly flared up in my life.

---

[1] Carson McCullers, The Heart is a Lonely Hunter. Bantam Books, Inc. 1961. p. 90ff.

It must have been a Sunday night, for my father and I were walking after church. I had not been to the service myself; my father would never have thought of taking me. But occasionally on Sunday evenings he would look embarrassed and tell me: "I shall be in Wentworth Street at eight o'clock, if you'd like to come along." Wentworth Street was round the corner from our parish church, but we were not supposed to know where he was going. He would set off, as though he and the church-bell had nothing in common.

This particular Sunday night was warm and twilit, and I fancy summer was nearly over. As we came to the end of the town, the sun had just gone down behind the river, and -- I remember it as though it were yesteday--in the yellow sunset sky there was a sickle of new moon, and high over our heads a sprinkling of stars just coming dimly out. We stopped and looked.

My father said:

"I wonder if they're what we think they are? Stars! Stars like this!" He waved vaguely. "People think we know about them. I wonder if we do."

I gazed up at him.

"I wonder if we can," he added.

I didn't know what he was thinking. All of a sudden I felt that all the things around me were toys to handle and control, that I had the power in a tiny, easy world.

"I wonder if they are what we think they are," my father was saying again.

"Let's find out," I said. And then:

"I'm going to find out."

My father looked puzzled. "Well," he said.

The night had taken hold of me. I wanted to do something with those stars. I did not quite know what, but I was elated. Their beauty stirred me, but it was not only that. If I had been older, I should have said I wanted to know, to understand, to alter. I wanted to rush out and have them for my own. I laughed:

"I'm going to find out all about them."

I remember my father's face as he stared at me. His eyes were kindly and bewildered, he was chewing one end of his moustache, there was a sort of baffled amusement round his mouth.

"Perhaps you will," he reflected. We began to walk home.

"A lot of people have tried, you know," he said doubtfully. "Sir Isaac Newton--and Sir Robert Ball--and Sir William Herschel--and Sir Oliver Lodge--" My father's reading was odd, I discovered later, and he always found it an effort to shorten a title. He must have called his friends "Mr.--" when he was alone with them. "Sir Oliver Lodge," he repeated. "Very great men. They've all tried."

"I don't care," I said defiantly.

My father had lost himself in some more speculations. "They may be wrong after all," he was saying to himself. "All these stars. Bigger than the world. Bigger than the sun. It seems strange if they're put there just for nothing. It doesn't seem right."

But I was full of schemes by now. As soon as we got home I rushed to the bookcase and took out all the eight volumes of the Children's Encyclopaedia and began to turn the new shiny-smelling pages in search of pictures I hazily remembered. I didn't know anything of indexes then; and, despite my father's gentle wishes, I had scarcely glanced through the Encyclopaedia, which he had bought for me a year or so before. While I dashed over the pages, my mother kept calling me in to supper. At last I found what I was looking for. My mother was placated as soon as I began to eat some of the trifle or fruit or blancmange--it must have been one of the three which we had for supper that night. Soon I broke out:

"Father!" I only used the word very rarely, when I wanted all his attention.

"Father! I want you to help me make a telescope."

"Why?" he said.

"To look at the stars." We smiled at each other.[1]

These, certainly, are not the only fictional treatments of symbolic growth experiences and perhaps they are not the best, most appropriate or complete ones available. However, both illustrate a young person's sensitivity and response to inner needs and immediate experience and the ability to symbolically elaborate these experiences in the interests of personal development.

One pressing and crucial question confronts us in the use of our fictional examples. Are such capacities to symbolize experience in the interests of one's personal growth actually possible for young people or do these vignettes merely represent the idealistic distortions of a novelist's autobiographical interpretation of adolescent experience?

In an attempt to answer this question, let us compare these reports with non-fictional ones collected by the author from college students.

MALE

It was early in my life when it first started, but it was only a shadow of what was to come. My

---

[1] C. P. Snow, The Search. The New American Library of World Literature, Inc. 1960. p. 13ff.

father brought home a surgical mask and gave it to me and my two brothers. It wasn't anything really big, we all wore it while running around with a kitchen knife. I was too young to realize even what surgery was all about and I believed it was worn because it was a symbol of my father and his profession. The days past, the mask was lost or torn to shreds. But it left something, an impression of some kind.

Years later I used to deliver a newspaper around the area. One of my stops called for me to go into the hospital. I'll never forget how I used to love that smell, of all things! I would stand there in the lobby and, while watching the nurses go by, I would take deep breaths. It was exciting, was "an unknown" and probably that is what made it so exciting. My dad would take me through his office, let me watch him develop X-ray film, and these too were exciting encounters, to say the least. But I was still in my youth, and as I said they were encounters with the unknown, perhaps no more exciting than going to a circus. It really didn't <u>mean</u> anything to me.

Now comes the important part. I had had individual experiences before that were exciting. Such were the night I first played guitar at a dance, or my solo flight in an airplane, but they didn't <u>mean</u> much. I got kidded and kidded back about being a great jet fighter pilot or a rock and roll star. These things were fun.

One wintry Saturday morning my father asked me if I'd like to come over and watch a T & A (Tonsillectomy & adenoidectomy). I was but 16 and had not a serious bone in my body. I was excited as I had been before. We left for the hospital about 7:30. Everything was fine until I hit the front door, then I was hit with the tremendous sense of responsibility and meaning of what I was to see. I became wickedly serious, my eyes flew to intricately inspect every movement taking place about me as I walked to the doctors' locker room. There I began to change and was through before my dad could practically get his locker open. He told me I would have to wait a few minutes for him to get

the patient ready. I said OK and slipped out the door. Something drove me straight to his office. I sat in his big chair and poured into a surgical book. It meant nothing but I drove myself into every word. Any other time I would have been proud to sit at his desk. I would prop my feet up and pretend I was a hot shot. This time no - no pride, no hot shot, I was intensely drawn into this whole matter. I felt humbled yet intensely interested in what I was reading. "Tonsilar fossa," "blunt disection," "pillar retractor" meant nothing, but meant everything.

My dad found me in his office and took me to the operating room.

Inside the operating room I went "wild." The horrible smell of the ether was a God-given scent. The shining sterile instruments, the hustle, the exactness. My mind was in a frenzy watching all, thinking, wondering, not letting even a whisper pass me by. Then it was over. I didn't run home, didn't tell everybody what I'd seen, didn't feel happy, didn't feel sad. I just thought and felt responsibility. There was a tremendous sense of worth and a burning desire to help and aid. This was something deep-very deep-----

MALE

At the age of twelve, I was very childish. By childish, I mean that I demanded much from others and gave very little. As far as I was concerned, the world revolved around me. That year, we had our usual family Thanksgiving gathering. In our family, I enjoy a rather favored place, being the first male child of the new generation in a family that still harbors many of its Germanic traditions. At the Thanksgiving gathering I demanded and received the attention I was accustomed to, especially from my favorite aunt.

Several days following the dinner, we received a phone call informing us that Aunt Lenore had taken ill during the night and died. Upon hearing the news, I of course, displayed the customary signs

of grief--expecting to be comforted, held, soothed, told it would be "all right." However, the death had come with such a surprise to my parents, that they lost their usual composure. My father wept. This, perhaps, is the most dreadful sight that I can recall to mind--my father sobbing like I had done. I had never before seen him cry, in fact, for some reason I had conceptualized him as devoid of most emotion, other than laughter and anger. I remember that I went to him and embraced him, trying to comfort him as he had so often soothed me.

While being with my father, I remember feeling "different" or "unusual," but not being entirely aware of what I was experiencing. However, later, in the privacy of my bedroom, I relived the scene and discovered what I thought was its meaning. I should explain that at this time I was undergoing a "religious experience", meaning that I was trying to live by the Christian tenets and the teachings of the Bible. I felt that I had given a part of my life to Dad instead of demanding from him, and as the Bible says "greater gift hast no man than this." I compared my behavior to that of my younger sisters, who had continued crying, much the harder, when Mother and Father failed to console them.

In looking back now, I am not so sure that this interpretation was the correct one. Perhaps all that I learned was that Father is human and not an Olympian god. Perhaps I became not a "new person", but simply discovered a facet of myself that had hither to fore been hidden. What ever the actual meaning of this experience was, I do know that it has remained vividly imprinted on my mind and still retains its power to call forth a "feeling."

FEMALE

This is a series of events that began when I was fourteen which all support and reinforce the type of awareness of myself and others that I experienced. It started with the marriage of my brother to a Japanese girl. I thought nothing about the fact that she was "different" but a few of my

relatives made some disparaging remarks. I was hurt because I knew my brother loved this girl. I began to think of things I had heard from classmates about Negroes...which were not necessarily disparaging remarks but certainly not objectively thought out-they were attitudes based on stereotypes and "popular" opinions.

Around 15 and 16 years of age I began to feel a real awareness of the race issue - in relation to myself and school - my friends who were all white, Caucasian, etc. Somehow I felt a real responsibility to read and become knowledgeable in race issues. I joined NAACP of my community. It was after I had joined or while joining that I came to the awareness that I had responsibly carried through on my convictions, my feelings, and had acted upon them. I objectively looked at myself and was very pleased with myself - before this time I had lived a very "unconscious" life. There were no other white kids my age who went to the NAACP meetings with me. I was very proud of myself - because I could divide myself from the group - I didn't need their support.

This gave me the self-confidence in other areas of life and school to voice my opinions. I soon found out that one's classmates respect this type of independence also.

To a certain degree, I think a very large extent of this has definitely reflected my actions, my life in college. I have been a lot more "daring" and not afraid to undertake a duty or action that I didn't know too much about.

FEMALE

I can distinctly remember the first time I went to the Community Center to work. I come from a town where there are no slums, no Negroes, etc., and had never been exposed to poverty. I had read and heard about this settlement to which I was going--called "Little Hollywood"--but I was really both afraid and anxious to go. I felt like a crusader and as if my life would never be the same because of what I would witness.

> I was a freshman in high school the first time I went and was so apalled that I didn't go back 'til my sophomore year, but from then on 'til I graduated, I went weekly.
>
> Just as I had sort of expected I almost got sick when I saw the filth and grime. Little children were starving and could hardly talk. Many of the parents were drunk or simply bums. I was repulsed at first but still felt good because I felt noble--as I expected to.
>
> At the time, I really felt this experience would be a turning point in my life and it was, but in a somewhat different way which I now see. I thought I was going to become a giving, loving person who would "be good to the poor." From my experiences in "Little Hollywood" I really did change--but not to give anything to the poor - just give them every opportunity to get it for themselves. I now believe in setting an example, not telling them how to live.
>
> At that time I didn't know myself (do I now?) well enough to know how being friends with the sort of person I was never allowed to associate with would affect me and I was not exactly right in my evaluation as I see it now, but I will always remember thinking as I drove there in the car that I would return to my own community an entirely different person.

These vivid accounts of personal growth experiences raise some pertinent issues for education.

The concept of the <u>symbolic growth experience</u> is predicated on the belief that human experience can be incorporated into that propriate core of inner needs and personal relevance and symbolically appraised in the interests of one's personality development and life course.

We hypothesize that the capacity for <u>symbolic growth</u>

experiences is a major way, perhaps the only way, of achieving self-realization. The symbolic growth experience represents an episode that expresses the highest unity of the personality. It is a time when all crucial elements and all relevant facets of one's life converge within the context of immediate experience. The cognitive and affective components of the personality are truly integrated; life's time dimensions meld together to form a new whole within which experience is interpreted and given meaning; and conscious and unconscious forces blend together in this unique achievement of integration and self-realization.

Growth-experience-learning need not be limited to successful psychotherapy. In theory, it should be possible to teach children -- perhaps people of all ages -- the sensitivity and conceptual orientation necessary for the development of the capacity for the symbolic growth experience, so that they respond to and symbolize crucial life experience in a way that promotes personality growth and self-realization.

Maslow suggests that "experiential richness,"[1] the perceptual sensitivity to our most basic yearnings and

---

[1]Maslow. A Theory of Metamotivation. p. 117.

needs, is either teachable or recoverable. Certainly, such a sensitivity to one's inner needs and signals would be a vital component of the capacity to symbolize experience in the interests of one's own growth.

For education to address itself to the promotion of self-realization and the development of the capacity for symbolic growth experiences at least three areas are suggested as priorities for our schools.

1. It is recommended that a holistic orientation to the self and a holistic model of growth be provided. This would involve the teaching of an image of man that stresses his proactive nature and his potentials for self-actualization. This holistic orientation to the nature of man would emphasize man's capacity to use freedom in a responsible manner for self-directed growth and self-creation. Building upon this humanistic view of man the structural-organizational integrity of the personality should be stressed. The essential meanings of personality integration must be explored. The importance of stability and organization to the organism must be contrasted with the process conception of personality development. The implications of the concepts of growth and change should be presented.

It is felt that this holistic orientation to the human personality forms a critical base from which all other teaching and personal developments emerge. If children perceive themselves as learning machines, as the passive recipients of teacher controlled stimuli; if they cannot look beyond a deterministic-reductionistic-mechanistic model for their development; if they cannot experience their essential wholeness and know themselves as the center of their experience; if they are unable to conceptualize their own potentials for self-determination, then all other educative efforts will be in vain. The schools, therefore, must not determine the validity of the child's experience. This responsibility and this ability must remain as the child's prerogative. The child's struggles over verisimilitude must remain a personal struggle guided and illumined by the innate directions of the human organism and enlightened by experience. This harmonic resonance between inner processes and directions and authentic experience must be the child's domain. What parents and teachers can do is to provide those experiences that are crucial in helping the child discover himself and his world in such a way that he can make intelligent choices in harmony with his unique nature as well as in harmony with the more universal

tendencies in the human organism.

There is no reason to suspect that a growth orientation toward the human personality and the concept of self-actualization cannot be taught as successfully as any other concepts.

2. It is recommended that the schools also introduce experiences that will insure the exploration of new dimensions of self-awareness so that the learner will become more and more alert and sensitive to his own inner life processes, his rich resources and capacities for growth. Efforts in sensory and body awareness, esthetic and non-verbal exercises, and techniques of meditation and contemplation are all experiences that can be valuable in developing a deeper awareness of inner needs and the "impulse voices" of the self. Art, dance, drama, and the mosaic of archetypal energies and expressions of human nature, all need to receive attention in the education of the child. It is crucial, however, that such techniques and experiences be integrated into the curriculum and represent the genuine philosophical stance of the school and teacher if they are to have any real impact and significance in the lives of the learners. Where such experiences are now provided, they

are usually detached from the cognitive, intellectual concerns of the classroom. There is an unfortunate split between the affective and cognitive experiences. Inevitably, in such cases, there must follow the development of some corresponding compartmentalization in the life and mind of the child and a sense of incompleteness in his self-perceptions. Affective experiences may come to be enjoyed and appreciated by the students but if such experiences remain segregated or detached from the total life of the child they may provide a contradiction to the expressed concerns, goals, and educational philosophy in the classroom.

The Ford-Esalen project (Brown, 1968) for innvoation in humanistic education was designed to bring the thinking-feeling dimensions into harmony in teaching methods and curriculum. Specifically, the primary task of this project was to experiment with the various ways in which the feeling-emotional aspects of human experience and learning could be integrated into curricular units that also stressed the development of the necessary conceptual and cognitive skills. The experiments illustrate in both philosophy and method,

the above recommendations.[1]

3. Finally, it is recommended that curricular opportunities for an evaluation and interpretation of experience be provided as they relate to the metaneeds and to the holistic concepts of human growth.

It is felt that these approaches would aid in the development of the capacity for symbolic growth experience since they would provide an integration of the two major forces in human development (1) the instinctoid needs and capacities and (2) self-awareness.

---

[1] e.g., See Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW WITH DR. ABRAHAM MASLOW

(Brandeis University, November 23, 1968)

Frick: Dr. Maslow, the beginning of your career goes back into the early 30's, and as I looked at some of your early published works it seemed to me that you were at one time a very traditional psychologist although I don't think you were as behavioristic as many were at that time, but at any rate, you were a respected member of the establishment. Now you are leading a third force psychology that has really been extremely free-wheeling and experimental in its efforts to grow beyond the deficiencies of traditional psychology, and I'm wondering where along the way in your career you sensed these deficiencies in psychology and where along the way you developed the more humanistic concerns that you are expressing now?

Maslow: Well, I think the humanistic concerns were part of the reason, a very large part of the reason that I went into psychology at all, from philosophy. My concerns were socialistic with American Socialism. Norman Thomas was a great hero of mine, and Upton Sinclair, and Eugene Debs, in college. There is the

Jewish tradition of the utopian, and the ethical and I was pretty definitely looking for the improvement of mankind. I became impatient with philosophy, at all the talking that didn't get anyplace, and wanted in effect an empirical philosophy in the old 19th century sense of working at philosophical problems empirically. I had made one shot at it before at Cornell with Titchener and then just fled.

Frick: Did you hope to find what you were looking for in the psychology of the day?

Maslow: Well, I had, when I came into it, because I knew nothing of psychology. I came in following a kind of an ideal which didn't yet exist. But, I was fascinated with everything that <u>did</u> exist and also behaviorism just looked different then than it does now. Clearly the great moment when I went back into psychology was when I read Watson's work and had a great illumination, a great vision about the future. You know, this was a programatic thing and it looked so clear.

Frick: Behaviorism really appealed to you at the time?

Maslow: Oh, yes. That brought me into psychology, or back into it, because it looked as if all you needed

was hard work and so on. The future looked quite clear. There was a program that all you do is condition everything, etc. But as a student, I ran across Freud and Adler out there at Wisconsin. The first paper I did was on psychoanalysis, but I was a very timid boy--very shy, very easily frightened, very isolated--an outsider, and the first paper I did was for the Wisconsin Academy of Arts and Sciences. I think I was a first-year graduate student, and I offered a paper which would still be worthy of doing. It was called "Psychoanalysis and Mental Hygiene as Status Quo Social Philosophy." And I was to give that, but when the day came I was so frightened, so timid, that I just fled. I just didn't show up for the meeting and didn't give my paper, but that was the first paper I . . . you know, if I had given it, that would have been the first paper I would have published. So that I felt open about psychology from the very beginning and used it in terms of an ideal which did not yet exist. Some people are frightened away by the inadequacies of psychology, that is, the discrepancy between what exists and the ideal.

Frick: Many students are today . . .

Maslow: Right, but I think the best students are not. I think I was a good student, but I felt that if psychology did not come up to the ideal, well damn it, it should. And so I went into it having what we now call humanistic questions very definitely in mind. As a matter of fact, behaviorism looked like a program for humanism then, and it was only when it played itself out -- when it didn't work out--that I became disenchanted. But I was never, you know, the devotee, the disciple, the great programmatic follower, . . . my dissertation really came out of my studies of Adler and Freud and it was an effort to answer the question which was right?

I should say at the other end too, that I feel quite open about . . . I'm not anti-behavioristic except as a philosophy. And I don't feel sectarian about it at all. The humanistic psychology that I'm working up, and I hope to make systematic, includes, that is, it is a larger philosophical, theoretical, and methodological structure which includes the whole positivistic psychology. It doesn't reject it.

Frick: It incorporates it and makes a better use of it perhaps, theoretically?

Maslow: That's right.

Frick: I hope to get to that theoretical integration in a few minutes. You know, Dr. Maslow, something that interests me, and it ties in with the question I was going to ask you. You said you were a very timid boy, very obsequious, perhaps, in your early graduate work. Does this have any bearing on your later and more recent concerns for self-actualization? Certainly, as much as anyone I know, your theories are very much a part of you as a person and so I wonder if this represents personal striving.

Maslow: That can be answered at many levels. In going through psychoanalysis you discover all sorts of things. I guess at the most superficial level, the most conscious level and obvious level, this self-actualization idea came from simply loving and admiring two people in particular, and then later more. One was Ruth Benedict and one was Max Wertheimer, teachers whom I just loved in a way that today's students don't love their teachers.

But they were puzzling. They didn't fit. It was as if they came from another planet or something. Everything I knew didn't explain them. They were mysteries. They were also very nice and parental with me, and answered questions and let me hang around. It was just simply the normal kind of . . . normal for me, anyway--sort of intellectual poking, poking, poking, until I understood. And I had all sorts of notes on them, sort of journal notes, and I kept on trying to figure them out. That was an entirely personal enterprise. It didn't even occur to me to think of it as an exploration or a research. It would be like sort of a diary occupation, and I lectured to my classes about these ideas since my classes were always the repository for whatever I happened to be interested in at the time. And then one day, finally, those two pictures clicked into one and there was a composite rather than just individuals. Of course I was very excited about that and I kept on plugging away privately, secretly. It didn't fit into the Zeitgeist at all, and the only use I made of it was lecturing to my classes and discussions with my friends. Then the only reason it became public was through Werner Wolff who was a

very brilliant depth psychologist at the time. He had just started a journal and asked me for this material and it was published about seven years after it was written.

Frick: Well, he published one of your first writings on your experiments with the self-actualizing or healthy personality, didn't he?

Maslow: That was the first publication and I think I would have been too timid to do it unless he had urged me and asked me for it, because it was so "unscientific." But his journal was called --you know --it wasn't like Psychological Review or the Journal of Experimental Psychology. It was called "Personality Studies," or something like that, and this gave me the courage to do it, to write it, to publish it, to make it available.

Frick: That hasn't been many years ago, really, has it?

Maslow: No, that was published, oh, it must have been about 1942 or somewhere around there but it had been sitting on my desk since 1936 or 1937.

Frick: Still timid?

Maslow: Oh, yes. Well, a little of it still pops up once in awhile.

Frick: . . . I can't believe that now!

Maslow: Well, in my dreams and fantasies the little boy is still there.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Maslow, I've been a follower of yours for many years now, and I think that your writings have had a great deal to do with my own efforts and my own position, and so it's difficult for me to really offer a critical and objective appraisal, I think, as many could who are less involved with your writings and thinking, but I would like to play the devil's advocate with some of my questions for a few minutes. I think as I've gotten deeper into your work in the last few months, I have been disturbed a bit by the very strong instinctoid base that you lay down for man's behavior and development. It's as though you are introducing a very strong biological determinism here and I think this is seen when you use the analogy: man actualizes his potentials in a very similar way to the acorn becoming an oak. You use this analogy,

or similar ones very frequently. Somehow I see here, and I think the thing that really bothers me, is that I see a real programming here. Certainly, the model of the acorn into the oak suggests an indelible kind of programming and this troubles me, and I would like you to respond to it, and then I have some related issues that I would like to get into. Maybe it troubles you, too, I don't know.

Maslow: Trouble isn't exactly the word--fascinated with perhaps. Yes, I love thinking about them--working at it--I try to work it out. I think the acorn-oak business was a poor choice of figures of speech, of analogies, because it <u>is</u> programmed.

Frick: It did lead to that connotation?

Maslow: That's right. It just leads to the notion of something growing all by itself without any effort, and it's quite clear that you have to put something together with what I'm convinced are instinct-like or genetic or biologically based potentialities, very, very weak, very delicate, very subtle, not like animal or plant things. We have an inner sense of strength, and of overwhelmingness and practically

nothing can stop a cat from becoming a cat but melding into this nature is the existential emphasis on man making himself. That is, I would think of the potentialities of human nature as being biologically rooted or instinctoid and that it's in the culture and in one's own life and with will and self-responsibility that one makes oneself. That is--the potentialities--if you leave them alone you are just a vegetable, so that hard work is the path to becoming a good physician or scientist, or whatever; Hard work, determination, commitment and incorporating the ego ideal into the self. I think the easiest way to say it is in the existentialist mode of saying "man is his own project," only they overdo it, because they become anti-biological.

Frick: That's right, they do, but I feel there is a real contradiction here, in a sense, in your position. I haven't worked it out yet but I've been struggling with it. You say that we've got to discover this nature. It's there but we've got to discover it. The existentialists come along and say "No, we really haven't got to discover it, we've got to create it." Now, it seems to me that in your position, you are somehow de-emphasizing choice.

Maslow: I don't mean to.

Frick: You don't mean to?

Maslow: No. That was why I said that was a poor choice of words. There is no word that puts together discover-create. It's sort of a difficult discovering or if I think of, let's say my working as a psychotherapist, of the difficulty with which one discovers one's human nature, or one's own talents, or tendencies or tastes, or trends or constitutional-temperamental bent--then we must make up some suitable words, because that's the operation. That's the basic operation upon which I'd start this whole business of uncovering, discovering, creating by hard work and by one's own determination of oneself with, however, the receptive emphasis. That is, the creating is <u>not</u> arbitrary. I cannot make myself into a woman, except in a very inefficient and unsatisfactory way. The real job there, is in a certain sense, discovering what you are and that phrase is okay with all these other modifications, you know, discovering your own trends, your own bent, your own tendencies, your own intentions, and then sort of bringing them to pass. If I discover that I'm a . . .

well as I did--it came slowly through the college years and the . . . well, it's still going on . . . the business of finding out what it is that I really want which means, you know, what I really am, and in my case just through the years sort of developing slowly, more and more courage. . . . I'm not fully courageous yet, you might say, because as I work I have things now which are safe in the privacy of my journal.

Frick: Things you haven't committed yet?

Maslow: No, they're so far out, they're so . . . I still get nightmares a little bit before I'll publish it.

Frick: . . . even with your reputation, you still have this kind of inhibition?

Maslow: Well, the reputation is based on something else and this new thing that I want to talk about will offend the people who . . . it will offend my reputation you might say.

Frick: Yes, but you're moving from a position of strength here, you know.

Maslow: Well, I feel more confident--much more than I

used to when I'd go into prostration. The first talk I gave on the peak experiences and this B-cognition stuff, there was my old professor sitting in the front row and, God, I couldn't sleep for several nights beforehand, and I had to rest in fatigue--just exhaustion before and after--and I had dreams about being thrown out of my family. I remember one dream that happened about then. It was sort of a recurrent dream whenever I'd say something publicly that had been worked out privately. It was a typical dream and it sums up this whole courage and fear thing--of being in the street and then somebody yells, "Hey, lions and tigers are loose," and then I would get frightened and run to the door behind which is my family--not the blood family but somehow the whole clan--and bang on the door, "let me in, let me in!" And the door is locked, and they don't let me in, and it was definitely the American Psychological Association. I was always figuring, "My God, they're going to throw me out!" or "I'll be cast out," and this, I think, may be a universal fear. If you say something that contradicts the people you've admired and learned from, something that contradicts your teachers, this is kind of a

cosmic, eternal thing.

Frick: . . . yes, and whose admiration of you depends upon certain known positions . . .

Maslow: . . . and each time giving up the admiration and in effect giving up the reputation.

Frick: Right, or running that risk, at least.

Maslow: Well, each time unconsciously, I was giving it up.

Frick: That's right.

Well, perhaps we should get back to this issue of choice which is very complicated, really. It's a two-fold kind of thing: choosing to recognize and go into your uniqueness in a sense, and also choosing to actualize those instinctoid potentials as well.

Maslow: That's the same thing.

Frick: Yes, but one is a racial kind of thing as you talk about species-wide potentials. The other is more personal and unique in a sense but they're not mutually exclusive.

Maslow: Well, that's one of the things that I'm trying

to do, to work very, very carefully to select the words so that they're just right. The word I'd use there would be not uniqueness. I'd use rather "idiosyncratic" meaning individual. That is, the way in which we're different from other people is also discovered in this same personal self-searching, identity-seeking kind of thing.

Frick: In the instinctoid base?

Maslow: That's right. But that which is not unique to me, but which we all share I discover by the same process; that is, in depth, in psycho-analysis let's say, I will discover as a great discovery the need for love, which I share with everybody, and the process itself--that is, the discovering of what's common to the species, and what is unique to me--comes after the fact of discovery and uncovering.

Frick: Yes. Right.

Maslow: At least, that's the way I would say it to save the uniqueness and idiosyncratic qualities and their difference from species-wide things, and yet also to save this similarity process by which we discover

ourselves. Subjectively my need for safety, or my tendency to express my ectomorphic rather than mesomorphic type of intelligence are discovered in . . . and then let's say my maleness, which is not species-wide and then even more let's say, my particular level of intelligence and my particular yearnings, let's say, for a good world, etc., that these are discovered the same way. All of the species-wide, half species-wide, big groups, and then finally the idiosyncratic.

Frick: You don't think then, Dr. Maslow, that you are returning to a kind of an instinct psychology as we used to know it?

Maslow: No, no. I reject the MacDougal theory as I do the ethologist's instinct theory since it just doesn't apply. It's essentially behavioral theory and I'm not talking about behavior. The behaviors which are genetically determined are so trivial, not trivial but reflex, that they just don't matter for the psychologist much. I'm talking rather about impulses or even better said, I am referring to needs in the strict sense. Needs for the sake of physical health and full humanness.

Frick: Right. Dr. Maslow, I think you have been criticized . . .

Maslow: . . . I could be criticized for using that word "instinctoid," because it has brought misunderstanding, but I just couldn't think of any other word. And that, too, is blunt. It joins the issue sharply, and I keep getting impatient with the sociologizing and the environmentalizing of psychology, and of making principles which apply to any species and which are not species specific to the human species. So that word is . . . I'd apologize for it on the one hand because it does mislead more than I expected. On the other hand you have to have something like that because the issue is fudged too often. It gets involved with your politics, too. Erich Fromm, for instance, is just ducking the issue, really, even though he says it in a half dozen indirect ways.

Frick: He takes a very similar position doesn't he?

Maslow: Well, without saying so. I think it <u>is</u> a similar position. I think that Carl Rogers takes a similar position but one time when we were sort of debating,

I chose this one issue as the one difference of opinion, and then Carl said, "Well, he didn't disagree." And I said, "Well for the love of Pete, say so." And yet there is something not quite respectable about using certain words.

Frick: It's been contaminated, hasn't it, by MacDougal and all of the instinct people, and it's hard to return to in any way, I think.

Dr. Maslow, you've been criticized for your emphasis on the goal of becoming fully human, becoming everything the person can become. Now, some have said that you're very indiscriminate here, that you see this in kind of an unrealistic global fashion. My question is, doesn't the person have to make choices and select from a tremendous reservoir of potentials and must there not be some priority in terms of what the person sets out to really actualize within himself? You wouldn't disagree with this, would you?

Maslow: Absolutely not. But again it's very hard to find the words. The only way you can say this is in extenso with lots of examples. You can't make a neat and simple statement about it. Of course I agree. I

hope to do a systematic book if I live long enough, presenting a thorough system of human nature. I hope to expand the last chapter in my Toward a Psychology of Being, called "Some Basic Propositions of a Growth and Self-Actualizing Psychology" and develop a comprehensive philosophy of psychology, and I hope to extend that material into seventeen volumes or so.

Frick: . . . magnificent!

Maslow: Well, do the old German professor, 19th Century Handsbuch in seven volumes, you know.

Frick: Are you timid about this?

Maslow: No.

Frick: . . . as you think about it?

Maslow: No. That I enjoy. As a matter of fact, that is . . . that's a timidity chasing thing, because that would be systematic. It's not trying to say in a brief span, something which cannot be said in a brief span. That will give me the extensiveness that I want, so then I can address myself to all these questions that you have raised.

Frick: Then you can take care of all of these discrepancies.

Maslow: Absolutely and really get the thousands of footnotes and the data. I have a form that I'm putting this in--my death-defying form, I call it--which will grow biologically, sort of by intussusception which is the way we grow rather than the way a pile of stones does. It will grow from within, keeping the proportions. I have about 200 propositions, and I can make kind of a brief statement about them in a page, or two or three. Then I'd have for each of those, an appendix containing the supportive data and with reference also to the data which we do not yet have--all of the experiments I'd love to do if we had a 200-year life span.

Frick: It would certainly encourage further research, though, wouldn't it?

Maslow: That's what I want to do, that's what I'd like to do. I'll probably end my life with that because that can be published the day after I die. It will be in shape so that it is always completed. And yet it can grow.

Frick: Right.

Maslow: And if I live to the age of 80, then it is going to be an awfully big book.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Maslow, with your concern for developing the human potential you would say, then, that a very narrow person, focusing on model train building, for example, let's say this is his real "thing." This is how he expresses and finds himself. If he were that narrow, that is, if this was his consuming interest could this person be self-actualizing?

Maslow: Well, let's take a better example, because probably that would be neurotic, that is, if you poked into such a person you'd find that this was a flight from or a defense against something. That's just sort of my expectation--it might be wrong--this might be full self-actualizing for, let's say, an unintelligent person. That might be the best he can do.

Frick: It would be consistent with his other potentials, then?

Maslow: Well, I think we get. . . for instance, I find myself getting narrow, oh, more and more narrow with

my age and becoming so absorbed in my work that I've given up plays, and poetry and making new friends, which I just don't do anymore.

Frick: . . . you say you have given all of these things up?

Maslow: Yes. I love my work so much, and am so absorbed with it, that everything else starts getting to look smaller and smaller.

Frick: Is this good? Is this self-actualizing?

Maslow: Well, whatever it is, I'm doing it. I don't know. We just don't know.

Frick: It's hard to judge, isn't it? Is this what we're saying, and this is kind of what I was asking here.

Maslow: Well, I ran across this statement in Darwin. Darwin, saying something of the sort, said he finally turned into what he thought was a dry, narrow man, just absorbed with his work, and with nothing else in the whole world. If I compared this with the reading of novels, and going on trips, and going to parties, and doing a thousand things, all of which I enjoy

doing--I hardly listen to my records anymore, except for background things. I am so much more narrowed down to my work which I think is more and more me and more and more what's important.

Frick: All right, you're making choices, aren't you? This is self-actualizing for you, although you are making certain sacrifices as well.

Maslow: Yes. Whether that's a good thing or a bad thing, I don't know. For society I suspect it's a good thing.

Frick: For you as a person it may be limiting.

Maslow: Yes. I feel sad over . . .

Frick: . . . what you're missing in other ways?

Maslow: Yes, I . . . all the pleasures that I . . . This semester, for instance, I gave up the Audubon walks in the woods, and the bird walks, which I love. Well, it just took too much time. Well, what did it take time from? I loved it, and yet sacrificed, renounced it, gave it up for the sake of my mission, or vocation, or calling, or something.

Frick: Now, I would like to ask something here, Dr. Maslow.

It seems to me that . . . Rollo May has made this point, and I think you have, too, although I'm not sure I could locate it right now, but I am referring to the need in creative work to have these moments of self-renewal, to have the passive moments--the bird walks, and so forth--and I'm wondering what your sacrifice is in terms of giving up a lot of moments of serenity and peace and calm, and these other interests. Would they not feed back into your work in a very stimulating way?

Maslow: Yes, they do, and I do walk a lot--anyway I must for health reasons. And yet somehow I feel better about the walks, you know, it isn't just a waste of time because I can meditate on the work I am doing, and other things I am thinking about. But it's a little . . . it's very hard to describe, because rather a few people have that sense of mission. I know Rollo May does have it. Rollo May is a world savior, too. The way I'd say it for myself, and I've said it to other people to try to explain and to my wife, for instance, when I don't go to the play with her and try to justify myself. Supposing you found a cure for

cancer, what would you do? Could you then go to the theater and sit and watch the play?

Frick: When work has to be done . . .

Maslow: Yes, when work has to be done, and mankind has to be helped. This is the way I feel, although it's really more important than cancer. How can I piddle around at these things and yet it's an overstatement because, well, I went to a party last night. It was our department party and I enjoy parties, yet I think I am just most happy and most fulfilled, and most myself, and most being as if that's what I were meant to be when I am involved in my work.

Frick: A mission is a good word for it, isn't it? A sense of mission.

Maslow: There are the old words for it. You find your vocation, or your calling.

Frick: Sidney Jourard has called it your project. There are many words for it.

Frick: Viktor Frankl, as you know, has been critical of you, Dr. Maslow, in his article "Beyond Self-Actualization

and Self-Expression." I think you had a rebuttal or a rejoinder to that article but I didn't read it. Frankl says that you have . . . or the self-actualizing psychologists have neglected "that sphere of human existence in which man chooses what he will do, and what he will be in the midst of an objective world of meanings and values."[1] Now, in the light of what we have already talked about, would you say that Frankl really didn't understand your position here? Because it seems to me you're not denying the importance of choice.

Maslow: Well, we got together on that like two co-workers and straightened it out and agreed and he felt quite good about that. My article wasn't a rebuttal, exactly, but sort of an explanation and a sharpening up, underscoring, and the like. And we certainly agree on that. I think he must be pleased with the paper with which I really finished a 25 year project. . . I finished the paper and then I had a heart attack, and it's as if it were a . . . I had been staggering along working

---

[1] Viktor Frankl, "Beyond Self-Actualization and Self-Expression." Journal of Existential Psychiatry. Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1960. (5-20). p. 17.

so hard, and that was my job, that was the end. Then I had the sense of completion with this theory of metamotivation. Did I send you a copy of that?

Frick: Yes, and it was also published in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology, I believe more recently.[1]

Maslow: Yes. Well, in this paper I think it is much more worked out and much more detailed along Frankl's line of what is the meaning of life, and what are the end goals, and what do you seek, what do we all seek, so I feel that there is no real argument between us. He was over at my place, oh, several months ago when he was in the neighborhood, and we talked. I agree with him by the way, just to make it explicit that there is something beyond self-actualization, something beyond the full identity and the real self, and I think I would go much further than Frankl and call it "cosmo-genic," as somebody has called it.

Frick: I'm not sure that Frankl would agree with you that values are instinctoid, would he?

---

[1] Abraham H. Maslow, "A Theory of Metamotivation: The Biological Rooting of the Value-Life." Journal of Humanistic Psychology. Vol. VII, No. 2, Fall 1967.

Maslow: We did not discuss that.

Frick: This, I think, is an issue that I see you different on.

Maslow: Well, that might be a struggle over words, and then my guess is again, and I've done this often enough instead of arguing with people, you get together before the fire place with a couple of martinis, and just hash it out.

Frick: You're really saying the same things.

Maslow: Well, we then find the super-ordinate language which we can both utilize.

Frick: The meeting ground, yes.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Maslow, you have characterized self-actualizing people as exemplars, as good choosers, lives that reflect these higher instinctoid values. In other words, you seem to feel as if the people you've studied and whom you've identified as self-actualizing really provide an answer to the question "what is the good life?" You have also suggested that the free choices and the values of the self-actualizing individuals indicate

what is good for most other human beings. Now, if this is true, if we find in our research that what you say is very definitely true, how would you implement such a finding? What does this mean? I must confess that it frightens me a bit.

Maslow: Well, I would say in the first place, that is very clearly not a factual statement, but an extrapolation or an hypothesis. I just feel that it's probably so but I don't know for sure, and I wish it were possible to have the research institutes to work with such questions. What does self-actualization mean in feeble-minded people? Or what does self-actualization mean and is it possible for somebody caught in a situation where he has to sacrifice his own individual potentials. You know, the man with four kids and a lousy job, and a mortgage. He may know what he wants to do, but for the sake of others cannot do it. Of course, a way of testing the hypothesis is to see how it works. Supposing that's true, then what happens? Many people are working on these problems and I'm doing it at the theoretical level, but for instance, much of the turmoil that is going on in education now--the new affective education for instance--is based on this assumption

and represented by the Esalen approach, or the Summerhill kind of thing, which is really based upon a kind of a trust or a faith that's not a fact, I mean it's not proven. Well, let's assume this is true, and then act on that assumption and let's see what happens. Now, acting on that assumption works pretty well in education but not with the establishment education which acts on a different assumption and therefore, I think, partially a failure, but the assumption is that if you leave people to their own resources, then they will "grow"; if you leave things to individual choice, they will generally, statistically, in the long run choose well rather than badly; if you give freedom, it will be well used if the people are reasonably decent to start with and not too psychopathological. Well, they're using that assumption in many areas. The whole theory-wide management of education is based upon the assumption that human beings seek to actualize a higher nature. Now we are learning about when it works and when it doesn't work and under what circumstances and what the necessary prerequisites are and how to do it, and the strategy and tactics of it, and when it fails and you get the richness of detail, and this is

now happening in education, it is also happening in management and organization development. In these two huge areas there is a lot of work going on using this assumption and it works out pretty well.

Frick: I was thinking that if you really identified what these instinctoid values were in the human being and you wanted to implement this in terms of an educative process, would this not lead to something very close to behavioral engineering, or would it not lead to something very similar to what Skinner is suggesting? This is what I was wondering about, the problem of implementing these values.

Maslow: Yes, I think I agree with you that it can look like that superficially but, profoundly, it's not like that because this is the difference between control and . . .

Frick: . . .and allowing it to happen . . .

Maslow: That's right, it's the difference between a controlling Frazier as in Walden Two--when a benevolent philosopher-king can, in fact, shape behavior. I have no doubt about it, that whenever we have had a philosopher-

king in human history, things went well. The only question is that in Walden Two there are two psychologies. There's the psychology of the people, and there's the Frazier psychology. Who picks Frazier? How does he come to pass? How do you not get a Hitler there instead of a Frazier? If you use controlling techniques; controlling, shaping, modeling, molding techniques, then the question comes up of the controller and the shaper or the sculptor. And the other philosophy has had its roots very, very differently because it's more taoistic and receptive and trusting. You don't have to shape human nature, it shapes itself to a much greater extent, I don't know how much yet, but certainly to a greater extent than any other great culture has ever acknowledged. That's one reason I have such great faith in the future of the United States, and of the world, too. I think we're the first culture in history--first large culture--that has built itself pretty firmly on the notion of a higher nature of man and that if you give him the freedom to choose, that he'll choose wisely. You know, the one man one vote is the actualization of that faith, or the free press, or our way of sportsmanship in politics. If

you lose an election you just rally behind the man you've just been fighting. This is extremely different from getting a big stork to govern over the frogs and hoping that you'll get a benevolent one. Now, human history teaches us that most people have not been benevolent when they got power. People who struggle for power, the people who love power are apt to be not benevolent, and the best kind of leader, if you have to have a leader, is one who is a leader very reluctantly. Now it's perfectly true that if I had an ideal school I would use the teaching machines very widely. I think they're very useful, but I think of them in a taoistic way. That is, they're available, like a smorgasbord, for anybody to use if and when he wishes to use it, and to go at his own pace, to be idiosyncratic--that's purely individual--and not one of a class of 35 sitting in rows. Now, if I like teaching machines and Fred Skinner likes teaching machines, it's really a superficial comparison because the philosophy which underlies it is very, very different.

Frick: Yes, very different.

Frick: Dr. Maslow, you have indicated that most people do not know or appreciate their strivings to become more fully human. You have said, "All he knows is that he is dominated by certain needs of the moment. He does not know in advance that he will strive on after this gratification has come, for another higher need. The absolute value for him is the need in the hierarchy he is dominated by during a particular period." I think this appears in your recent book Toward a Psychology of Being. Now, my question is: can human beings be taught to develop an attitude toward themselves that would incorporate a concept of growth and the concept of process toward self-actualization? I think this is crucial here, and I am wondering if you feel this is something we can teach people to feel about themselves, even if they're struggling with a deficiency need?

Maslow: Well, it's happening now, and if I were to rewrite that material you just quoted I'd say it in a different way, because the happenings in the last couple of years have been sort of like a huge experiment. My book Toward a Psychology of Being[1], for

---

[1] Abraham Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being, 2nd Edition, Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1968.

instance, has been read and sold very widely, and mostly, I gather, among young people. It has sold about 150,000 copies by now, and apparently it's been used for helping to produce this kind of insight in hippie groups and among many, many youngsters of the more educated...College people, for instance, are setting for themselves these goals in a very conscious way. The goals of authenticity, what we might call idealism. You know, the idealistic goals of these B-values, these ultimate goals of truth and honesty and pure justice and excellence and the renunciation of hypocrisy and phoniness. The kids are doing it. Now, they're doing it stupidly and inefficiently and incapably and they want it "<u>now</u>."

Frick: ....Right, next week at least.

Maslow: And they don't realize that that's a lifetime project and that you struggle and work toward it, and that it doesn't come in a big, single peak experience. Well, in psychoanalytical terms, they're apt to make too great a stress on the <u>insight</u> and not enough on the working through. Working through is a lifetime business, and if you want to become a

good pianist, or a good anything, you just work.

Frick: Self-discipline is something that enters in here that they don't want to accept as part of it, I think.

Maslow: That's right and there was one button that summed it up perfectly -- somebody on the West Coast put them out--and it's called "Nirvana, Now." Of course this is something we can learn from, too. If these youngsters that I'm thinking about are very self-consciously seeking for self-actualization and ultimate values, and metamotivations and so on, their goals are wonderful, the goals are fine, but the strategy and tactics are very inefficient.

Frick: Do you feel....are you really speaking now of college students who may be struggling at some deficiency-level? Do you feel like they can really develop this orientation to their own growth even when struggling down here at a deficiency level?

Maslow: ...If they would say it the way you just said it. In my seminars I've been trying the role of the consultant rather than the professor in charge, and

what has happened now in two seminars was that when I threw away the reins and abdicated power, then these students spontaneously went into a kind of a T-group situation. That is, what they looked for was belongingness with each other, communication, affection, love, and working together, which is really at a very low level of personal development. This seminar I just had was a kind of a marathon which they did themselves. I was not there. They were in complete charge and they came out with their eyes glowing as people usually do from these things, but this is a re-discovering of the ...it's a dropping of the defenses, and a re-discovering when it works well, of communion, of belongingness, of love for each other which they've never experienced, and then they take the content and throw it the hell away. They forget about the topic and glory in feeling communion with each other. Then it can make you very sad. My God, they should have had that four or five, or six years ago. Of course this is a much more prepotent need, to communicate with other people and to feel brotherly...

Frick: ...and the cognitive needs somehow...

Maslow: Well, they're much less important.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Maslow, in your article on metamotivation which was recently published, you said, "Metamotivation now seems not to ensue automatically after basic-need gratification."[1] Now, it seems to me that this represents an important shift in your theoretical position. Is this true?

Maslow: Yes, it's a surprise. I'd always assumed, the way Freud did -- maybe I learned it from Freud -- that if you cleared away the rubbish, and the neuroses and the garbage and so on, then the person would blossom out, that he'd find his own way. I find especially with young people that it just ain't so sometimes. You get people who are in the ... beautiful ... need-gratifying situation and yet get kind of a value pathology. That is, it's possible to be loved and respected, etc. and even so, to feel cynical and nihilistic, and to feel there's nothing worth working for, which is nonsense, of course. Especially in younger rather than older people, you can see this.

---

[1] Maslow, A Theory of Metamotivation. p. 94.

It's sort of a loss of nerve, and I think we're at this point where the traditional culture has broken down altogether, and for many people they just feel, "My God, there's nothing."

Frick: ...there's nothing else but to be gratified in a sense, and it goes back to Schachtel's concept of imbeddedness,[1] I think, don't you?

Maslow: There's some tendency to regress...

Frick: Well, safety, you say, is prepotent. Isn't this involved here?

Maslow: Yes, but I'm talking about people who, as nearly as I can make out, have been brought up well, in my sense, and are living in a very good situation. These <u>are</u> the basic-need gratifications so far as safety and security is concerned, and the love and belongingness is concerned. You know, they have enough glory and applause and appreciation, and self respect and yet they look out on the world and on

---

[1] E.G. Schachtel, <u>Metamorphosis</u>. New York: Basic Books. 1959.

society and say, "My God, what a shambles," and then feel hopeless, some of them.

Frick: In other words, even with all these basic gratifications, they don't move on into any self-actualizing kind of stage?

Maslow: Some do, and some don't. That's quite clear. Some do not. They just get depressed at that point, or a lot of other stuff that I've described as meta-pathology including value disturbances of all kinds: not only cynicism and nihilism, and sort of a destructive type of anarchism rather than the constructive kind, but anomie and hopelessness and pessimism of a kind that, you know, that produces apathy, and then perfectionism which we've seen in the last election of "either I'll have the perfect way or I won't play the game," which, of course, doesn't fit in the real world. This can happen. It can happen with a fair proportion of the youngsters who drop out of the society, and who move toward death, I think, in many cases.

Frick: And in terms of your hierarchy of needs these

young people are basically pretty well gratified, aren't they?

Maslow: That's right, that's right, and this was a surprise. This I've learned really, fully, in the last three or four years.

Frick: What does this mean theoretically, Dr. Maslow? What are the implications here for theory?

Maslow: Well, for me, it makes me feel like more of a missionary than ever. You know, my God, we have that wrong, because there <u>are</u> values. And then I start thinking about publicity and how to get it around, and you know, communication and printing, and writing and distributing, large mass circulation magazines and stuff like that.

Frick: Well, what are the variables here? Let's say we take two people, and one is very basically need-gratified and feeling safe, secure, comfortable, and operating within this framework. The other person is also equally gratified, and yet one person moves on toward something better, and another person stays

here in an imbedded sense. Now, what makes the difference?

Maslow: Well, that's one of the things I'm working on. I'm now in this stage of trying to work out the vocabulary and to crystallize it in my own thoughts. Broadly, it's pro-life and pro-death. There are many other overlapping terms: the winner and the loser, the striver and the non-striver, the success and the failure type, the weak struggler or the active and passive. This is what I am struggling with right now, to find out how it is that some people find the world is beautiful and worthwhile and other people, if they don't get everything they want, are perfectly willing to die or to say, "the hell with the whole damn thing." I've made up all sorts of words, none of them quite good yet, but for the moment, I'm talking about pro-life or life-positive in Wilhelm Reich's sense.

Frick: ...but this life-positive orientation doesn't necessarily come about automatically, does it, as a function of basic need-gratification? Now where does it come? Where does it enter in?

Maslow: Well, again I think it is constitutional in large part, or it can be constitutional. For instance, I watched my granddaughter, two months old (at 4 a.m.), she's such a ...well it could be seen at the age of 24 hours. This was an active baby in the psychoanalytical sense. It was willful. She wanted what she wanted, by gosh. It's not just restlessness. She'll yell her head off until you give her what she wants.

Frick: It's a sense of purpose right there, early.

Maslow: Yes. She needs what she needs when she needs it. She wants what she wants when she wants it, and it's very definite, she knows what she wants. That's another theory. This whole theory of impulse voices--that is of the signal--inner signals. She <u>knows</u> when she's hungry and a passive child or the quiet baby comes into the world without strong appetites, so that they fall asleep at the breast in the middle of the feeding, or, and this is a test for passive children, if you take the breast away from them in the middle of the feeding they're apt to fall asleep, whereas the active baby will yell his head off in

indignation. At the extreme it's as if, I'm taking an extreme obsessional now, he doesn't really know what's going on at all inside himself and he lives by external cues all together: the clock, the calendar, and the schedule. In research work with the obese people, they don't know when to stop eating. They don't know when to start eating, either, and they go by the clock.

Frick: It's time to eat now, kind of thing.

Maslow: That's right, and if you push the clock back, then they eat some more. The wisdom of the body is less, and I think maybe what we call life-positive are people with strong appetites. Well, impulse-voices is my word. It's not quite accurate, but in order to keep your theoretical structure comprehensive something like that has to fill in the gaps in theory to answer this question which you raised, which is such an important, crucial question. I wasn't aware of the <u>question</u> until a couple of years ago.

Frick: Dr. Maslow, it seems to me that this calls for

a kind of a reworking of your whole need hierarchy somehow. The implications are rather important here and I'm inclined to think that this is less instinctoid, that is, the moving over the hurdle, after basic need-gratification I would like to think is less instinctoid than apparently you do.

Maslow: Well, what I'm tentatively thinking and, you know, your guess is as good as mine....If we had lots of decades more to live, and to work at it, I would try to test this hypothesis of the impulse voices, meaning the strength of the need. That is, to save the whole need hierarchy. There's another variable, maybe, which is the strength of the whole blasted thing, or the weakness of the whole thing.

Frick: Right--all the way through. Yes, that would bridge the gap then, wouldn't it?

Maslow: That's right. The weakly, hungry person, the weakly sexed person, the one who can't sleep--who's not a good sleeper, or the one who's less apt to know what he wants because the voice is so weak.

Frick: Well, you know, certain studies have been made comparing sexual gusto and activity with zest in eating and they seem to go together, this appetite kind of thing.

Maslow: I haven't read any of those studies but I would guess that.

Frick: Dr. Maslow, this seems to suggest that this plateau, or this stage in one's life, is damn important--that is, after the basic needs have been gratified. This seems to be a crucial period for people--in marriage, and personally--do you sense this?

Maslow: Well, I just wrote a paper about it. It's going to be published next year some time and is called "Theory Z," did I send that to you?

Frick: No, I'd like to have it.

Maslow: Then I'll give you a copy of it.

Frick: This may be the most crucial period that man goes through, you know, if we could identify when he goes through it. I think it's different for different people, but...

Maslow: Well, we can talk about self-actualizing people at different levels much more than I ever thought ten years ago. For one thing there's this becoming acquainted with people who had everything. I mean everything in my terms, in psychological terms rather than automobiles, and yet who could be quite unhappy and not know their way and stagger, and stumble around and do all sorts of dopey things, and stupid things. Then there was another differentiation that I had to make, that of people who were basic need-gratified, neurosis free, and using some capacities well and yet being "merely healthy" as I call it, the "merely healthy" as over against the transcenders. Well, I think the difference comes from those who have peak experiences and those who don't, more or less. That's what I described first for self-actualizing people who are transcenders mostly, people in whom the basic need-gratification would automatically lead to the value system which implies also the bodhisattva path. That is, the helping service to humanity or the helping of other people.

Frick: The homonomous kind of development.

Maslow: That's right, and of simply becoming better human beings for others, as well as for themselves, and finally of transcending the ego...

Frick: ...in peak experience?

Maslow: That's right, and then of remaining that way, that is, becoming a different kind of human being in the Eastern sense, or the awakened, or the illuminated, or what we might call the "sage," or what I prefer to call the sage-saint. Well, the one who really got me onto this distinction was Eleanor Roosevelt who just had no peak experiences. She said she didn't know what it meant and yet she was clearly self-actualizing by all the criteria I had set forth: she was basic need-gratified, using capacities well, using herself well, obviously not a neurotic person, and she had transcended the troubles of her childhood.

Frick: ...and yet something was missing.

Maslow: Something was missing and then I got pushed into the corner with this. Then I had to say...well, take a man like Truman, who is clearly not a lofty person, not a saint, you could hardly call him that--or even

a sage--or finally, just to make it, with Eisenhower. I just can't have great respect for him, but he fits our criteria, at least these minimal criteria, and so then I talk about the "merely healthy". I called it at first the "Truman-Eisenhower-Roosevelt" syndrome and separated it off from people like Martin Buber and Aldous Huxley whom I worked with before he died, and people like that. Well, these were two trends of people. With Truman and Eisenhower you can talk about values and there is apt to be an acceptance of the culture. They're like the culture and they find it quite good, and work within it, and improve within it. Certainly their aims are benevolent, they're well wishers, and they have no malice. Eisenhower certainly has very little malice. He's a nice man, and a good man <u>but</u> something is missing. And so I talk about "merely healthy" then. This last paper, I think, is very important for me, because I have to struggle through with these. You are raising questions which I have to raise and which were very disturbing and confusing.

Frick: Dr. Maslow, some good material has been written recently concerning crisis theory. This is something

I'm particularly interested in at the present time and I wonder what you think of it, and in the light of our conversation whether this may be one possible answer to explain what can happen to help individuals move from basic need-gratification or the "merely healthy" into true self-actualization. Now, I'm thinking of Dabrowski's book, Positive Disintegration.[1] I'm thinking of Laing's center for so-called psychotics and also of Menninger's recent attention to this issue in his book The Vital Balance.[2] In a provocative section he calls "weller than well" Menninger talks about the tremendous potential of crisis and disintegration for the personality in terms of growth. Now, maybe here is a possible answer for a lot of people. In other words, the men I have mentioned see crisis and disintegration of the personality as a prerequisite for growth at different periods of time in life. What do you think about this?

---

[1]Kazimierz Dabrowski, Positive Disintegration. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1964.

[2]Karl Menninger, The Vital Balance. New York: The Viking Press. 1963. See pages 406-417.

Maslow: Well, it looks as if it is more true than otherwise. I can certify it's not always true. There are people who are very fortunate people, and I just have no idea of their number in the population, but there are some people who just placidly and calmly live a good life without great crises, that is, without disintegration.

Frick: But are they "merely healthy?"

Maslow: No, they can move on to the highest levels that we know about.

Frick: ...and do it gradually?

Maslow: ...and do it gradually. I think they're probably less in number than the ones who have to go into a big turmoil to come through to...

Frick: ...higher levels of integration.

Maslow: Yes, but as to the Dabrowski theory, I have a pal that I work with, a psychoanalyst, we've published a paper together and probably will others.[1] He's a good friend, and I like talking with him. He gives

---

[1]Dr. Harry Rand, Psychoanalyst.

me my vicarious clinical experience which I don't have the time for now, and we've talked for about ten years. He had a patient about ten years ago who was almost a model for the crisis theory, maybe better than some of Dabrowski's cases. Here was a guy who was a patient and he was a patient for being a son-of-a-bitch, to put it briefly. He was a nasty man. He was very wealthy and used people, especially women, and he was sadistic and cruel. In psychoanalysis things moved a little too fast, I would guess, and he realized he was a son-of-a-bitch. I think this was just too much for a person to take, and he went crazy. He went into a florid psychosis, a schizophrenic psychosis, and was in the hospital for about eight months. But somehow, perhaps because he was in psychoanalysis through it all, he retained all the insights that a schizophrenic can have and came out a wonderful man. He came out a very fine man who devoted himself to good works.

Frick: A complete switch of the value system.

Maslow: Absolutely, and he has been that way ever since, about ten years. He never will have another

psychotic break. There's no doubt about it.

Frick: That's quite a story.

Maslow: We've watched him, and followed this up through the years and you would say now, he's a very fine man.

Frick: Has this been written up at all?

Maslow: I think I mentioned it in some place, but we had thought to get more cases, but they just never came along in that same beautiful way. Also my impulse is that if somebody else is doing it, well, they're taking care of it. Dr. Hobart Mowrer has been collecting such cases for about a decade and the conversion experience which is part of it. Silverman, Laing and Dabrowski are using disintegration--these sudden breaks--and using it well for insight and then for working through. In just the same way that you would say with LSD, it can be either a plain kind of damaging thing, or if it's used well, then it can help, and it can be built upon and of course, Dabrowski is building upon it. Only this does not always happen. In getting the life history of a group of

self-actualizing people I discovered that two of them were severly neurotic, characteristically into their 40's. Then there was a great cosmic consciousness, a sort of a conversion moment. In one of the persons it was a single moment where he saw the whole world differently. I don't know whether to call it a peak experience or not. I call it cosmic consciousness following Bucke.[1] In the other person it took about a week. It was a week of turmoil and of change but in essence a sort of a cosmic consciousness. And the neuroses disappeared, spontaneously, forever, and then they became what I saw, these wonderful people, saintly people. So this can happen, there's no question about it.

Frick: Yes, and you're suggesting here that the crisis experience is most valuable for a person who has been living a neurotic or disturbed life up to that point, aren't you?

Maslow: Well, I would say...my guess is that if the life were too neurotic, there would be a very severe break.

---

[1] R. M. Bucke. Cosmic Consciousness. Philadelphia: Innes and Sons. 1901.

Frick: ...there would have to be, to change.

Maslow: That's right, and I think that throughout history they would have simply gone crazy, and stayed crazy. Now we have new knowledge, new techniques.

Frick: Now we have a different way of looking at the experience, don't we?

Maslow: That's right, that's right.

Frick: Laing sees it, for example, as a voyage into the self, a self-discovery kind of voyage, and it's quite a unique way of looking at the psychoses, I think.

Maslow: Well, the man who taught me that...as much as anyone else, was well...this case--this one case of my friend I have already mentioned. John Rosen's understanding of schizophrenia was for me very helpful. I think I got more feeling, more instruction out of Hannah Green's book, I Never Promised You a Rose Garden,[1] than I have out of any book I've ever read on schizophrenia. That's a wonderful book and I've used it for my students.

---

[1] Hannah Green, I Never Promised You a Rose Garden. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Frick: It is a beautiful thing.

Maslow: I'm not going in much for crisis theory because other people are taking care of it very nicely, and I would add there the Erik Erikson kind of thing,[1] the milder or the normal crisis, you might say.

Frick: I do a lot of counseling work at Albion College and I experienced the value of crisis even before I was very familiar with crisis theory. I was having experiences with students in therapy over and over again that bore this out. I had a dramatic one early this semester, extremely dramatic, and it was the same kind of thing.

Maslow: Well, you keep your eye open, and you will find among your best people...I'm thinking now of one girl, who may be certainly one of the best in this psychological sense. She was a wonderful young woman, whom I knew first as a freshman, about eight years ago. The critical moment or the crises for her were mild. They weren't great blowups. She had a wonderful

---

[1]See Erik H. Erikson, Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co. 1968.

father whom I had met and talked with, and she's just lived a good life. She's a strong girl and was able...Every crisis she ever went through was so fruitful for her that it was mild, you might say. The Laing model really is too extreme. She lived a good life, just as if she were going step by step upward, without any steps back.

Frick: She was able to make use of this experience on her own, maybe, without a lot of help.

Maslow: Well, some help. I was the benevolent one around because I liked her and I was so interested in her, then her father must have been a help because he was a very fine, understanding man. But essentially she was on her own, and she handled herself very, very well.

Frick: Dr. Maslow, our discussion of crisis theory leads me into another question. You've talked about the perfect society and have used the concept of synergy.[1] Let us suppose that we could develop a

---

[1] See A. H. Maslow, "Synergy in the Society and in the Individual", Journal of Individual Psychology, vol. 20, November 1964.

healthy or utopian society, compatible with man's intrinsic nature, where we have a synergic relationship between the social system and the individual. What would happen in a society that offered only gratification? Is it possible to conceive of this?

Maslow: Well, we can't conceive of it historically. It's impossible to conceive of, because there is more than just one person. We would have to have conflict and the pacing, at least, of gratification. You'd have to have certain controls, such as inhibitions and delay. I'm talking about Apollonian control as over against repressive control. The Apollonian approach would not call the gratifications into question, but only the pacing and would say, if you Apollonize, "take it easy, be orderly about this thing and don't rush it." It would actually increase the pleasures of gratification in the long run. But, always there remains the ultimate things of "I fall in love with you, and you know you're not in love with me," or "you're my Papa, and you die, and I'm four years old," etc. I simply cannot conceive of the vicissitudes of life just disappearing,

so that we'll always have them. I think that what we'll have to do in the theory of eupsychia is to learn how to make hay out of them, how to use them well, and to learn how to soften the blows when they tend to become traumatic or dangerous. How do we strengthen people so that they can take a trauma and profit by it instead of being hurt by it? I have a big chapter planned in this big system book on the beauties and the benefits of frustration. This is like the outward bound kind of thing, do you know what that is? The outward bound program is the teaching of young men to handle danger and hardship. You know, the experience of being alone in the wilderness for five days, etc. I think this is very fine and very good for building a stronger person who can then face traumatic experiences and conflicts, and anxieties and overcome them and profit by them.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Maslow, there are many fads that have come along as a part of the new third force psychology: sensory awareness, sensitivity groups, nude therapy, and so on. Now, I'm not demeaning these developments, but some of the experiments and activities seem to be

peripheral in a sense, and I'm wondering how you look upon them. Are they of real significance in this whole movement?

Maslow: Well, since I've had something to do with all of them, kind of setting them in motion...I'm all for...I think of this as part of the scientific process. I call it first-stage science. Some people call it openness, being ready to try anything out, but without a priori commitments. That is you try it out the way you try this pair of shoes or another pair of shoes to see how it works, and how it fits, and whether you like it or not. For instance, I had suggested this nude therapy thing in my journal which was published, there was a little suggestion about it and then some guy came along and took it up.

Frick: Paul Bendrim.

Maslow: Yes. I don't think I would have. I think that the culture was not quite ready for it yet. But in principle I'd say, well, because I got involved in it, I would say "Gosh, I don't know how it's going to work. It's a thought, it's an experiment, it's a gamble." Obviously, the thing to do is to try it out,

evaluate it and if it works well, then you go on from there. If it works badly then it's out. So that I have no commitment to it working or not working, and I've suggested many things even where I feel skeptical. I think I would gamble that they would not work, but I think they ought to be tried anyhow. I think that at this level of scientific exploration we ought to be quite willing to try all sorts of cockeyed experiments and not pre-judge the case. We ought to post-judge the case.

Frick: Right, give it a try and then evaluate it.

Maslow: As for fads, anything can become a fad and I, myself, certainly am prepared for that. I mean the history of religions, you know, I was just reading last night about Buddhism and you get a fine man like Buddha and look what happened to his teachings. That's for any religious leader and I think for any intellectual leader, it gets corrupted to some extent, and that's always been true.

Frick: Dr. Maslow, one final question. What do you see for American psychology in the next few decades? What do you see in terms of the status of behaviorism

and its future? Where are we going with the new third force psychology? Could you comment briefly on these related items?

Maslow: Well, I'm very convinced that many of our differences in opinions and philosophy are characterological differences and temperamental differences, so I think we are going to have more positivistic people and more humanistic people. I think a million years from today there are going to be people who like rigor more, and those who like rigor less, and people who will like a third decimal place and others who are more global, and some who love warm human relations, and some who love cool human relations. So I think there will always be something of that, and that will have it's affects, but I think that for the immediate future we can incorporate. These are not contradictory, except as images of man.

Frick: This is a pretty basic difference, isn't it?

Maslow: They're philosophical differences rather than scientific differences, and I think the philosophical differences are going to become very clear in the next decade.

Frick: A sharpening up of these differences?

Maslow: Yes, so that they won't...I think the brightest and most intelligent behaviorists will be content to give up the cosmic kind of generalizations, and to recognize that their work with the pigeons or white rats or whatever is perfectly all right without making a cosmic philosophy out of it. I think we are going to have a much more eclectic psychology or what used to be called eclectic, but I would say now a really more comprehensive philosophy of psychology.

Frick: This is what you're trying to do in your book?

Maslow: That's what I'll be doing if I live long enough. Big job!

Frick: Thank you, Dr. Maslow.

INTERVIEW WITH DR. GARDNER MURPHY

George Washington University, February 14, 1969

Frick: Dr. Murphy, as I have studied the holistic personality theorists, I have identified at least two major holistic themes. The first theme stresses the drive for self-consistency, or organization, and bringing completion to incomplete structure. The second theme stresses the evolution of the personality, seeing the personality as always in flux, always growing, changing, and in process. And it seems to me that these two theories of growth are in conflict. If number one is true, that is, if the personality is always striving for organization and cohesion or self-consistency as Lecky called it, what explains growth in the personality and change, and evolution? It seems to me that these two themes have not been adequately tied together theoretically or conceptually, and I wonder if you would comment on this.

Murphy: Well, I think there are two possible answers to that dilemma or apparent contradiction, and the first is represented by Kurt Goldstein going way back to the Gelb-Goldstein studies of brain-injured men

in the first World War, showing that visual space, for example, reconstitutes itself after damage to the brain, and the man moves towards an orderly structured, or integrated visual totality. Of course, later, in the other publications like Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology, he developed this into a personality theory, undertaking to show that there is always movement towards the realization of a hidden potential, a somewhat Aristotelian way of viewing growth and assuming that there has to be a final or ultimate goal towards which we move. Now, the other point of view would be represented, I suppose, by orthodox Gestalt psychology let's say by Wertheimer and certainly by Koffka and Köhler, with an emphasis upon movement towards fulfillment of a praegnanz, the achievement of an order which is as good as possible in terms of some logical or mathematical or frankly normative goal of beauty or goodness.

Frick: It's kind of a perfection, isn't it, the striving for an achievement of perfection.

Murphy: Yes, it certainly involves that assumption. If

you pursue either of these, either the Goldstein or the classical Gestalt view, you can say that growth of any sort--let's say involving differentiation and then integration of the differentiated parts--is compatible with, or even very close to, this idea of fulfillment. I don't think that the conflict is very great, really, as you state them. I think that there is a potential conflict in the sense that the latter, the evolutionary conception, is closer to data. It's better grounded in observational reality whereas the former as a perfectionist scheme is a platonic definition of an ideal and, in fact, somewhat glories in its remoteness from empirical grounding. It's for this reason that I have almost no use for the first idea. I have the feeling that most of our contemporary theories of holism are wildly idealistically remote from the grubby difficult task of finding out where growth of a particular sort is actually occurring or not. I think there's a danger of using fiat, or using verbal violence on the data, to say no matter what disturbed or frightened child you encounter in clinical practice that he is seeking growth. Well, maybe

he is seeking to get even with a sibling, or with a father, and all that is immediately apparent is the struggle to inch up a little bit of gamesmanship--one upmanship--in favor of himself at the moment. I think Lecky very grossly ignored that problem in the sense that he actually didn't deal with the fact that a great many people move away from consistency with a great deal of satisfaction. They don't want to be trapped into the kind of consistency that....

Frick: ....that he was speaking about.

Murphy: Yes, I think it's the empirical reality that human life is full of both a movement toward consistency and movement away from consistency, at different times, and at different places, with different people. And I think that lacquering this all over with a sort of smooth surface to give the impression that there is only one motive, and that it is in an ideal direction is really a disservice to the investigator's task. Now, I've taken quite a different direction, actually, about this in my efforts to bring Pythagoras into the picture in the little paperback, Psychological

Thought from Pythagoras to Freud,[1] which was recently published. I have attempted to show that there is a kind of perfection in mathematical order as Pythagoras saw it, and as Descarte saw it, and as a number of evolutionary biologists like D,Arcy Thompson are saying it in this century. But I think that that is based on quite firm and solid biological observation and that it remains for the psychologist to show the same degree of discipline, the same respect for data that those biologists have shown. And if they can, in other words, if these ideas about achieving symmetry, rhythm, order, and ultimate perfection are found as richly in psychological domains, particularly in personality study, as they are at the level of studying, let's say, the veins of leaves or the paths of paramesium; if, in other words, psychology can really learn its lesson from biology, then I say we will have gained a great deal from it. I think beginning with the ideal and insisting that our data must take this ideal form is not very helpful in a scientific enterprise.

---

[1]Gardner Murphy, Psychological Thought from Pythagoras to Freud. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1968.

Frick: Well, Dr. Murphy, you're suggesting then that growth and change and the vicissitudes of life that go along with this, is a more important principle than the principle of self-consistency?

Murphy: Yes, I think so, definitely, partly because there are workmanlike, orderly, disciplined ways of approaching problems of growth, rhythm, and symmetry. The techniques have developed to a high pitch and need to be respected and used, rather than replaced, I think, by a verbal solution to the problems.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, I had thought that one of the best ways to resolve this conflict, if indeed there is one here between these two principles of growth--consistency versus change--is by using the concept of crisis as a conceptual bridge. That is, it seems to me that if the personality does reach a point of cohesion and self-consistency and stability, the continued growth of that person might be explained by a crisis experience as suggested by Dabrowski in his book Positive Disintegration, and in Menninger's The Vital Balance, where he talks about people who have grown through crisis. I'm wondering how you feel about this use

of the concept of crisis?

Murphy: Well, I have a great deal of respect for the concept. I would add, I think, reference to the evolutionary sequence of crises as developed, for example in Schrödinger's What is Life, a very brilliant and powerful study, I think, of the way in which "step functions" as he calls them, the sudden, dramatic, forward movements appear in the evolutionary sequence indicating that very often, if the organism is stymied for a very long time, it's perfectly hopeless to expect a series of minimal gradations, like the old Darwinian minimal random variations, to produce the new. You have mutation theory and then you have this theory of the step-function. Now, offering a crisis serves as an alternative way of developing out of the groove in which one has been moving. Another illustration coming from a very different point is Toynbee's idea of challenge and response, in which he's saying that society may go on for thousands of years with very little change, and then may be either made or broken, depending upon the form and amount of challenge to

the traditional ways. The crisis may be sufficiently severe to destroy, but if it does not destroy, it may evoke some potential....

Frick: Creating new developments--positive developments.

Murphy: Yes, particularly in the form of leadership. I think Margaret Mead's recent book on her follow-up on the Manus study that she did in the late 20's, showing the powerful effect of one brilliant political leader--social, cultural leader--is very interesting in contrast to the many other hapless groups in the South Pacific that didn't have any dramatic leader of the particular sort. I think your idea also could be pursued in the philosophical direction by going back to Hegel and Marx and perhaps Herbert Spencer and in modern times, Heinz Werner, all of whom look for specific dramatic conditions under which a process which is organized at a rather low level is forced by the crisis situation to a higher order and more articulate form of organization, which is, of course, Herbert Spencer's idea. But I'm thinking now, particularly, of the dialectical way of stating this

issue as Hegel and then Marx formulated it. I think you can say that we don't have a very clear theory of crisis, but if you mean a threat to life, if you mean a threat to integrity, then I think the issue can be phrased rather simply as a question of whether there is a tightening of structure, or whether there is a dissolution of structure. You can strike with a battle axe hard enough to crush. Short of that you may just blunt your axe on the metal in the door. It takes a certain intensity to get a result, and of course, biologists just up and touch with this all the time with acid-base balances, and saying that you will get a result, or you will not get a result, depending upon the resistance of the organism to this particular blow that's being applied. Very often you make or break with a single confrontation. I think crisis theory is sound in those cases.

Frick: Well, Dr. Murphy, this leads me to think of the student revolts taking place all over the country today. I was reading the Washington Post this morning, and there were about four or five major confrontations going on in institutions across the country

yesterday. How do you feel about these student demonstrations and revolts? Doesn't this represent a kind of a crisis situation that may evolve into something better for education in the long run. I can't believe it is all bad, although it looks awfully violent right now. I wonder how you view this, and....

Murphy: Well, it's a very mixed dish. I don't really know too much about it. My wife and I were teaching in New York City thirty years ago and in that area we saw a great deal of constructive student demand upon faculties. At Sarah Lawrence College where she taught it was very rich in faculty-student channels of communication. Student's ideas were taken very seriously and the progressive achievement of the college was based <u>largely</u> upon the willingness of the faculty to listen long and hard to the ideas that were being developed by the students, not only by seniors but even by lower classmen. We didn't get at Columbia as much dialogue as we would have liked. We didn't get as much urgency, as much eagerness on the part of undergraduate students as we could have used. Well,

now, we look back at New York after these years and we see a situation--let's begin with Columbia--in which obviously the administration, and to some degree the faculty, had not been distinguished at all for eagerness in getting the student point of view. And when you hear about reports lying on tables for months, you have to ask yourself, "did the students have reason to believe that they could get a result, except by being pretty vigorous?" And, of course, they went wild. When you start swinging brickbats around, somebody is going to get hurt. Of course, the method is out of proportion. That would follow from the dialectical nature of the discussion: the thesis-antithesis, the "hit-him-once and he-hits-you-twice" kind of approach which is going to be followed when feelings really run high. Now, I don't think that the feelings ran at any time to a point which warrants the feeling on the part of the staff that students have gotten out of hand. They have gotten out of <u>our</u> hands, yes, but society is going to be the ultimate judge in this situation through political and economic and other constraints. I don't see how either a

public or a private institution of education, and through its administration or its faculty, can take the position that "we know what's good education and we know who should be admitted to this and how he should be guided through the educational process." It seems to me we have discovered collectively as a society that we are not giving an intimate enough, rich enough, individualized enough education. We live in a period of specialization and we don't know how to produce people with broad and general knowledge and wisdom. We know how to make people more and more refined in their specialization. We know how to get government contracts for bigshot professors and to assign graduate students to work with them but we don't really know very much about general education in a free society, as they called it at Harvard. And I think there is going to be a lot of wastage and a lot of skulls are ultimately going to get cracked in the process of adjusting educational systems to the demands of a rapidly changing society.

Frick: ...and to the needs of the young people as they seem to feel them.

Murphy: I'm putting it that way but I'm putting it, really, primarily in terms of the salvaging of the society in view of the racial tensions, but particularly the international situation and the very considerable likelihood that we will blow ourselves off the face of this earth within a few years at the rate at which things are going. We live with the fail-safe type of risk, and the likelihood of somebody making a blunder somewhere, somehow; the likelihood that the political machinery will become ineffective to control the military potential. It seems to me entirely proper to have a great deal of milling around and experimental efforts to dislodge the present, rather sleepy leadership and get into serious experimentation with our educational system. I think there has been relatively little experimental education in the last few decades. Mostly, people learn their subject-matter stuff and they go into classes and they retell the stuff, and the students write it down, and they go along and find their slots in life, and I don't think that's enough. I don't think that can be justified in terms of the need of our society. So, I'm not condoning violence or arrogance or

impulsiveness. I'm saying that these are a part of the bi-product of sitting on the lid for a very long time and failing to grasp the magnitude of the forces that were building up underneath.

Frick: You recognize not only the individual student needs but you see this in terms of the needs of the total society that have really been neglected here?

Murphy: Yes. I think the student can very well ask for the fulfillment of his own needs, but I don't think he can stop there. The student is a relatively fortunate person. The further he goes along with his education the more special and fortunate he is. There are a lot of people who don't have those privileges. The problem is really whether the educational system can reconstruct American life and World life fast enough to prevent the holocaust that otherwise I think is likely to come.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, I would like to shift now to another theoretical question. You have supported what you have called a "soft determinism" approach in human development. You used that term in your

book, Human Potentialities. In talking about soft determinism you made the statement that "spontaneity in the sense of causelessness, we cannot use." Now, Abraham Maslow has done a lot of writing on unmotivated behavior or metamotivation, and I'm wondering if you reject this concept of Maslow's in the light of your statement on soft determinism?

Murphy: Well, I'm not familiar enough with Abe's writing to handle it in the terms that you put to me. I'd rather simply say, as I see the thing, the real philosophical issue is between "hard" determinism (as William James called it), and "soft" determinism. The "hard" determinism is fatalism or external control over man. Man is conceived to be the hapless pawn in the hands of vast cosmic forces which he cannot control. "Soft" determinism says that man is himself a part of the system of cosmic forces and and these forces, so to speak, flow through him. He represents a little sheltered structure through which bio-chemical and physiological forces operate, and he does what is his nature to do. You find James, and many others of course, have developed this far

more fully than I have in the Human Potentialities book. I'm saying, essentially, that to protest against being oneself is a rather empty kind of thing. The more fully one developes into an understanding of one's situation, the more likely one is to achieve some sort of freedom that means something, which is an intelligent, thoughtful consideration of options and selection of options which are realistic. But this is done by virtue not of arbitrary spontaneity, as James would have said, but by virtue of the utilization in a rational, orderly way, of the powers that one has as a living system. Now, that can be called determinism but it's not fatalism at all. It makes man a part of the causal sequence.

Frick: It certainly involves choice, doesn't it? Man's ability or power to choose is essential here.

Murphy: Yes, but the power to choose is itself the power to realize what one is and therefore does not involve indeterminism. Most people who talk about free will talk as if there were some freedom in doing something alien to one's own nature and that, to me, is senseless. I think to do something that is fully

in accord with oneself, laid down by the nature of one's own being, can be called "soft" determinism in James' sense of the term. I don't think there's any escape hatch here, philosophically. I don't think that one can then come back and say, when Oliver Cromwell decided to punish the Irish for their role in the Civil War, "too bad he did this, because he could have done so many other things." I think this is nonsensical. I think Oliver Cromwell did what his military personality and the kind of a person he was required, which was an essentially sadistic thing.

Frick: You are saying that he couldn't have acted in any other way, really.

Murphy: He had complete freedom in the sense that he had the freedom to be what he was. And that's exactly the kind of freedom that I hope for. I don't want to transcend myself by doing things alien to my nature.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, in your book, Encounter with Reality, you give a great deal of attention and

support to the socialization of reality-seeking about which you say, "it is a matter of introducing levels of reality which are richer in value than those already existing in the individual." You have also suggested that by sharing in a group-defined world that we believe to be real, we let ourselves not only in for illusion, but for reality, not only for self-deception, but for social discovery. Now, Maslow has suggested as one major criterion of healthy personality, the transcendence of culture, or society. The ability, in other words, to say to hell with a value of society if the individual really is against this value system. And I'm wondering if you're in disagreement with this or not?

Murphy: No, I don't think there's any real difference of opinion. In my book, Human Potentialities, Part III: "Breaking Through the Mold" is concerned very much with this process which you quote from Maslow. It's the process by which one takes a critical and reconstructive attitude toward the cultural manifold that we're caught in. As a matter of fact, a lot of people have said this. You know the sociologist

J. K. Folsom, almost forty years ago, set up the opposition between culture and creativity, in a book that I read. I began to discover that anthropoligists were very well aware of this fact; that culture can either be a flexible mold, or a tight, hard mold that's hard to cut through. So I'm glad the psychologists are waking up. I'm glad I had a chance to be one of those responding to this essentially anthropological discovery, I think.

Frick: This might be relevant to a previous question concerning self-consistency versus growth. I think that if we're bound by our culture, it does lead to certain rigidities in the individual personality, wouldn't you say?

Murphy: Yes, but there are rigidities in the group situation which are much more difficult to cope with than at the individual level, because we support each other and make a sort of fortress to resist new possibilities. The individual, after all, is ultimately and as a rule, at the mercy of the group rigidity. But there is very little, actually, that the individual

can ordinarily do to cut through the social rigidities. The history of science has been largely a history of the struggle of the investigator or his little group to cut through the crystallized, dogmatic convictions prevalent in science as in other fields in any given era. Quoting Abe, I think the best thing Abe has ever done, is The Psychology of Science. It is a brilliant book in which he has shown the crystallized nature of science and why only a very human kind of approach can grasp the artificialities that are involved in the scientific system.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, in my interview with Dr. Maslow, he talked in a rather humorous way about his "great fear and timidity," as he called it, in presenting his unorthodox study on self-actualizing individuals. He interpreted some of his dreams during this time as being symbolic of his fears of being thrown out of the American Psychological Association. You have also given a great deal of support and encouragement to an unpopular area in psychology and, of course, I'm speaking of your interest in parapsychology and the paranormal phenomena. You gave outspoken support to

this area when it was not popular and when it was not really acceptable or respectable in psychology.

Murphy: It's not respectable at all. It's still anathema to over half the psychologists.

Frick: I'm wondering if you ever felt any anxiety over your professional standing or personal development, for your support of these phenomena?

Murphy: Sure, and I would want it to continue that way. It's going to take a very long time, much longer than my lifetime, to get these phenomena organized, documented, replicated, so that they are going to gradually find their way into the body of science. And in the meantime, they are so alien to the general organized forms of science that they are going to involve severe punishment--social, and intellectual ostracism--directed against anybody. It's much harder on the young people who are trying to get themselves economically established. One of our major jobs is to encourage freedom and confidence among young psychologists, and people in other sciences, but it's not going to be an easy road for them. It

never has been in the history of science for anything that's alien to the organized thought patterns.

Frick: Alien to the established laws that we work with...

Murphy: Yes, the understood ways, and of course it's largely 19th Century physics that's making the trouble. It's not the middle of the 20th Century physics. We have lots more physicists studying and oriented toward serious consideration of extra-sensory perception, for example, than psychologists. This is because modern physics is a relatively flexible, intellectually rich and complex, rapidly flowing system of ideas. So you talk to a creative physicist and he begins to try to be helpful as to how his ideas might help you in <u>your</u> research. But you don't expect to find psychologists, for the most part, close enough to modern physics to understand. They're sure that in Newtonian terms, or even in 19th Century terms, these phenomena are impossible, and that's all there is to it.

Frick: Well, Dr. Murphy, when you come out in your

writings in support of parapsychology, and you have written some recent material on the paranormal phenomena, do you ever feel any real anxiety over your position in terms of your respectability among psychologists?

Murphy: Sure. You have to be realistic about that. Now a lot of people... There are two large classes of people. There are people who think that I'm irresponsible and misleading the youth like Socrates and worse, and then there are people who say I'm a nice guy and I'm generally respectable and everyone has his foibles, and what if Murphy has his own....

Frick: ...he's only human, huh?

Murphy: Yes. You have to expect that. It's part of the game.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you've often addressed yourself to the union of human organisms with the material and social environment and the isomorphic relationship that can grow between them or that potentially exists between them. In pursuing this theme, you have said that man is a part of the sweep of the cosmos, and

that he responds to cosmic patterns as an integral part of his self-structure. You are fond of saying, too, that "man resonates with cosmic structure as a part of his nature...." I have been greatly stimulated by these statements of yours that appear in your Human Potentialities book, but I have sometimes wished for specific examples of such resonance between man and the cosmos when I have been thinking about my own life. I wonder if you could give me some specific illustrations of this kind of union or isomorphic condition that can take place.

Murphy: Well, if you stand on the seashore and begin to analyze the different cadences, the different rising and falling sounds of the waves and the wind, you become aware of the fact that your own breathing, your own heartbeat, so far as you walk or run along the sand, the resonance of your own locomotion picks up the ultimate vibratory or other rhythmic patterns that are going on there. If you're interested in music you discover that the sound of the sigh or the exaltant shout, or the gentle up and down movements and cadences of the song of joy or a lullaby, are all

incorporations of cosmic rhythms into the human rhythm. And it couldn't be anything else. If you go back to the evolutionary approach, to the beginning of respiratory function, traced down to the oxidative process; if you study the osmotic pressures, and the ways in which some substances are accumulated more and more within the living system until they reach a certain limit, and then begin to be excreted, or eliminated, you begin to realize that the life system has to be patterned on the rhythms of the world because it was constituted out of the rhythms of the world. And I think the same would be true of the cycles of the seasons. I've tried to do a study of Asian psychology. If you compare the psychology of India with the psychology of Greece, the differences are to a considerable extent explanable in terms of the fact that in the choppy, rapidly changing seasons with the alternate mountains and valleys as you travel through Greece, you get every mood being broken by a new mood. You have different aspects of nature different parts of the year in different parts of Greece. When you go to India you

have the one great high plain, the Deccan Plain, which sweeps across all of India except the northern river valley. And this means that between the great Monsoons, a period of ten months, India presents you the same face continuously. You don't have rain, you don't have any unexpected heat or wind, for the most part. It's a stable...almost an eternity as you face it. And if you look at the actual texture of Greek psychology and Indian psychology, you would find that they arise, or appear to arise, to a considerable degree from these actual differences, as of course has been recognized by many historians and geographers. I would think you could pursue this right down to a good deal of detail. I think you could show that the ecology in terms of the physics, chemistry, geology, the meteorology and climatology to which man adapts, bring into his body the different rhythms, different patterns, in different parts of the world, and at different times in history. So I don't think there's any mystery at all about man being isomorphic with the cosmic structure.

Frick: Would this include also, Dr. Murphy, an ab...ity

and sensitivity to perceive and react to cosmic patterns and to natural phenomena? Now I was thinking that not too long ago, following a gentle rain, there were drops of water on some bushes behind my house and every drop of water on every branch was serving as a prism as the sun began to shine through the bushes. I was quite taken by this scene because I could see hundreds and hundreds of miniature prisms. Would this be an example of resonating with the cosmic kind of materials that you're talking about--just the responding to this kind of thing here?

Murphy: Yes. You could take a particular kind of rhythm. Let's say, stating it carefully in mathematical terms, start with the spectrum, the solar spectrum or any other orderly presentation of light. Let's say the prism splitting like Newton--the white light into the component spectrum of colors--you can follow that through the water, you can follow it into the eye, and you can follow the mathematical relations the way Polyak did at the University of Chicago. You can study this through to the visual purple and the action of the supporting cells, and retinal cells,

the cones of the retina, you could on through the optic chiasm to the occipital region of the brain and you could show that the basic mathematical form has remained invariant. What's there in the sun, what's there in the water drop, what's there in the retina, what's there in the occipital lobe of the brain, are all one rhythm. It's not a series of billiard balls each one knocking the next one. It is actually, literally, the same wave form and, mathematically, the same expression all the way through. But, of course, this has been said by the neo-realists. E. B. Holt said this way back in 1912. It was said by Selig Hecht, the student of visual physiology and psychology. "Cast your material into invariant form," he used to say, you can get your phenomena to the point where you can see that you're not dealing with the whimsies of different media, but with the basic uniformity of the mathematical pattern.

Frick: But doesn't it depend, ultimately...when you say "cosmic consciousness"--and you have used this term--this designates the importance, I think, of

the awareness of one's world in response to one's own nature. I mean you can take this to any level and you can get very physiological and mathematical, but in terms of cosmic consciousness, this depends upon man's awareness of this kind of relationship with his environment, doesn't it?

Murphy: Well, I think for some people it does. But I think that the experiences called "cosmic consciousness" are widely variable. I think that the different disciplines which lead to so-called cosmic consciousness result in very different potentialities to be released in different people. I'm not convinced, for example, that yoga and Zen Buddism and psychedelic drugs, and deep hypnosis produce identical states even though they may all be loosely called by some such name as cosmic consciousness. I think we don't know this field very well. I don't think that phenomenological descriptions are very good. I do think that cosmic consciousness in the sense of awareness of some sort of meaning of the universe as a whole, is accessible to widely varying kinds of people depending partly on the culture but

very largely on other variables we don't know about. There's a beautiful study in the journal, Daedalus in 1958 by Edith Cobb, describing the experiences of this kind of universal awareness in small children. She has collected hundreds and hundreds of childrens' reports on this early sense. It is very similar to what you get in Wordsworth's Ode on Intimations of Immortality. It is the experience of the small child in belonging, not just to his parents, or not just to his home, but somehow to this whole universe. What this ultimately means, I don't think I know, but I would include it among the universally accessible testimony to experiencing something that transcends the competitive individual.

Frick: ...right, the competitive striving...There's a great deal in your concepts of cosmic consciousness and the idea that man is a part of the sweep of the cosmos. I think there's a lot of similarity between this concept and Maslow's "peak" experience, or maybe going back even to Freud's "oceanic feeling." And, of course, it's also called the "mystical experience."

Murphy: Yes, but I think that these terms are very hard to define. The term "mystical" is one with exceptionally broad connotations. Abe's "peak experiences" we don't really know about. I had a talk with Abe about this a dozen years ago and he told me reasons which I accepted as to why they could not be fully verbalized and why he could not share them. This has always been the testimony of mystics. They can say a few things and then they crumple up in the sense of the inadequacy of words to describe this, and this makes the comparability of Zen Buddist satori, and the Hinduism Samhita and the Western World sense of the loss of individuality, and the Nirvana experience difficult. All these things probably overlap some but I don't think we have good descriptive and explanatory psychology of these experiences. I would be very reluctant to say they're identical. I would be very reluctant to say that Abe's peak experiences are identical with Wordsworth's experiences in Tintern Abbey which they can be compared with. I think they have some halo, some emotional overtone which can be shared, but not substance for substance equated, I wouldn't think.

Frick: I'm wondering...you seem to feel in your book Human Potentialities, and also in your more recent book Encounter with Reality, that it's very much a part of...or among man's most precious human potentials to be able to resonate with cosmic structure and cosmic materials and to be able to experience this kind of identification. I'm wondering how we can educate young people to have this kind of concept and projection of their own growth and development. This seems to be something that should concern education, and I'm not sure we're really concerned about it.

Murphy: Well, there are a great many routes to this goal. I'm not convinced that we have any way of evaluating which are the best routes for different people. When I saw my wife teaching Sara Lawrence girls eighteen and twenty years old the appreciation of small children, helping them to understand and to love small children, I would say that hardly anything in human life could be more beautiful or more magnificant. Then I see Abe Maslow having a peak experience; I see Mike Murphy out at Esalen encouraging

people in various types of out-reaching experiences, even excitement about the ability to touch another human being; I read the accounts of psychedelic experiences of many sorts; and hear the words of travelers about the uniqueness of certain experiences, let's say in a Zen training program; I don't feel that we know what's the best. In fact, I'm not sure we even have any criteria for saying what's the best. Even when I'm very close to these things as I was to my wife's experience with the Sara Lawrence girls and the nursery school children with whom they worked, I don't pretend to understand this. I don't know to what extent psychoanalytic concepts of identification or Erik Erikson's ideas of identity, or some of the modern ideas about the loss of ego boundaries--the depersonalization or removal of all individuality in experience--I don't know how far these are useful ideas. And I get a little restless when somebody comes back from India or from Esalen and says "we've got the answer." I don't believe there's any one answer. I think there are many routes, many interesting things along the way but we do have an obligation to students to warn them against cul-de-sacs,

and against dangerous pits. We get off of our known route into the unknown and see all sorts of odd effects. I would feel that the problem is a research problem today and not a problem of evangelism. I think that we have suddenly dumped our student world into a whole, rich, complicated sink of unknown or not well understood human experiences and more or less said "sink or swim." And I just don't think we have that right, if one speaks morally, except under very carefully safeguarded conditions where careful observations can be made. I do think we have to go on studying LSD-25 and mescaline and the rest of them on a scientific basis, the way they are doing in a few medical centers. But I think just saying that the student has a right to new experiences ignores the vast, dark uncertainties and the same is true for not only drugs, but the same is true of almost any radical method of self-examination if it involves getting off by oneself in a special brotherhood or a sisterhood in which each encourages the other to get some unusual type of experience, and they're not subject to any social discipline or any careful concern for the consequences of such extreme isolation and

burying oneself in a new criterion of life. I think these things involve very considerable hazards.

Frick: Without being impertinent, Dr. Murphy, I think that some of your writings have done as much as any other writings in recent years, to take us into the unknown, and to give a certain amount of respectability to it. Do you feel any qualms about any of your writings in this area at all? As you speak of responsibility here, I think...

Murphy: Well, I don't ever know whether the evaluative statements and the precautionary statements are properly phrased or directed to the right people. I do believe, for example, in the very great importance of research on psychedelic drugs as I just said, and I believe at the same time they involve great risks. Well, in Sidney Cohen's book[1] on psychedelic drugs for which I wrote the introduction, there is the appeal for the recognition of very new information, and at the same time the recognition of the hazards

---

[1] Sidney Cohen, The Beyond Within: The LSD Story. New York: Antheneum. 1964.

which are involved except in the most careful medical supervision. I may have been unwise in the phrasing, I don't know. I may have been incompletely forthright in regard to the uncertainties of all that West Coast psychedelic research about which I know something. There are several different places in California in which there has been a good deal of bold experimentation and I may have been inadequately sensitive to some of the problems. I still don't know that. Certainly, as far as psychical research is concerned I pointed out the enormous importance of understanding these strange experiences more adequately and at the same time may have been insufficiently clear that for some people the cultivation of the world of the paranormal may at times be unsound. It depends on the person, the supervision, and the moral strength of the group, I mean their loyalty to each other. It's just got to be said over again. There <u>are</u> risks involved in extending the horizons. If you push to gain more information about human nature or about social life, you're going to keep on encountering unknowns that are somewhat threatening to some people. I think you have to take

those risks. If I said an insufficient amount about the fact of the risks, let me say again I think that any attempt to push the horizons far, give a person new areas of experience, involves problems. Depending upon the strength of the person and the strength of the people working with him there may have to be different kinds of restraints, different kinds of disciplines used. It's a personal matter with individual hazards which often simply have to be faced.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, I would like to get less theoretical now, and a little more personal for a few minutes if you don't mind. We've been talking a great deal about parapsychology and extra sensory perception, cosmic consciousness and so forth. I'm interested in how you became interested in such phenomena. I feel certain that it wasn't a part of your formal training in psychology. I wonder if you could comment on this, and then I would like to ask you for a couple of personal experiences if there are any.

Murphy: Well, I've told the story several times about my reading in my grandfather's library at 16 years of age William Barrett's Book, Psychical Research. I

read that book with great delight and made up my mind it was very important. It was one of the factors that lead me to major in psychology at Yale, and at that time, the junior and senior years, I made up my mind that I was going to go into psychical research. That was somewhat dominant over my second choice which would have been to be a neurologist, or a neurologist and psychiatrist. I decided that I did not need the medical training and that I did need a Ph.D. in psychology, and I went on to Harvard and then to Columbia, insistently spending a great deal of my time studying the best material in psychical research. In my first graduate year at Columbia I gave two hours a day, systematically, to reading psychical research. I read almost the entire massive literature of the London Society for Psychical Research, and then I decided I hadn't been doing it real justice and so the second year I was there I gave three hours a day right straight through. I led a completely double life because, of course, the other graduate students had no respect or interest in it, nor did the staff have any respect nor interest in it, but I believed that it was right and I

continued. When I got a chance I did some research in the field and over the last 50 years I have put in a very considerable part of my professional life into reading, discussing, supervising, and working with research people in this field. Now, I am not, personally, a so-called sensitive subject. I am not a big-time ESP subject. I've had interesting experiences as everybody has had which can be called coincidences or whatever you like but nothing that would be important enough to write home about in their own right. However, I don't base my faith in these realities upon so-called personal experiences but upon scientific study of published evidence and the witnessing of experiments and participation in the research group activities.

Frick: Have you had any outstanding....I go back to this term cosmic consciousness which you've used a number of times. I wonder if you've had any experiences of cosmic consciousness that might in some way be similar to what Maslow terms "peak experience?"

Murphy: No. No. There's no use equivocating about that. The answer is a flat "no." I have not had

Maslow's type. I know what he's talking about, because I've read dozens and dozens of careful descriptions, but I've not had them myself.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, your major work in personality theory, Personality: A Biosocial Theory, was an extremely eclectic work and has been called this by reviewers and writers, and I would like to know if you've moved away from an eclectic position in recent years. It seems to me that you have been moving somewhat more towards a self-realization theory, and...

Murphy: No, I have very scant respect for this word "eclectic." In the introduction to the Basic Books edition of this re-published study just a few years ago, I wrote, "Such a book as this is likely to be called 'eclectic.' The word means two very different things: 1, the juxtaposition of fragments from different systems effecting a loose federation of essentially unrelated ideas. 2, the organization of a coherent theoretical system into which observations from different viewpoints can be integrated. It is in the second sense that I respect and try to accept this conception." And I remain in that same position today.

Frick: Would you say that since you have written this book which has been a number of years ago, you've moved more toward a self-realization theory of personality?

Murphy: No, I'm very uncomfortable with these phrases. I attended a meeting of the Humanistic Psychology group and some of their leaders in Connecticut. You perhaps know about that meeting about four years ago. And I was delighted to see that almost every person in the group said that there is much too much vague uplift talk going on and too little concrete discussion of how self-actualization can be achieved, how it can be recognized, investigated, measured, and so forth. You would have to have a positive program. I am restless, really. Year after year we go on with both the leaders and followers talking about undefined concepts and the idea of self-realization strikes me as really incapable of being defined along these lines. I tried to indicate at the beginning when I was talking about Goldstein versus the Gestaltists that we're moving towards an undefined ideal, I think. I have a further difficulty. It seems to me that every

individual represents many potential selves, and to say "self-actualization" implies that there's just one potential self, and that the business of the human individual is to achieve it or complete it or express it. I don't believe that. I believe that the stuff of human nature in its general and in its individual form is very rich in open potentialities for movement in many possible directions, and I think we blind ourselves to this openess when we talk as if there were one route that the individual must follow towards self-actualization. I think many people reading Maslow or Rogers or Gordon Allport or any of the other leaders, have come through with an essentially polished, finished kind of personality, which is not at all what the authors would have intended. Gordon Allport would never have meant to be understood that way and yet I think that the concept of self-actualization lends itself to that interpretation. I hope the time will come when we talk about the realization of potentials or of multiple selves or something of this sort. We're desperately afraid of such. We think we're talking about Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. We must recognize the fact that each

child has many potential selves depending upon what the environment has to offer and particularly what parents, school, and siblings offer by way of reciprocity, by something to interact with.

Frick: Yes. Isn't this where we meet the importance of choice and the freedom of choice that the individual has for determining what directions and what potentials he is really committed to?

Murphy: Yes, if one makes a reasonably systematic use of the idea of openness and flexibility, mobilizing all that one has in the making of the choice rather than being limited to one traditional direction in which one must move. One has to face the fact that in the world of today there are bewildering possibilities all of the time. Just take the vocational sphere alone. We only go back a few generations until the father largely dominated the son's vocational choice. Now we have a dictionary of occupations, we have organized information of many types showing what kind of preparation we need for what kind of roles of activity. The trouble is, you still don't really tell the story like it is, because it's even more

complex. I was just talking to a very able dentist about how he was given the Kuder and the Strong interests tests and intelligence tests and so forth, and was told at the end of his sophomore year that he would be a good dentist. Well, they didn't study his interpersonal relations. They didn't study the way in which he cared for the patient and the patient's wife and children as they waited in the office. They didn't consider the hazards that the man would find with people who use their teeth, so to speak, as a screen for a psychiatric difficulty. Thousands of difficulties we can think of that are not candidly spelled out and can't be candidly spelled out to a sophomore that wants vocational guidance. The real fact is that just practicing dentistry in Washington, D.C., which sounds like a very simple thing, can really lead into many different ways of looking at human beings and helping them or injuring them. Well, I think this particular man that I'm talking about was given very effective guidance but many others that I have seen in the United States and some other places, in medical, dental and other remedial services,

have not been given an idea of the real complexity. I see clinical psychology students still that don't seem to have read what Lowell Kelley found out at Ann Arbor about the enormous number of mistakes that are made in guiding people into clinical psychology or in trying to practice clinical psychology, because they've oversimplified the job. So when somebody says he's a "born clinician," I just shudder.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you have said that there is a katydid nature to scrape, a frog nature to croak, and a warbler nature to warble and that it's human nature to play Air for G String on a stradivarius. You have also concerned yourself with the things a species tends to learn, and interests and directions taken when the species is free to choose. Rogers, in a similar vein says that people in psychotherapy, if really free to choose, go in certain directions. And I wonder if your statements suggest your support or faith in a naturalistic value system. I think you hint at this at times, but I'm really not sure how you feel about this.

Murphy: Yes, I firmly believe in a naturalistic value system. I believe that wants and sympathy and the enjoyment of fellow feeling resonance of one person to another, are just as biological as eating. I think that these root component factors in a human ethical system are very genuine, and can be built on. I think the aggressions are likewise very genuine and real. I think that the environmental conditions--physical and social conditions--will play a very large part in releasing one or another system of natural biological tendencies. Now, on the other issue, man being a kind of an organism that does things that are not biologically predictable at such a simple level, I think the point is that anthropology and paleontology have given us a lot of evidence recently of the amazing rate at which man developed relatively undifferentiated or unspecialized brain tissue. Go back a million years if you like, it is only a moment in geological time, and you find that man is developing a vast associative network of potential learning, perceiving, thinking activities, and that these very rich possibilities act to make

his sights, his hearings, his smellings, his touchings, much more complex, more interesting, and capable of aesthetic development. Art forms begin to emerge as he shapes a stone into something polished, having a little aesthetic charm. It is more than something he needs to use to scrape or strike with. It has its own intrinsic, delightful quality. That aesthetic factor beings to appear in the same way that preliterate socieities developed all sorts of musical instruments to enjoy the tones, the rhythms, the cadences, the multi-instrument orchestration and so forth which make up the aesthetic delights of music. Now if you say that these things serve a biological purpose, I will agree with you. However, they don't serve a <u>survival</u> purpose in any obvious sense, but rather they add to the enrichment of experience. When I'm talking about man playing the <u>Air for G String</u> on a stradivarius, it is that he takes the primitive auditory satisfactions of the pure tone and he elaborates this in all sorts of ways and that is a biological function but it is also a cultural function. It's a bridge-over from a biological to a cultural function, so that I think I

would agree fully with Rogers and Maslow and others who talk about hierarchies of needs, but I would not be inclined to say that any of these more complex needs are secondary to, or subserviant to others. In fact, we all know musicians who are very reluctant to go and get a bowl of soup if they can hear another Toscanini record or whatever it is. It has its own intrinsic "functional autonomy," Allport would have said, or some "canalized" value I would have said. There are other ways of phrasing this capacity to make something very rich out of something potentially also very simple.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you do accept, then, a kind of a naturalistic base for human values and I would like to know, also, if you feel that there are universal criteria for healthy personality?

Murphy: Yes, but on an empirical basis I don't think we know an awful lot. I think we can state some of these things negatively by speaking of the conflicts, the humiliations, and the guilts that contribute to the suffering of children and prevent their growing

into effective or happy adulthood. In fact, I think we can lay down on the basis of modern psychiatric experience quite a lot of simple rules of thumb regarding how to prevent these things, particularly the humiliation, shame and guilt which do such a great deal of damage to the normal development of a healthy ego and sense of adequacy, a sense of worth. But I don't think that these negative rules are anywhere near enough. I think that the discovery of enrichment of one's own individuality through commerce with others, through conversations, through play, through love, through social integrative activity, is still largely carried out at an intuitive level. I've just been hearing this noon, before I came over here, about a couple of young clinicians who, as they were described, were over-involved. That is to say they got so deeply concerned with the problems of the patient that they had no perspective. I presume they meant for other people who were on their list of patients or to the families of these particular patients, or to their own future needs to learn and to report adequately on experience. This

over-involvement would be pretty good proof that the individual doesn't know how to control, how to discipline, how to draw firm barriers on his impulsive out-going response. You read about Jesus going into the desert or up into the high mountains when the multitudes got too thick, needing some time by himself, and Schweitzer, and other modern Messianic figures will remind you that the best we have, still, is an intuitive response: "how much can I give?" "well, I'll give a lot until I'm drained, and then maybe I'll have to stop giving." We don't really have an orderly disciplined scheme of how to cultivate with impunity, warm and rich social relationships. We know we need them but we don't know how to tell a wife or a daughter or a friend, "you're giving too much, you've got to stop," although we see the need. In other words, we have good rule of thumb principles, and they can be delved into with the most elaborate type of ethics. I know people who seem to think that Dr. Schweitzer, for example, achieved a complete ideal of modern rule of life, and I feel equally clear that having seen some Ghandis and some Nehrus, and some Schweitzers in action, it is pretty clear

that we don't have a specific applicable modern ethics except in the most rudimentary form. And I say again that the negative influences we can tell pretty clearly, that this treatment or influence would involve damage to your patient or to your child. But what's too much? What are the ground rules for an effective use of, say, a clinicians' or a social worker's time? I listen to them and I get the impression that they're not too sure themselves. We need the spadework for developing an orderly disciplined conception which would not be restraining and inhibiting, but that job remains to be done.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you've written a great deal about the human potential, and you've expressed concerns about its development, its enhancement and fulfillment and, yet, I've never read any explicitly stated theory of healthy personality in any of your writings. I've tried to develop one but I would like for you to characterize healthy personality if you could, and this is perhaps an unfair question right now, because it's a very, very difficult and complex kind of issue, but I wonder if you could comment on this.

Murphy: ...well from my limited angle, that's the same question that I just answered. In a purely negative way, I think you can say that there are certain things that inhibit the development of a normal personality, particularly guilt, shame, the bitterness of self-blame, etc. I don't have anything to add to that. On the positive side, I think we can say in a bland, general way, love, generosity, support, a reasonable amount of balance, poise, self-control, all these things are in the right direction. But how to make a mish-mash, how to make a goulash, a hash out of all these ingredients? The super cook that has the ability to tell us how to make a really magnificent French dish out of these things...we still rely on the journalist and the novelist to tell us this. I don't believe the psychologist knows any more about healthy personality than a playright or a novelist. I don't think it has reached a scientific level yet.

Frick: Do you think we will reach that level in psychology?

Murphy: Yes, by gradually being more specific in the use of terms, by being more exact, by giving examples, and by noticing exaggerations. Of course, the further discovery of the biology of human nature as we learn about it through sensory deprivation studies, sensory enrichment studies, and as we learn the powers of self-understanding, self-control that come with these modern techniques of sensory enrichment, internal scanning, etc., we may know enough about our internal world, we may interpret the messages from the viscera and the muscles more and more accurately, so as to understand the basis for a rhythm and order in living; understand the marginal messages from the vital organs that relate to our aesthetic experience like the rhythms that I mentioned, or the responses to cosmic order. All of this will come. I have a piece, incidentally, in the American Psychologist which has just been accepted, and will appear in a few months. It is called, "Psychology in the Year 2000,"[1] which was derived from that talk

---

[1] Gardner Murphy, "Psychology in the Year 2000." American Psychologist, 24, May, 1969. Presented to the Wayne State University Centennial Symposium, Detroit, Michigan, May 10, 1968.

that I mentioned that I gave for Ross Stagner at Wayne State University. In this article I tried to develop this "internal scanning" theme. I believe the psychology of the next 30 years is going to be very rich in self-discovery of the scientific sort. And, of course, it will share with the self-discovery of the humanistic and religious and mystical and other types. So I think that your question can be answered when we have a lot more data. I just don't think right now that I could tell a twenty year old anything much that he or she didn't know about achieving a healthy personality. I say try to understand yourself and try to understand the people around you and have hope that more generous and less self-accusing attitudes will develop.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, would...I keep referring to your term "cosmic consciousness" because I think it's an important concept in some of your later writings. I'm wondering if you give any important place in healthy personality to man's ability to sense and relate and resonate with cosmic structure.

Murphy: Well, I'm sympathetic to what I hear about these people but I don't really have enough first-hand experience to say that. If you gave me information regarding each of the next ten people that come into this office as to what kind of cosmic orientation they had and you asked me to predict how well adjusted they were in their everyday lives, I wouldn't expect the two to be correlated. I wouldn't expect that I would know how to use one to predict the other. In fact it may be a highly individualized matter. It may be that somebody might follow Abe Maslow's scheme and come out on the opposite end of the opera glass and <u>not</u> develop the characteristics that Abe says have come with his orientation. Abe is highly individualized and so are most of these people. I'm quite sure that if I attempted to be a mystic I'd be a terrible mess and I can enormously respect people who are mystics without being one myself.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, what are your chief professional involvements and interests at the present time? And I wonder if you would tell me something of your plans for the future.

Murphy: Yes, well, I have a light load here at George Washington. Technically, I am on a full time basis but that's a very generous appellation. I'm teaching two seminars and I have four students working on individual reading with me and one PhD student. I go up to New York at present, every two weeks for a day. I teach a class in History and Systems at City College there on alternate Wednesdays. When I'm in New York I give all the rest of that day to the American Society for Psychical Research, of which I'm President now. I carry on a very large correspondence with experimental people in psychical research, notably with Dr. Ullman at Moimonides Hospital in Brooklyn, with Gertrude Schmeidler at City College, with Thelma Moss at UCLA, and I do have a fairly heavy administrative responsibility to keep things moving on what I consider a constructive direction at the American Society. I'm also involved in a great deal of correspondence accumulated over the years. For example, as a result of going to India twenty years ago, I have about a hundred regular Indian correspondents and it's quite a considerable bulk of mail. It is the same for Columbia days, for City

College days. Everything I've done in my life has lead into ongoing communications. The Menninger Foundation has been generous enough to give me a full-time secretary although I'm only out there a few days a month. She is a very excellent secretary who has worked with me and being a very competent, devoted person she enables me to carry this huge volume of correspondence so that people are puzzled when they get letters that have obviously been written and typed in Topeka, Kansas. I have been out there with the Menninger Foundation for the last fifteen years. I'm also trying to read. As a companion volume to the Asian Psychology that my wife and I edited last summer I have a volume in press called Western Psychology, from the Greeks to the end of the 19th Century with William James, and there will be other companion volumes in that series. I'm planning a book on Overcoming Self-Deception, which is a follow-up on my book Encounter with Reality. There are also small research and writing jobs which I can't start on now until the others are out of the way. But we have our summers...we have a full ten weeks in our place in New Hampshire which makes big progress possible in

the matter of writing. I carry a dictaphone up there and this book on Overcoming Self-Deception will be done there. I'm about two-thirds through a revision of the Historical Introduction which will be published, maybe a year and a half from now, and I have a systematic book on Psychical Research, which I have over half written which I hope will also be done there if I live and if my health remains fairly good, which it is at present. Next summer will see those two last books, Historical Introduction and Psychical Research pretty far along. So you see it's a rather scattered life and if you ask me where I want to focus, I would say, "I'm like a man taking hold of several live-wires at once. I don't know how to let go." I would certainly not give up psychical research. It's enormously important to me and several big breakthroughs are appearing right now. What Ullman is doing at Maimonides Medical Center in Brooklyn, what Karlis Osis is doing at the American Society itself, what Gertrude Schmeidler is doing at City College, what Thelma Moss is doing at UCLA, are all very important breakthroughs. And I'm not going to abandon the field. I also don't want to get outside the

academic world. There are all together too many precious associations that would be lost if I had no academic connections. And I have a good faculty here to associate with and I'm in sympathy with the kind of work that is being done around me, and I enjoy the students, so I have no plans for immediate retirement. My wife, of course, being seven years younger than I and in good health, will continue in her research with children and that's one of the major factors in making me unwilling to make any big change. She has a position here at the Children's Hospital. And if that work continues and is properly funded by Federal support we won't change our basic plan of life for the present.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, what's the nature of the work you're doing for the Menninger Foundation? I believe you told me you just spend two or three days a month out there.

Murphy: ....writing and consulting, mainly. Actually I go out there Thursday afternoons once a month and stay until Monday afternoon, a long weekend. It will be somewhat more next year, probably. I expect to

be there five or six days each month if I can work it out. I consult with four or five of the project directors. You see, I've been there...I served as Director of Research for 15 years.

Frick: Is this still your title, or is this changed now?

Murphy: No, Professor of Psychology at George Washington University is my current title. They probably will give me some sort of honorific title. I was Henry March Pfeiffer Professor out at Menningers and I think they're going to call me Pfeiffer Professor Emeritus, so I'm told. And that will mean a little more than a nominal connection. It will mean a working connection with all the projects directors. You see, these projects grew up during the period that I was Director of Research and I'm quite close to the men who are leading these studies so I shall continue to work with them as a consultant. And then, of course, all this writing that I was describing to you, as I said, is made possible by my secretary who is a Menninger secretary and it's possible for them...

Frick: ...so she handles all this for you?

Murphy: Certainly. I couldn't do any of this without her.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you mentioned some key breakthroughs in psychical research and I wonder if you could just mention one of these, perhaps, for the record.

Murphy: Well, what Montague Ullman and his associates have been doing at Maimonides Hospital in Brooklyn is a modern utilization of the sleep-dreams laboratory of the Kleitman-Dement type, where it is possible under proper safeguards to have the content of a pictorial presentation transmitted telepathically from a distant sender to a sleeping subject. The technique has to be very elaborate as far as controls are concerned but it is not elaborate from a conceptual point of view. It's a very simple thing: Can you demonstrate significantly and with replication over and over again, that at a considerable distance, 110 feet, with four closed doors between, randomly selected visual material--paintings--can be transmitted to show up in the content of the dreaming of

a distant individual? And they've been at this several years now and have published quite a good deal. I think the results are quite clear-cut.

Frick: That's really exciting.

Murphy: Yes, I think it is quite clear-cut. Oh, it will go through a long period of challenge and replication and challenge and replication but there has been some replication both there and elsewhere. There are several other studies but that would be the one I would emphasize most at this time.

Frick: You know, the sad part about it, I think, is that so very few psychologists are really in a frame of mind or spirit to be open to these findings.

Murphy: Sure, but what are you going to do?

Frick: Plug away, I guess.

Murphy: You catch them when they're young and they're eager and they're capable of developing a discipline appropriate to the investigation. We have a good deal of success there. We've had, oh, young folks like Charley Tart at the University of California

at Davis who has been at it in recent years. He is a very competent, able guy with an open mind and a high experimental productivity. It only takes two or three in a generation, if they're really first-class, to open up a field.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, in my talk with Dr. Maslow a couple of months ago, he indicated that he was devoting most of his life now to his theoretical interests and he was rather sad as he talked about giving up many of the things he enjoyed to pursue more vigorously his theories and his writings. For example, he said he has stopped going to plays and stopped going on bird walks and other things like this that he really enjoyed very much. I'm wondering if your development is tending to go in the same direction as you move toward the end of your professional career. Could you comment on this for me?

Murphy: Well, of course one fights a rear-guard action against old age but I do walk quite a lot and my wife greatly enjoys walking, particularly in the warmer part of the year. We have our place in New Hampshire and we make the most of it. We're outdoors

a good deal and we hike and canoe and we enjoy the outside world. Our grandchildren visit us up there and so forth. During the dead of winter it's difficult to get out enough and there is a danger of loosing tonus, but since my eyes and ears are all right and I can do the usual academic stuff, I don't think I'm losing ground very fast. If I can go on this way, I will just gracefully taper off a little bit. I don't expect to retire. I expect only to taper off as I may have to.

Frick: Are you keeping up an interest in hobbies and other things non-professional right along?

Murphy: Well, the same things...music means a great deal to my wife and me. We have a son and his wife in New York who are very musical. We have a daughter and her husband and four of our grandchildren whom we see very frequently and they keep us oriented to many young interests. I don't think there has been any great change in recent years. I read a good deal. I have a lot of visits, so I don't...I wouldn't say that I feel any serious restrictions at present.

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you've been a part of American psychology and a very important part of its growth and development over the last few decades. What major directions do you see American psychology taking in the next decade. Do you discern any major trends here?

Murphy: Well, more and more towards extreme sophistication in method. I think it's methodologically a very devoted and very intense kind of a world that we live in and psychology has rapidly given up the diverse, confused, many-sided shape that it had. You and I are both fighting a rather unsuccessful rear-guard action against specialization and quantification. Abe Maslow can get to be elected by a miracle to be President of the APA and one has to study a lot of politics to understand that but all the big plums, everywhere at all the levels, are tending more and more to go to the brilliantly sophisticated, experimental design, statistics, mathematical models, ultra-scientific scientist. And that's one of the things that Abe takes apart in his book on the Psychology of Science. I think that's

going to continue. I think the prestige is there and the satisfaction of getting replicable results. Psychology can be squeezed into a mechanic form the way other sciences have been, and there's less to resist. After all, physics has got enough open space to move around in so that contrary alien theories can be thrown up a dime a dozen every year and physicists, as long as they're brilliant and creative and mathematical, can't be laughed at for dreaming up a new theory, but the less mature sciences can't afford that luxury. They're going to have to be scientific in the scientist sense of the term and there's no other direction to go. And so the rest of us who happen to be more diffuse or variegated or flexible, or whatever you want to call it are going to have to be content to be voices crying in the wilderness for awhile.

Frick: You've played this role for a long time, haven't you, Dr. Murphy?

Murphy: Well, yes, it's a very great satisfaction to see every now and again, one of one's pupils like Muzafer Sherif or Ted Newcomb or Ron Likert who get

very much in a central position when doing something that's not a part of the orthodox, official movement. I was quite amused, by the way, to see what happened when Muzafer Sherif got one of the three APA research prizes this year. Muzafer came to me at Columbia in 1935-36, and we worked together. He was all full of ideas as to how the ultra-objectivism of Floyd Allport could be replaced by a direct perceptual study of participation in a social group, a study of the experience of the individual himself. And he did that study magnificantly, as you know. Now, in 1968, he gets the prize and the little spiel that is written in honor of Muzafer talks about how tough and hard-boiled, how objective and scientific he was in the work that he did...because that's the Zietgiest. Now, one has to have a sense of humor.

* * * *

Frick: Right. Dr. Murphy, how do you feel about the humanistic...the so-called third-force movement in psychology today?

Murphy: Well, it worries me, it frightens me, it gives me...as the old spiritual says, "it causes me to tremble." I don't know where it's going. I got a

letter from Dr. Sutich sometime ago indicating that they got a thousand subscriptions, I believe, a thousand subscribing readers of the Journal of Humanistic Psychology and now they're ready for another kind of effort which is beyond psychology and beyond personality, apparently.

Frick: Yes, what's the name of that new journal?[1]

Murphy: Isn't it Transpersonal?

Frick: Yes, I believe thats it.

Murphy: Well, I don't think we've digested our breakfast and we are ordering a big lunch. I'm having a hard time seeing what's really new and sound in the humanistic psychology and I think it will take quite a while. I don't see why all of these articles have to appear in a new journal. I was told, and it may well be true, that it was because the APA editors wouldn't publish any such stuff. Maybe this is the reason but I don't think it's the only reason, because I think a lot of people including Abe, including

---

[1]The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology.

Gordon Allport and Carl Rogers, have a very big public following. I never felt any ungenerous response to my stuff even though it is off the beaten track.

Frick: Maybe they're able to accomplish this by the sheer force of their reputations whereas many lesser knowns would have a real struggle here.

Murphy: Well, all right, I have no quarrel with it. Is the message of humanistic psychology a solid, sound, thoughtful, orderly presentation of very important issues? Well, okay, if it is, more power to it. The few articles that have actually come through to me have not had very much to offer and I haven't felt that they needed a journal. I told you about one humanistic meeting I went to. I went to another. I went to the APA Humanistic Psychology Group Meeting in Washington, in the fall of 1967.

Frick: You were on a panel at that meeting, weren't you?

Murphy: Yes. I just don't feel that they have a very great deal that's new to offer but I may very well

be wrong and I'd be willing to suspend judgment for a few years. I just say "let's use the same careful standards that we would use in any other kind of scientific effort." If they would say, "we're not trying to be scientists," I would say, "okay, then you've got the whole world of literature and philosophy and if this is your message, fine. But if by "humanistic psychology" you mean you're going to do more than the playwright and the novelist and the historian can do; if you're going to attempt the discipline of a psychology, a scientific study, then meet the standards of science."

Frick: Then you feel they're not really doing this right now.

Murphy: Well, I haven't seen the stuff. I....the whole business of a third force in psychology implies that it's within psychology. It implies that along with behaviorism and psychoanalysis, another scientific effort must be made. I don't feel that hostile to psychoanalysis. I've probably learned more from Freud than from any other one person. I think behaviorism is pretty shallow but I still have learned

a lot, particularly from Pavlov, who was very hard-boiled and anti-psychological, but I still learned a lot from him. I don't see the need for crying on the housetops the importance of science unless the methods of science and the canons and the criteria of excellence which obtain in scientific work, are going to be applied to some degree.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Murphy, you have called for new and creative ways of utilizing group organization and group life. I'm wondering if you see the recent flourishing of T-groups and sensitivity training groups, as a viable effort in this direction?

Murphy: Well, I can only say so being outside the ballpark you know, or seeing a fly come over the fence once in a while. I'm not there on the inside. I have never gone to Bethel or any of the other training centers. I hear a lot of talk and I think it is interesting. And if there is a lot of verbiage, a lot of cultist jargon, well, that's true of most new movements. No, I don't really think I have much to offer on that.

Frick: Thank you very much, Dr. Murphy.

INTERVIEW WITH DR. CARL ROGERS

(La Jolla, California, January 24, 1969)

Frick: Dr. Rogers, I think my first introduction to you was in 1951 when I read your first book on client-centered psychotherapy. I've been reading your material ever since. I must say, before I start these questions, that you've been very influential in my own development both personally and professionally. However, I think this morning I would like to play the devil's advocate and ask some questions in areas that trouble me a bit as well as other types of questions later on. One of the things that troubles me sometimes, regarding self-actualizing theory, is its deterministic treatment of human development. That is, it seems that many self-actualizing theorists place a great deal of emphasis on an organic or biological base to human strivings. Maslow has his instinctoid needs and you have your own way of saying this. The self-actualizing theorists talk about discovering the self and the existentialists talk about creating the self and there's a very different emphasis here. I think this is highlighted in Victor Frankl's article Beyond Self-Actualization and Self-Expression where he criticizes self-actualization

theory and says that "we have neglected that sphere of human existence in which man chooses what he will do and what he will be."[1] Now, do you feel that the self-actualizing theories and your own "self theory" is in a basic conflict with the existentialists here over freedom of choice?

Rogers: No, I really don't. Let's see if I can get in a theoretical mood this morning. I think that you're right that I do see a biological base to human development. That, to me, doesn't seem strange. I think you see it in plant life, animal life, that the individual organism developes according to its innate pattern and in that sense you would say that it is a process that is largely determined, partly by genetic factors and partly by the environment. I think that all of that is true in man as well, but for me the element that changes that in the human being is the development of consciousness or awareness and consequently it would be insufficient to talk just in terms of actualization.

---

[1] Frankl. Beyond Self-Actualization and Self-Expression. p. 17.

Frick: Or the innate kinds of things?

Rogers: Yes. I've always made a distinction here. I don't know whether I've always carried this through but I do recall trying to clarify the distinction in this way. I'd be perfectly willing to speak about actualization of the human organism which I think follows the same kind of lawful process that you find in any living organism. But I think self-actualization does have reference to something a little more than that, which does grow out of a person's awareness...

Frick: The conscious component.

Rogers: That's right, the conscious component or the conscious and potentially conscious component. In that area I am a hearty believer in the fact that not only does the individual choose many elements of himself, and in that sense creates himself, but I believe that is one of the most distinctive things about the human organism that does tend to separate it off from other forms of life.

Frick: This is, then, a part of his genetic makeup in a sense, the power to choose?

Rogers: Yes, part of his genetic makeup that grows out of the fact that in his evolution he has developed consciousness and awareness and consequently, as far as we know, he is the only animal who really can be aware of his past as well as his present and consequently can make some choices about his future.

Frick: I guess to make this more specific in terms of my quandry here, which is personal as well as academic, I always ask myself the question in reading the theoretical material on self-actualization: Does the organism have the freedom to choose between good and evil and somehow it seems to me that the self-actualizing theorists including your work, answer "no" to this question. If conditions are ripe or adequate for the human organism there seems to be the idea that man will <u>automatically</u> do those good things in life as a part of his inherent nature. That is, he really doesn't choose between good and evil. He is on a kind of automatic pilot <u>if</u> conditions are good. Is that a fair evaluation?

Rogers: Yes, I think I would go along with that but I would certainly underscore that final phrase you use,

"if conditions are good," by which I would mean if the conditions are such as to promote healthy growth then I think you can trust the choices of the individual to be social but it's very obvious from all kinds of things that are going on in the world today that for many people the conditions of growth and development have been far from those that promote a healthy development. So you get destructive choices, you get some enormous amounts of aggression, you get all sorts of things that we would regard as socially undesirable and man is perfectly capable of making these choices when his situation has not been good and, again, when he's not been fully aware of himself and his background. I don't know whether you know a little paper of mine that was written many years ago with Bill Kell and Helen McNeil.[1] It was based on some research that Bill Kell did under my supervision and was a study of delinquents and their further delinquencies. By studying the case histories of the delinquents, he rated them on various factors:

---

[1] C. R. Rogers, B. L. Kell, and H. McNeil. "The Role of Self-Understanding in the Prediction of Behavior." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 12, 1948.

the goodness or badness of their genetic inheritance, their intelligence, their family background, their social environment, and then as sort of an afterthought we put in a rating on self-understanding and we assumed, at least my own assumption was, that what we would find was that probably the family environment would be most predictive of recidivism. What actually turned out and we really didn't believe it the first time, was that the degree of self-understanding correlated much more with the future. That is, a person with relatively good understanding of himself and his situation, a relatively realistic appreciation of that, was far less likely to become delinquent, and that just seemed too good to be true. At that time I wasn't prepared to believe that finding. We didn't publish this or anything because I just didn't believe it. Sometime later Helen McNeil did the same study over again with a new crop of delinquents with not quite as striking findings as Bill Kell had gotten but essentially all the same things. That's why I put in the importance of real awareness and especially a realistic awareness of self and one's situation in choosing the future.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, at various times in your writings you have implied an acceptance of Maslow's instinctoid need hierarchy and yet you have stated in one of your recent writings that you felt that love, the need for love, is learned. This seems a little bit inconsistent of you and it bothered me when I ran across that statement. I'm wondering if you care to comment on this?

Rogers: I guess it's been quite a while since I've thought about that issue and I'm a little bit puzzled to know that I said that. Perhaps this appeared in the Koch book[1] because at that time I was influenced by some theoretical thinking that one of my students was doing. I think I would have to say that the need for love and affection seems to me to be innate and if I have said anything that would contradict that I think I would probably go back on it.

Frick: Well, it has been a number of years since you wrote that material in Koch.

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in The Client-Centered Framework" in Koch, S. (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, vol. III, McGraw-Hill. 1959.

Rogers: Yes, much earlier than when it was published. I think it was written about 1953. I think Harlow's work indicates that even in non-human organisms the need for affection seems pretty deep and I would think that would be true with the human being, too.

* * * *

Frick: I have one other question, Dr. Rogers, that deals with the issue of determinism here and it is related to your concept of congruence. This is one of the key concepts that you have been working with. Do you feel that the person is a victim, in the deterministic sense, of the conditions of worth that are placed upon him by others? Cannot he ignore certain conditions of worth, reject them, or say "to hell with them?" Maslow suggests this when he speaks of the healthy person as being able to transcend the culture or the society, by refusing to accept certain values and impositions. I wonder if the child is as victimized by conditions of worth as you seem to suggest in your theory of congruence. Isn't it possible for the young person to say, "This is not the way it is and I reject the conditions you're imposing on me, mother, in order for me to feel worthy."

Rogers: Yes, I think the clearest example of the fact that that is possible is the kind of thing that happens continually in psychotherapy where a person is saying, "yes, I was thought to be no good, but, by God, as I really look at myself and examine my experience, I have confidence. I have a lot of positive qualities and I'm just not going to accept that evaluation." I think that <u>can</u> happen in a child...

Frick: Outside of therapy?

Rogers: Yes, I think that can happen in various individuals outside of therapy. By and large I think there is no doubt that it is easier for the person to reject conditions of worth when he has not been subjected to a great many of them. That is, the individual is already weighed down with all kinds of things very early in life. I think he would find it very difficult to reject those conditions without some sort of help, some sort of a therapeutic climate whether it was planned or unplanned. I think probably the more psychologically healthy the development of the child the more he would be able to challenge conditions of worth.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, you have often insisted that the state of congruence equals psychological adjustment or psychological health. Now, I've been wondering if it's not possible for a person to be in a very high state of congruence and still be a disturbed personality. Does the condition or state of congruence insure healthy personality? In other words, I can see people that I regard as being very congruent and yet I wouldn't regard them as healthy. This seems to me to be rather important because you do equate the state of congruence with health.

Rogers: Well, you have obviously been thinking more about these issues than I have recently. I get theoretical by spurts, and it has been some time since I really have buckled down to hard theoretical thinking. That's why I wondered at the outset if I could get in a theoretical mood. I don't think I'll attempt any definitive answer to that. I'll just try and think out loud a little bit about it. One thought that occurs to me is that if the individual is experiencing something in his organism, if he's aware of it in himself, aware of it and acceptant enough of that experiencing that he even would be

able to express it if the situation was appropriate for that, then I think I would say that he is in as great a degree of psychological health as his organism would permit at that moment. Something like that I think I would be willing to stand by. Take someone who is overwhelmed by grief, or someone who is very much conflicted in thinking about some choice or some aspect of his life. I think the more an individual is fully aware of what's going on within him at that point, the more he is making as healthy a reaction to that situation as is possible.

Frick: I guess what I'm saying is that it seems to me that congruence can represent a kind of static state, a state of ennui or boredom and I go back to Maslow's recent discovery -- that just because the basic deficiency needs are met it does not automatically mean that the person is going to reach a level of self-actualization. Prior to this he has always assumed, that once these deficiency needs have been fully satisfied the person automatically moves into a higher level or functioning or self-actualizing stage. I guess that's what made me think of the state of congruence as not being a sufficient

condition for health.

Rogers: Let me talk off the top of my head on that. I don't think I could agree that congruence could be a state of ennui or apathy because I think things are always going on in the human organism. There couldn't be anything static about congruence because one's experience is continually changing and to be really congruent would mean a continually changing awareness. The other aspect to your question as to whether an individual is automatically self-actualizing. I guess I would have to confess to being uncertain. No, perhaps I feel more certain than I recognize. I think there do have to be various stimulus situations around. I say this partly on the basis of a very practical observation that I made when I was visiting Australia and New Zealand. There you could say, perhaps particularly in New Zealand, that many of the conditions for an adequate life are very well fulfilled; the physical needs are met and there really is almost nothing that you would call real poverty and neither is there anything very extreme in the way of wealth. Their physical needs

are pretty adequately met and they're secure in their medical care, in their lifetime care, and so on. And, instead of those conditions leading to a utopia, it's a fairly dull society. In Australia you could see that sort of breaking down a little as they've been taking in recent immigrants, trying to import them from Europe, and so on. People are being stimulated to new thoughts and new opportunities and new possibilities. I think probably we can make a parallel between this and the school child too, that you could meet his physical needs very well, and still perhaps he wouldn't be very much of a learning organism. You do have to surround him with stimulating opportunities for learning and development and then I think he eats them up. I see it more as the presence of external stimulation.

Frick: Yes. You know, I think they have said the same thing about the Scandanavian countries that you observed in New Zealand and Australia. Everyone is apparently so secure, and yet there are real problems and the young are still restless. I am wondering if this doesn't really take us back to education. That

is, the need to stimulate at some very basic levels here. I don't think education is really doing this.

Rogers: No, I don't either.

Frick: Education is still stuck at the cognitive level and with the three R's and I'm wondering if children really are getting the kind of stimulations that Gardner Murphy would talk about, leading them to cosmic consciousness, or something similar at their level of development.[1] They are such rich, creative people at that age.

Rogers: Well, that's an issue I feel very strongly about because I think as an institution education is the most backward of any institution in American life. I've got a new book coming out in a month or so now, six weeks I guess, entitled the Freedom to Learn, where one of the things that I do try to stress is the importance of a much greater freedom for the individual and not all this, what do they call it, the mug and jug theory where they pour from the mug

---

[1] Gardner Murphy, Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1958.

into the jug, which I think describes too much of education today. The child may be given a great deal of freedom to learn but then freedom to learn in a vacuum is not profitable. This is why I make the point in that book that if teachers devoted as much time to thinking about the learning resources they could make available to these children or students at any level, as they do with the contents of the next lecture, we could surround students at all levels with very rich opportunities from which they could choose ...and where they could learn and learn at their own pace and consequently with a lot of personal satisfaction. I guess I'm not quite so concerned about cosmic consciousness as I am about individuals developing some new and significant channel for himself that would carry him beyond...

Frick: That draws on his own potential.

Rogers: That's right. That gives him an opportunity for creativity and where he goes further than he ever has before in whatever direction.

Frick: I'm wondering, Dr. Rogers, if you think this

has some pertinent bearing on the drug abuse that we're seeing young people involved in today. Our attacks at this problem seem so peripheral. Do you think this would have a bearing on their experimenting with drugs?

Rogers: Oh, definitely. One reason I'm so interested at the present time in encounter groups and the intensive group experience is that I feel that when people have an opportunity to use themselves fully and to relate on both an affective and cognitive basis to others, to themselves, to a world of facts and discoveries, etc., that they do get turned on and they get turned on quite without drugs and I think they find it and I would certainly regard it as a far more constructive way of getting turned on than drugs. I think that the use of drugs is increasing especially among high school students and is due to a number of things: It is a rebellion against a stupid, so-called learning environment that isn't a learning environment.

Frick: It is the lack of stimulation in other ways, perhaps. You know, I was sitting in the beautiful

La Jolla Cove yesterday and it was just a beautiful scene. The waves were breaking over the rocks and it was magnificant and then I looked around and saw the houses on the hillside and I got to thinking what a discrepancy this is in terms of the way people are living their lives. I became very sad and somehow, you know, it was out of focus...

Rogers: The possibilities are so rich and the actualities are so impoverished.

Frick: That's right, and then I thought that really the La Jolla Cove represents something very basic to man that he has somehow lost touch with, I think.

Rogers: That's something that has real meaning for me, because I think it's terribly unfortunate that man has tended to lose touch with external nature in so many instances, as well as with his own internal nature and between the two of them he is a very alienated organism existing in a world that doesn't exist.

Frick: That's right, and I think I'm going to refer back to Gardner Murphy again here because I think

this is something he's done. He has tried to link the external environment with the internal needs. It relates to your comment on education, I think, because this is what you would like to see education do, in part.

Rogers: Yes, that's right.

* * * *

Frick: I would like to take up a question dealing with holistic theory, Dr. Rogers. In my study of the holistic personality theorists I have isolated or discerned two primary themes of holistic personality theory. One of them is the drive of the personality for self-consistency or organization, bringing completion to an incomplete structure. The second major theme stresses the evolution of the personality, viewing the personality as always in process, in flux and undergoing change at all times. It seems to me that there are certain conflicts in these two holistic themes and I would like to talk about them for a few minutes. I don't know whether you recognize them or not. Maslow has suggested that the need for safety is prepotent over the organism's growth needs and Prescott Lecky's entire reputation rests on that

one little book he wrote, Self Consistency.[1] I think this question could be approached in many different ways but if number one is true, that is, if the organism does strive for organization, stability, cohesiveness, and a well-structured kind of development in the personality, what accounts for change and growth and becoming? I do see a conflict here in these two themes and I think we need to tie them together theoretically. I would like you to comment and then I have a suggestion.

Rogers: I think that is a very discerning distinction you have made. Some of the thoughts that come to me first have to do with therapy or experiences in small groups where I've often said and certainly feel that any significant learning, and I guess by significant learning I mean learning that might influence one's behavior, is to some degree threatening. If I'm about to learn something that might change my picture of myself or the way in which I react to situations, that's upsetting. All significant learning tends to

---

[1]Prescott Lecky, Self-Consistency. The Shoe String Press, Inc. 1961.

involve a certain amoung of threat and pain, I think, from very mild to sometimes quite severe. It is a good question and I'm interested in whatever answer you may have to the dilemma because I think that both of those things are very true. Why does a child learn to walk? It's really a very interesting and paradoxical question. He tries to stand up and he falls and bumps his head. Learning to walk is a painful proposition. There's certainly no great reward to it until he really makes the grade and yet he's willing to go through that pain as a part of a biologically based process...

Frick: Even when he knows his parent will pick him up if he stretches his arms.

Rogers: That's right. To me, that is a capsule indication that unless the learning involves such a drastic reorganization that is just too threatening and the person can't face it at all, there is a real drawing power to the possibility of further growth.

Frick: The possibility for constructive change.

Rogers: Yes, change. And I think that's what we bank

on really. Certainly, you see this operating in small groups where an individual takes some pretty tough feedback from other members of the group and, boy, he's really hurting from that. Why, then, doesn't he just leave the group and forget what they said? No, if he has any feeling that this might lead to some sort of constructive change on his part he hangs in there with the difficulties and lives through them, and is glad afterwards. I remember one specific incident that has always been rather meaningful to me. A woman--she was the only woman in a group of business executives and she was an executive herself--talked a little in the group about how much she was dominated by her mother but I didn't realize that she had come to any significant conclusions during the group meetings. Afterward, though, she went home and took some quite drastic steps. She found an apartment for her mother and moved her mother into it so that they were separated and the mother wept and felt quite rejected. Yet the mother soon adjusted to her new life as she was a pretty independent person. This forty year old woman discovered that she was the problem. She wasn't prepared to be independent.

She really went through an awful lot of agony and kept writing me letters during this period and finally I wrote back to her and said, "I'll bet there are plenty of times when you wish you had never heard of that damn group that has opened up such a lot of pain for you." Her response was the kind of response that human beings make. She wrote back and said, "No. You're right that this has been the most painful period of my life, but I wouldn't have avoided it for anything." The possibility of further maturity and of constructive change must have a real magnetic attraction. That's the closest I come to linking the two together.

Frick: Yes, I have been struggling with this kind of conflict, the individual striving to protect a valued status versus the need to grow. And it seems to me in some of the recent work and writing that has been done, the concept of <u>crisis</u> is more and more appealing as a conceptual bridge between the striving for organization and unity versus the need for change. Are you familiar with Dabrowski's book on <u>Positive</u>

Disintegration?[1]

Rogers: No, I'm not, but I like that phrase.

Frick: It's really quite an exciting book. And Menninger has a section in his recent book, The Vital Balance,[2] where he used brief case histories to illustrate the tremendous changes that have come about in certain people because of crisis. Even mental illness is viewed as a potentially positive experience. I can't find any more appealing concept than crisis to bridge the conflict in these two themes. I am wondering if the most significant growth in people doesn't come out of a crisis situation. We see it in therapy, but I wonder if it also isn't true outside therapy.

Rogers: I think so. I think anything that's true in therapy is also true outside of therapy. I like that concept and it would be pretty well illustrated

---

[1] Kazimierz Dabrowski, Positive Disintegration. Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1964.

[2] Karl Menninger, The Vital Balance. New York: The Viking Press. 1963. See pages 406-417.

by the story I just gave you. Also, it fits in with what I said earlier about the fact that external stimulation is necessary. That is, the crisis usually comes about in part, because of some external circumstance and that would make real sense to me. Also in my mind it fits in with what I said about the New Zealanders. There are just not sufficient crises in their lives, to put it in your terms. This can have very sobering implications. Goodness knows I'm all in favor of all our efforts to improve the lot of the people, and yet I have come to realize that a life without tension would be no good.

Frick: That reminds me, Dr. Rogers, that as I toured San Diego yesterday I thought about how many things we saw that highlighted man's effort to make life safe, easy and secure and the efforts to protect the upward mobile strivings. It was just all over and really shocking to confront. I'm wondering, and here we go back to education, if there is a way to put stimulus into life, to put crisis in, maybe controlled crises in some way.

Rogers: I don't know if this will get us too far afield but it relates to a recent experience I had dealing with groups from Columbia University of trustees and administrators and faculty and students. One of the students was making some pretty extreme statements including the fact that buildings might burn. One of the trustees responded with a very well-reasoned, very carefully thought-out defense of the proposition that all difficulties in the end have to be settled through rational discourse, and that that was really the answer, and that violence certainly was not part of it. The students just mowed him down. I really was impressed. They said, "why are we here this weekend? Because of rational discourse? It's because we occupied buildings last May. Why is Grayson Kirk out as President of Columbia? Rational discourse? Hell no. It's because we created a fuss." And they just went through a whole long list of things that showed that...

Frick: They knew the value of crises, didn't they?

Rogers: Yes, they knew the value of crises. I just hope they don't overlearn that lesson or we'll be

repeating the French Revolution where violence was very constructive and then gradually fed on itself until the means became the end.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, were you called in as a consultant at Columbia?

Rogers: Yes, I was. I was one of several staff members experienced in small group activity and in part of this experience all 70 people were together, which was a very small fragment but a significant one, and part of the time we were in small, intensive groups. There was one other thing I came away with. Of all the different groups that were there the most difficult to reach was the faculty. I really came away feeling that we made some dent on that particular group in the communicated inter-change but I came away feeling quite pessimistic because I felt that the faculty were by and large too smug, not open enough to experience, and making absurd statements like, "we have good communications with students, we talk with students all the time."

Frick: In the face of what's going on, they say this.

Rogers: Yes, and it seemed to me that, as the phrase goes, they were applying band-aids when things like that were perfectly inadequate and seemingly without any recognition that what they were facing was revolution.

Frick: It's sad.

Rogers: Yes, very, very sad. Of course, I'm generalizing. This wouldn't be true of all the faculty members who were there, and anything of that sort. But by and large I thought they were the group that would be the greatest barrier. One of the students said something to me that also applies to our discussion this morning and to all theoretical thinking. He said that it seemed to him there were two worlds here, and he wasn't at all sure that the two could ever really communicate. He was thinking about the students and the adults. He said one big difference, perhaps one of the most important differences, is that the student world contains feelings. To me he really said a mouth full because I think that all of our academic life has been built on the notion of the completely cognitive, the completely intellectual,

and that was one of the reasons why the faculty were so hard to reach. The world of feelings for a great many of them just doesn't exist. And to tie it in with this discussion this morning, there is one thing I wanted to be sure to say before we got through. I have very mixed feelings about theory building. I think that's why it does go in spurts for me. There are times when, for myself, I need to try to make some sense out of the whole lot of experience, and so what comes out of that is a theory. I mean, you developed some sort of theory to,..

Frick: But you can't live on that, can you?

Rogers: You can't live on that, and also I even wonder... It is satisfying and you feel, well, now I got that clearer than I had it before. I begin to see what's happening, or what some of the ailments are. But I sometimes wonder if all theories shouldn't be kept to oneself because theory gets promulgated, especially with students, as being "This is the way things are," or "this is the way expert number one says they are, and this is the way expert number two says they are so it must be one of those two or more ways."

The value of theory exists, I think, in its construction and not in its dissemination. Quite possibly you could make out a case that the dissemination of theory does more harm than good. But the construction of theory, now that's a very rewarding experience for the individual. And I'd like to see part of education providing the kind of stimulus that would create at least a small internal crisis by encouraging such questions as: "How could all these things be true, or what could possibly make sense out of all this confusion of facts and observations?"

Frick: You would like to wipe away the slate of theory and encourage a fresh look?

Rogers: That's right and then the student would have to start to figure out, "Well, what do I think makes sense out of this," even though his theories were crude and incomplete and so on. He would get a deal from the experience.

Frick: He would get involved. This is interesting to hear you say after all you've had to do with theory building, Dr. Rogers.

Rogers: It's interesting, I mean, let me say just one word about that because I don't really think of myself as a theoretician. It is true that for a couple of years when I was working on what became the Koch chapter, that really was a very strenuous effort on my part to make some sense out of all my professional experience and personal experience up to that point.[1] But as I have watched what people do with my theories and what they do with other peoples theories and so on, God. I remember I wrote Calvin Hall after his book on Theories of Personality came out.[2] They were kind enough to send me the chapter in regard to my theory in advance of publication, and I guess I hurt his feelings by writing back that, "I wouldn't say that there were many mis-statements of fact in the chapter, it's just that reading the whole thing left me terribly depressed." It left me terribly depressed

---

[1]Carl Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework,"in Koch, S. (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, vol. III, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

[2]Calvin Hall and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1957.

because here was everything all cut and dried, and hell, it had never seemed that way to me. It would seem as though, well, out of all the possibilities this might be one possible explanation, but no, when it comes out especially second hand like that it is all a nicely packaged thing with everything closed.

Frick: The struggle is left out completely, isn't it? You know, Ledford Bishoff has written a recent book on personality theory, Interpreting Personality Theory.[1] I was amused that somewhere in the chapter on your theory he comes right out and says that you disagree with his interpretation.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, in the recent book, Beyond Counseling and Therapy by Carkhuff and Berenson,[2] there is a critique of client-centered psychotherapy. I don't know whether you are familiar with this book or not.

---

[1]Ledford J. Bishoff, Interpreting Personality Theories. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers. 1964.

[2]Robert R. Carkhuff and Bernard G. Berenson, Beyond Counseling and Therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. 1967.

Rogers: I really haven't read it. I do know about it though.

Frick: I think it's an excellent book and feel that they've made a real contribution. One of the chief limitations they see in the client-centered approach is the client-centered therapist's lack of freedom to be a whole and spontaneous person in relation to the client. In this regard they state: "Client-centered therapy brought more complete attention to the whole person of the client, but has neglected the whole person of the therapist, and the two-way flow of communication."[1] Dr. Rogers, there does seem to be an increasing emphasis on the freedom of the therapist to do his own thing; to be more spontaneous, more wide-ranging in his efforts to help the client, and perhaps existential therapy has come in here to influence this, I don't know, but do you agree, in part, with this criticism that client-centered therapy has neglected the whole person of the therapist?

Rogers: I would say that as of 1950 I would agree with

---

[1] Ibid., p. 68.

them completely. I think that following that time there has been a gradual change in just the direction they're talking about with the therapist much more free to use and be himself as a whole person in the relationship, and for me personally...how will I say it...The trial ground for this new development has been more in work with groups for reasons I don't fully understand, but I'm sure that if I were to go back to doing individual therapy, which I haven't been able to do for some years, I am sure I would be much more free in expressing my own feelings and my spontaneous self in a relationship as well as trying to help the client be the same.

Frick: You say that you do this in work with groups?

Rogers: Oh, yes, definitely. I express anger, and affection, and annoyance and all kinds of things, as well as being very responsive to hurt. Hurt arouses in me feelings of really wanting to be empathic so that a lot of the therapeutic attitudes that I've stressed, I think, are very real parts of me, and of many therapists and so they need expression just as well as anything else, but other feelings, too, have

equal validity.

Frick: You have gone beyond these limitations suggested by Carkhuff and Berenson, then?

Rogers: Yes, definitely. And then I think...Well, I was reading a paper the other day written by Hilton Carlson over at San Diego State. It was sort of a personal account of his own development as a counselor, and I couldn't help but write him a letter afterward because he had been greatly influenced by the client-centered point of view, and now feels that he has gone beyond it, and primarily in this direction of being more of a complete person in the relationship. I wrote him that it was fascinating to me how we all develop along parallel lines, because his work, what might be called a "Client-Centered Therapist as in 1950," left him dissatisfied and he's moved on beyond that and so have I, and so...

Frick: Kind of independently.

Rogers: Yes. Even though he's here in the same community we have had almost no contact for quite a number of years, and this is what I find time and

again. I think, "Well, I've certainly changed, but now I'm going to meet someone that I knew ten years ago, and they're probably still back where they were," but they've moved along the same lines.

Frick: Well, you know, the same thing has happened to me too. I have done quite a bit of counseling with college students, and I've shifted over a period of time.

Rogers: While I was still at the University of Chicago Time Magazine did an article on me and Client-Centered Therapy, and like all Time articles, I read it and thought that, well, they got some of the idea, and some of this is pretty good, and some of it is typically Time. I was telling this to someone, and they said, "well, they gave you an excellent term," and I asked, "what do you mean?" They said, "well, the title of thing..." and I asked, "what was it? I guess I haven't looked at it that closely." They said, "it was labeled 'Person to Person Therapy.'" "By gosh," I said, "that's true." That really is perhaps the best term for it, because that phrase certainly catches much more...and you could never of

known who coined the word "non-directive." If I did, I apologize for it but at any rate that certainly was descriptive of a certain early phase, with the focus being on the client's perception and therefore client-centered. The term has been often misunderstood, but it was supposed to represent the thought that this therapy was focused on the client's perception of his life and his problems. I don't think any label has been given further development, but certainly "Person to Person Therapy" would be a very good label.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Rogers, we've seen a great increase in the popularity,..almost a faddish kind of interest in behavior therapy, and from another direction we have an emphasis upon the existential approaches to human relationships and problem solving. Elsewhere in the theoretical spectrum we have client-centered or non-directive therapy and other approaches as well. I'm wondering, Dr. Rogers, what you see taking place in psychotherapy in the next few years, and what the trends in psychotherapy really reflect about a society. It seems to me that the fashions in psychotherapy

are pretty crucial in mirroring certain things about a society. Could you make that a case, or not? What would it mean about our society, for example, if behavior therapy zooms to the forefront of the various therapeutic approaches with people? Do you know what I mean?

Rogers: Sure.

Frick: And I'm wondering what your responses are to this, your predictions, and so on.

Rogers: I hadn't quite thought of therapy as mirroring the society and the trends in it, but I think a good case could probably be made for that. As I see it, I would really predict that there would be a sharp upward rise in the use of behavior therapy because I think that fits in with the thinking of a great majority of psychologists which, oversimplified, could be stated as being that man is a complicated machine, but we can probably understand him and control him, and I think that's part of the mood of present day culture, and that's why I would see that as likely to increase. On the other hand, the attitudes of young people make me feel that the days of

that point of view are numbered. The behavioristic kind of psychology is very much in the saddle in universities and what with tenure and all it will be a long time before the universities really change. But I don't believe that the younger generation coming along will be satisfied with that kind of a view of life and I think that the existential point of view, which means many different things to many different people, is going to be predominant. Certainly my version of this point of view has a great deal of meaning to me, and I think that...No, I guess this is more of a hope than an assurance. I hope that the humanistic person-to-person communication, which has really been shown to be possible, will play a larger and larger part, but I would have to say that probably is a hope rather than a sure prediction. That's the horse I'm betting on for the long run, but... and I don't mean to separate it from existentialism because I don't really think there's a contradiction.

Frick: But I think there is a basic contradiction with the theoretical orientation we see in behavior therapy. You could gloss that over if you wanted to,

but I think there are fundamental differences in how they perceive man as compared to you, as compared to the humanists.

Rogers: That's right.

Frick: And, Dr. Rogers, if you do see behavior therapy playing a larger role here, I feel there's something wrong about that in society. Because this means more and more people are accepting it, more and more clients are accepting it, and more and more treatment facilities are accepting it and, frankly, this seems to me to be kind of a regression.

Rogers: Oh, I think so too. For me, this goes back to the debate I had with Skinner. That didn't involve therapy, particularly, but the two basic differences are still existent. I like to think that at some point...let's see, how shall I put this...I wouldn't like to discard the obvious significance which operant conditioning and all that sprung from it, has for human life and human behavior. It's more than interesting, it has...

Frick: It's a real contribution.

Rogers: Yes, it's a real contribution, and yet if that becomes the be all and end all, and particularly if that becomes the philosophical point of view which dominates, I would regard that as tragic. And at some point I hope that someone can bridge the humanistic-existential point of view and the strictly behaviorist point of view into one more over-arching way of seeing the human world. But...

Frick: That doesn't seem likely does it? I mean, I can't see that...

Rogers: Well, I think historically it sounds likely and probable, but I don't really see it happening. The reason I say that it is historically possible is that most theories don't get killed, especially when they've been as effective as the behaviorist theories, but they do get assimilated into something larger and that has a broader perspective, and I would hope that would be what would happen.

Frick: This leads me to an article that you wrote some time ago in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology[1]

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "Some Questions and Challenges Facing a Humanistic Psychology." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, vol. V, No. 1, Spring, 1965.

where you were somewhat pessimistic about what the American Association for Humanistic Psychology and this whole movement was going to be able to do, and you pointed out that it was one thing to be critical of existing theories and approaches, but it was entirely another thing to make a positive contribution. This article was written several years ago, and I would like to know if you see this humanistic movement in psychology making more of a positive contribution now, or do you still feel it's more a reactive kind of phase?

Rogers: I guess that I would stress that what I'm going to say is strictly from an individual perspective. I feel as though I don't know what's happening to the humanistic movement, really. Somebody would have to be more of an observer than I am. I am a person who is involved in what I am doing. At any rate, from my own personal perspective, I think that the humanistic trends among psychologists and others with similar interests are finding many positive things, and I think they are engaged in them. And I would certainly put the burgeoning of the small

group experience as one of those attempts to deal with human alienation and inter-personal communication and a lot of problems and situations that have real implications for the individual human being. So that I do think there are a number of positive things being done. And then along with that I guess I'd put the increasing questioning of the whole concept of science as it has been used in the behavioral sciences. I don't know whether you've seen that new book that Bill Coulson and I edited[1] that grew around a conference that we organized here and centered around Michael Polanyi, the British philosopher of science.

Frick: No, I haven't seen that book.

Rogers: ...and I guess if I were to try to sum it up in a sentence, that conference--which contained it's own conflicts because there was a very strong behaviorist in the group, as well as people with different shades of philosophical opinion--constitutes one of the evidences of the very significant groping that's taking place toward some type of human science. I think psychology, especially

---

[1] William R. Coulson and Carl R. Rogers. (eds.) Man and the Science of Man. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill. 1968.

university psychology, is really living by an out-dated model of science. They are going by a Newtonian concept of science that I think is way out of date and I think they've never faced the problems created by the scientist being both scientist and the material of his science. It's something that no other science has really had to face because it's just been a little peripheral problem that the human factor does enter into the reading of the dial. But where you are not only the subject but the object of the science as well, it creates a whole bunch of new problems and I think we haven't yet found what science might mean as applied to the human being. One other statement on that and then I'll sign off. As you can see it's something I'm quite interested in. When Michael Polanyi first said to me that he wished we'd quit using the term "science" for at least a decade and just think about acquiring knowledge, I really was quite unsympathetic to that statement. Gradually, however, I've come to agree with him quite completely. I think in the behavioral field, in the human field, if we would just forget all about science...which for psychologists is all methodology and that isn't

what it is among the real scientists in harder fields, if we could forget all about that and just ask ourselves "how could we acquire more knowledge about human beings?" That knowledge might be useful, it might even be interchangeable. That is, you and I might see the same thing, or gain the same kind of experience from a given situation. I think we would be much better off because then we would be free to be creative about our approach to problems.

Frick: Well, this might bring about a rapproachment between behavior therapy and the other approaches, you know.

Rogers: Yes, I think so.

* * * *

Frick: Dr. Rogers, you have made the point that truth is never a closed and finished book, and I would like to quote you here: "There will be new discoveries which will contradict the best theories which we can construct..." This statement appeared in your paper in the Koch book.[1] Now, my question is

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, "A Theory of Therapy, Personality and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework," in Koch, S. (ed.) Psychology: A Study of a Science, vol. III. McGraw-Hill, 1959. p. 190.

this: what do you regard as the most likely or promising theoretical changes in your theory, to get theoretical again. Do you see any signs of things taking place that might be changing your theories quite a bit, or do you have that perspective now?

Rogers: Of course, if I really knew the answer to that I could be launching out on new theories, and new aspects of theory myself, so all I can do is just speculate a little bit on what are probably some peripheral things. I think that...I guess I can't quite say what specific changes might occur, but I think that by utilizing even more than I have the internal world of the individual as the base for theoretical thinking, that probably would bring a significantly changed emphasis into the theories because one thing I know that I have vaguely felt about various attempts of mine to organize things theoretically, is that there is a strong temptation, then, to externalize it.

Frick: Yes, I've noticed this in some of your writings.

Rogers: ...for instance in therapy, I really rely on

the internal world of the other individual. That's the thing that teaches me, out of which I learn, but I don't think I've ever known well enough how one could construct a theory from that vantage point. And maybe that is quite important. One other small thing would be to repeat what I've been saying, that I probably would make less effort to build a theory on empirical evidence. I can't be accused of overdoing that, certainly, but I did try to bring in as much empirical evidence as I could, particularly in the Koch findings. I guess I would play down somewhat the importance of that, because I think that our empirical attempts in the psychological field are really so primitive that they're damn near useless, and...

Frick: ...worse than useless sometimes, perhaps.

Rogers: Yes, and perhaps profound insights growing out of immersion in the phenomena, in this case the phenomena of human living or becoming a person or whatever, would be definitely preferable to trying to back up any observations with empirical data.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, I read the article that you wrote outlining a plan for using T-groups or the sensitivity training methods to change an entire educational system, to bring about innovation in education.[1] At the end of the article you asked if there were any takers of your proposal. After I finished reading the article I wondered how many expressed serious interest or real commitment to your ideas.

Rogers: Oh, the response to that was very interesting. Quite a number of school systems said, "We'd like to be the school system in which you work," but they really didn't have the funds for that. One foundation executive wrote me immediately after he had read it and he said, "you bet you've got a taker. We'll put this a little bit more in proposal form and we'll give you backing." And then to his enormous embarrassment his Board of Trustees wouldn't go along with it. It was too far out for them. It had already been turned down by one or two foundations and the

---

[1]Carl R. Rogers, A Plan for Self-Directed Change in an Educational System. Mimeographed and distributed by the author.

Office of Education turned it down twice. But then another foundation heard about it, got interested in it, and they did give us backing. One reason I haven't been much involved in theory in the last couple of years is that I got very much immersed in doing this, trying to carry out that plan.

Frick: What school system is this now, Dr. Rogers?

Rogers: I had assumed that, of course, it would be a public school system and there were really a number of public school systems not too far from here who were very eager to be the target system. Then we had some visitors from the Immaculate Heart Order and they wanted the educational system of their Order to be the target system and I said "no," I thought it should be a public school system and besides, I really didn't think that parochial schools were up to the level of public high schools and that they were more difficult to work with. But gradually, there were several factors that made us choose the parochial system. For one thing, it was the only one with a college that was turning out teachers so we could deal with the college level too. There were

also eight high schools and fifty elementary schools, so it was really a pretty whopping system to tackle, and we've had a most fascinating year and a half at it.

Frick: Are you actually involved in group contact yourself, or are you involved in supervising the...

Rogers: The way I like to work on a thing like that, I don't like administration of any kind, so I get someone who will serve as administrator to the project. I like to be in at the grass roots level, and then at the conceptual, and writing up level and that's what I've done. I've worked with groups of faculty and administrators, and recently a group of administrators of the college, and a group of high school girls, and high school faculty and students. These two groups finally were willing to get together, not initially, but they got to the point where they decided they wouldn't be too dangerous to each other, and there again, it was the faculty who were frightened, not the students.

Frick: They're the rigid ones, aren't they?

Rogers: They're the rigid ones. And then I've dealt with faculties of elementary schools and I've been carrying on a lot of the groups myself.

Frick: This is kind of surprising, Dr. Rogers, that this would turn out to be a Catholic school system.

Rogers: Yes, well, they are a very surprising set-up. Certainly at the elementary school level, and perhaps at the college level too, perhaps all the way through they are more consistently forward-looking than any educational system I've known. They are really a very swinging group. I don't know whether you've come across this in newspapers, but because they took some quite modern stands like deciding not to wear their habit and a number of things that went against the traditional notions, Cardinal McIntyre shut them out of all the elementary schools, so that these elementary schools that we worked with are now no longer available to us which sounds quite tragic, but I don't feel too badly about it because the people whom we've dealt with have gone into other schools and...

Frick: ...you mean the people you were working with?

Rogers: Yes, they really were dropped from all of the 50 elementary schools that were under his jurisdiction. There might be a few that were not. The Sisters were put out of them.

Frick: Well, this really destroyed your plan in those schools, didn't it?

Rogers: It did as far as those schools are concerned, yes, but I say the reason I don't regard it as a tragedy, is that we had an awfully good experience and saw some of the changes taking place before they were put out, and then the second thing that makes me feel comfortable about it is that all of those people that we affected, after all, have gone into all kinds of situations, and in some respects it may be a more effective outcome than we could have dreamed up, I don't know.

Frick: Are you primarily, then, dealing at the high school level?

Rogers: Well, the high schools and the college and we're really limited very much to that.

Frick: One or two final questions, Dr. Rogers. You've been very kind this morning and I appreciate it very much. In my interview with Dr. Maslow, he stressed that the closer and closer he got to the end of his career, the more he has eliminated things from his life except almost a compulsive devotion to his theoretical studies and his writing. For example, he said that he recently cut out bird walking which was one his favorite hobbies. He doesn't go to plays anymore with his wife. In other words, he has become almost totally dedicated to his professional work. And you know, when he was telling me this, he got very sad, and I felt that the tears were very near the surface. But this is a very committed man, obviously. Now, I thought I would like to have you tell me something about your life, Dr. Rogers. Is it as compulsively dedicated to your professional pursuits?

Rogers: Well let me...I <u>will</u> answer that. First of all, I would say that is the saddest thing about Abe Maslow that I've heard in a long time.

Frick: Did you know this?

Rogers: No. I sort of sensed that was the direction he was taking, but, God, to think of limiting one's life in that way. I really think that's a great mistake, because I don't believe that the best thinking comes from just shuting oneself away from a lot of outside stimulation.

Frick: You know, this is what I asked him. I asked him if this was self-actualizing and he wasn't too sure about this but, on the other hand, he said he was doing what was most vital and most crucial to him as an individual and he said he thought <u>that</u> was healthy. And he went on to say that there were times when, although he didn't go on bird walks anymore, he tried to be by himself. I asked Dr. Maslow, then, if these other interests and activities didn't feed back into his work. I mean, going to see a play, or....

Rogers: ...or watching the birds.

Frick: That's right and I guess I have wondered, Dr. Rogers, if this was the direction you were taking.

Rogers: My direction is almost strictly the opposite. I feel that...I've tried to face the reality of the fact that I hope I will continue to make some contributions but I do feel that my most creative years are past. I hope that maybe some wisdom accrues as one grows older. For that reason, I'm not eager to turn out lots more writings. I do still continue to write quite a good deal, but certainly not compulsively, and I am the same as I always have been in that I get my nourishment from direct contact with what I'm thinking about. That's why it isn't accidental at all that I would conduct a giggling group of high school girls for a whole weekend, and profit enormously. And I understand my granddaughters better on account of that.

Frick: Yes, they're about that age now, aren't they?

Rogers: Yes, we have an awfully good relationship with our oldest granddaughter, it just pleases me clear to the ground that she will talk with us and particularly talk with me about things that are very, very crucial and delicate and personal. When I think what I would have told my grandparents, which would

have been zero, then it just seems incredible to me. It seems as though a real change in culture has taken place when...

Frick: You're really bridging a gap, aren't you there, and you feel it.

Rogers: Yes. Jack Butler at Chicago once said, when I said I was going to Wisconsin, partly because I felt that I had done what I could at the University of Chicago Counseling Center, and I wanted now to work more in a general department. Well, at Wisconsin I was to have two departments to work in, psychiatry and psychology, and felt I didn't need to have a special group of my own. When I told Jack Butler this he said, "why, you can never get along without a group of your own." Well, by and large, I guess he's proven to be right. I built a group there at Wisconsin and out here it's been the same thing, and I find enormous stimulation in always being with younger people. We have very few friends our own age. They're all younger people, and I get a lot out of that. And I feel that, well for example, we have 40 people connected with the Center for Studies of

the Person, a lot of them not on salary and we always have various crazy kinds of informal associations, but I feel that I have an impact on that group. That's just as important as writing something. It's very exciting to me to see people go beyond what you could do and this would be one thing, I think, that Abe would be cutting himself off from. For example, in this business of being a person to another person in a therapy relationship, in a group situation or what not, I feel I've made a good deal of progress personally along that line. But then when I see the people who have worked with me, and who have really gotten the stimulus for this from me, and are able to do it much more adequately, much more deeply than I can, I think that's great. I really get a big kick out of that. And then, too, I guess another...well, I'll stick to myself and not Abe...No, I build bird feeders in front of the house, and learn a great deal from watching the hummingbirds at their feeders. I don't think I would have nearly the belief in territoriality that I do, if I hadn't seen it operate under my nose. And I spend more time raising tuberous

begonias than I ever would have spent at any previous portion of my life. I feel that...

Frick: ...these are enriching now, especially at this time in your life.

Rogers: Yes. I feel...oh, for example one change is that in the Center for Studies of the Person which is skating along on very thin, almost non-existent financial resources...in previous years, I would have felt very responsible for that group, because, like it or not, I'm sort of the ideological head of the place even though I am not the administrator. This time I really comfortably do not feel that responsibility. I feel that these are mature young people, and that they know what they're getting into, and if the whole thing goes to pot, they'll all land on their feet, so I can relax and enjoy them and feel this is a damn good experience while it lasts. If it doesn't last very long, and if we do come a cropper financially, why, alright, it will have been a good experience. So, I guess I am much less compulsive about my work. I've turned down many opportunities for talks, and all that kind of thing.

Frick: You have to, don't you?

Rogers: Oh yes, I don't suppose I accept one in twenty and even that's too many. And I still like to keep having experiences at the grass roots level of human interaction. If I do contribute anything else theoretically it will be because of that and I will always be someone who is very much rooted in the earth of experience.

Frick: Your directions now, Dr. Rogers, are primarily in education, aren't they, or am I wrong now?

Rogers: I would say that the things I am involved in most deeply at the present time are, first of all, the intensive group experience with all different kinds of groups, encouraging other groups and encouraging people to carry on groups that I haven't had much experience in like family groups and couples groups and adolescent groups. Then, certainly, that interest joins with an interest in education in this kind of thing we're doing to try to change an educational system, and then I have felt an increasing strength that I have had quite a lot to say that is

relevant to education, and have said it in a variety of different places, but most of it has been in the context of psychotherapy so that educators as a whole are not very familiar...or students in education are not very much aware of my point of view. And that's what led me to work on this new book, Freedom to Learn. And the third--these things keep changing in order of precedence from time to time--but third would be this interest which I don't feel very competent to follow, but I feel it's such a tremendously important question: What should be the philosophy of the behavioral sciences or what should the science of man really be? It should not be what it is at the present time, that I feel very sure of but just what the answer is I don't know.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, in concluding our conversation this morning could you tell me a little bit about your new adventure--or venture--probably both would be true, with the Center for Studies of the Person.

Rogers: Well, the Center for Studies of the Person is a very loosely organized group which could almost be called a non-organization. Yet, in spite of its

lack of organizational structure, it has a tremendous sense of community and closeness. We are bound together by a number of common goals which I think could be summed up by saying that we are all interested in making it possible for man to enrich his own life and to expand his visions for himself. Thus, every summer some of our staff conduct a very large program for the training of facilitators of encounter groups because we feel that these have had a very enriching experience. Another large project coming to a conclusion is the attempt to make it possible for a whole complex educational system to bring about self-directed and forward-looking change in itself, thus making education more personal and more relevant. We also have a half dozen other projects going on at any given time. There are about 45 people who are members of the Center, 24 of them have their doctor's degrees.

I think we are also involved in something which we did not plan but which has gradually emerged. We are probably a pilot study in what the organization of the future might be, one that would really attract the loyalty and creativity of younger people. Our

whole organizational purpose is to let each member do his own thing. He can freely join a project or a group and invest as much of himself in it as he wishes. The organization does not promise to support anyone but we help everyone as much as possible to find means of support. There is no one who is really in authority over any one else. Problems are settled through open discussion of feelings, attitudes, and facts. I am sure we have just as many problems as an hierarchical organization but they are a different quality of problem and the loyalty and enthusiasm and creativity of our staff is very, very high indeed. I think we represent the kind of organizational home that the person of tomorrow really desires.

Frick: Dr. Rogers, thank you very much.

Rogers: Well, it's been pleasant to talk with you.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

JOURNAL OF HUMANISTIC TEACHING[1]

Gloria Siemons' First Grade

Foothill School, Goleta, California

October 23: Imagination and Language Arts

1. Lie on the floor.

2. Close your eyes.

3. Make pictures in your mind. Try not to talk so you don't disturb your neighbor's picture.

4. Think of a special friend. A very special friend. If you cannot think of a real one, make one up. Look closely at your friend. Is your friend tall or short? Fat or thin? What color is your special friend's hair? What color are your special friend's eyes? Take a very good look at your friend. Try to know exactly what your friend looks like to you.

5. Now pretend you and your friend are going to a special place. How did you get there? Did you run? walk? ride? Think of where you are now. What are you and your friend doing at your special place? Keep thinking about your friend and what you're doing. Now take your friend's hand and take your friend home with you.

6. When you get your friend safely home, leave him there and you can open your eyes. You don't have to hurry.

When everyone opened their eyes, they sat up. I asked them then to try to go back to their desks and draw a picture of their friend. They told me their story and I wrote it leaving space under each line so they could re-write it just under it in correct form.

NOTE: Save stories and pictures for later comparison.

---

[1]This appendix includes only the first month of a journal that continued throughout the school year.

October 24: Literature and self-awareness (body)

1. Read Somebody's Slippers, Somebody's Shoes.

2. Talk about being barefooted. Take off shoes and socks.

3. Go outside and walk on:
   a. dewy grass (cold, wet)
   b. blacktop (dry, warm, rough)
   c. concrete (dry, cool, smooth)
   d. sand (rough, warm, stuck to wet feet)
   e. climb on jungle jim

4. Come inside and feel:
   a. rubber mat
   b. vinyl floor
   c. rug

5. Put on shoes while talking about feet.

6. Write stories -- watch for drawings of feet.

While putting on his shoes, Mark yelled out, "Wow! I can really feel my feet inside my shoes now. I know right where they are."

I said, "Go draw a picture of your feet and show how they feel if you want to."

Reflections: Some boys, not necessarily the same as before, were very uncomfortable with this. They balked at removing their shoes and then refused to go in all the areas.

October 25: Body awareness

Have children lie on the floor -- find their own space. Repeat Chant exercise, but this time keep the hands touching the head parts only.

"I am rubbing my head.
I am feeling my hair.
I am touching my ears.
I am rubbing my neck."

After warming up on this, give them directions:

Now rub your head. Try to find out if you have bumps on your head. Now run your fingers around your ears. Feel for soft parts, hard parts, bumpy parts. Close your eyes. Put your finger tips over your eyes. Feel the eyeball move underneath by moving your eyes underneath. What does the skin on top of your eyes feel like? Soft, rough, smooth, bumpy? Now move up to your eye lashes. Open and shut your eyes over your finger. Are your eye lashes long or short? Straight or curly? Soft or hard? Move to your eyebrows. Rub them one way. Now the other. What happened? Now rub them both ways again. Rub them back to where they were. Move your finger tips down your nose. Feel the hard bone underneath. Feel where the bone stops. Is your nose fat, pointed, bumpy, smooth? Do you have a scab on your nose? What does your nose feel like? Now move one finger under your nose. Breathe through your nose. Feel your breath go in and out over your finger. Is it hot or cold? Do you like the way it feels? Now move down to your lips. Trace your fingertips over your lips. How many lips do you have? Do they feel alike? How are they alike? How are they different? Now move over to the side of your lips. Open your mouth. Feel how your bones move. Go way up by your ears. Open and shut your mouth. Feel what happens. Feel your bones under your skin. Feel your teeth inside your mouth. Now move your fingertips down your throat. Swallow. What happens? Now make a noise. Listen with your ears and feel with your fingertips. Where does the noise come from? Take both your hands and fold them under your head. Close your eyes. Keep your voices quiet. Try to think about some of the things you did. What did you find was the softest part of you? The coldest part? The hardest? Warmest? What did you discover about your own face? When you are ready, go back to the mirror and take a good look at yourself if you want. Then draw a picture of your face. And write something you know about you.

NOTE: When doing this with first graders, I broke this up into 2 sessions of about 20 minutes each.

October 26: Getting to know each other. Moving into other awareness.

Have the children stand in a close circle -- touching shoulders and holding hands. (I actually had to go around and move bodies, but once placed, they stayed there.)

Play a game. Leader says, "This is my friend_____ and _____;" naming the children he is holding on to. I asked them to look right at each other when doing this. (They had some trouble with that.)

Then it progressed around the circle so each child made one statement, but heard his name in the sentence twice--once on each side of him.

When we were all around the circle, I asked them to sit just where they were. Remain close enough to still be able to feel their friends. Then I said, when you really feel like it, tell us what you are feeling. I started by saying what I felt from my two friends. (K had them close their eyes. Many did not stay shut and I said nothing about it.) I was delighted that children from various parts of the circle said what they were feeling.

After this stopped, I asked them to join arms and let's see what happens. Don't try to make anything happen, just see what <u>does</u> happen. In a while part of the circle began to sway back and forth. Then another part of it began moving in and out -- stretching down in front and lying down on our backs. After a while the circle became quiet again.

I asked them to lie down -- staying close to each other still. I said they could touch each other in any way they wanted.

Some seemed to want to pull away from the group. After letting them go for a while I asked them to come up to the rug so we could talk about what we did.

At one time, when the class went from sitting to lying down, I decided to leave the group -- I had a parent and a student teacher observing and I thought I would look a bit silly stretched out on the floor at 10:15.

But the children -- from widely spaced intervals in the circle, said, "No, Mrs. S, don't leave" and "You can't leave, you've got to do it too," not in a demanding way,

but as if to say, don't miss the fun, we've just begun this! I was very happy that they wanted me to be with them and I was glad to stay.

In our discussion almost all parts of what we did were brought out. One girl said, "I liked to say, 'This is my friend, Renee. This is my friend Christina'." When I asked her how she felt when they said her name, she said, "Oh, that made me real happy inside." She was just glowing.

Others mentioned lying on the floor. I was greatly surprised that many children said they liked the part where they could just go on their own the best. In watching the group I had felt they were falling apart at that point and so I called them up to the rug after only allowing them a short time on their own.

Then they wrote a story about their experience.

NOTE: Mike's story -- I didn't like being in that circle.

October 27:

After having so much fun with yesterday's lesson, I decided to try it again -- again without quite knowing where the lesson would go.

We started with the circle again. Today I didn't have to move them. From there we sat down. The group wanted to rock. So we rocked. I encouraged them to rock real hard -- way over to each side. Squash each other. Then I tried to get them to sit still and listen to themselves and each other. They didn't want to. Some laid down. So we all tried it. My side of the circle began to laugh -- really laugh. Everyone began doing it. Me too. The other side of the circle sat up and said, "What's so funny?" Since we didn't seem to get into a one group feeling I suggested they move off on their own and see what happened. I asked them to continue to move on their back, pushing themselves.

I didn't move from my place because three children moved to me right away. One boy moved up, picked up my head, and manipulated himself around until he had my head on his stomach. Then he giggled and giggled.

After about 5 minutes I asked the class to try to come together into the circle again. They resisted. After about 3 more minutes I said to try to come together to a slow count to 10.

After counting to 10, we all stood up. There were three separate groups. There was a close group of four or five over by the door, a large group, about 16, in the original circle area, and a few standing apart from everyone.

I then asked them all to come up to the group. As we began to move, two boys encountered each other in the middle of the floor. They were alone in an open space. I stopped them and suggested they "push" each other. (I had seen this with adults just the day before.)

The class became just wild watching these two. They were evenly matched in spirit, strength, and size. They thought it was great. Several other boys began to pair up on the rug, so I suggested we all go outside and try it. They were screaming to get out. I got them quiet enough to get out of the door and past other classrooms.

We went out on the playgound between a backstop and a fence about 40 feet across, and pushed.

I took on several children. Several challenged me. I challenged others that I wanted to meet. It was amazing to feel the strength of these little kids. It felt very good to feel those strong healthy beings really "take me on."

We soon found very few children pushing each other to the limits. We almost always stayed within about 20 feet of space. When we were tired and hot, we got a drink and had free play for 10 minutes. When they came back we had a very quiet attentive reading group.

NOTE: Mike and Jim physically left the group. Mike really was uncomfortable looking. However, he really threw himself into a contest with me. I let him back me up, but he knew it, and said, "No, don't move." So I stood my ground until he was tired.

November 10: From Can You Imagine --

We had the video tape in today and they knew they were going to be on camera. I asked them to sit by me -- like an Indian -- hands in your lap -- close your eyes.

Pretend you are something furry. (I could actually see some children move into this.) Are you big or small?

I had them then put up their heads and tell me what they were.

Close your eyes again. Keep imagining you are a furry animal. Do people like you? Why?

The class was getting wiggly. So I said, "Now try to think how you move." I had those who were big animals move on the floor. Then those who were small. I asked them how they could be their best at the animal they were now. Now favorable response. One said, "Be quieter" and she was a bunny. (The class was noisy at times)

This lesson was good considering it was a Monday and out first day on tape. We'll try it again tomorrow. I'm finding Tuesday and Wednesdays are good days again this year. (I've always invited visitors Tuesdays - Thursday. Monday and Fridays are not as good somehow.)

November 22: Voyage to Inner Body. Reporter: Peggy Peterson.* About 40 minutes, 26 two-year olds.

This is a report of something that happened spontaneously. My original goal was to help the children find places to hide other than under the desks, in the hall box, or closet.

As the hour passed, the children became very responsive to describing their bodies. I encouraged this for the purpose of guiding them to more accurate perception of their bodies. I also feel the process helps them to develop and use their imagination.

*Student teacher.

Also, Gloria and I can now use this kind of imagery in a variety of situations -- when a child needs to pull away, to pull the class out of hiding places after recess, etc.

It is important in the first grade to develop a more accurate image of the child's body.

I began by reading the poem, "Hiding" (See later). I then asked the children to close their eyes and find a place in their body where they could hide. The children had a hard time closing their eyes. (A hard task for first graders.) After a period of about 3 minutes it was obvious that most of the children were hidden. I then asked them to open their eyes, and, one at a time, tell where they were. About 3 children had spoken when I realized that this was an opportunity to find out how they felt about their bodies. The next boy said he was in his thumb. I asked him how he got there. He told about his trip into his mouth, down his throat through his heart, up to his shoulder and down his arm. The other children were fascinated by the story of this trip. My standard questions for each child were, "How does it feel in your _____?" "How did you get there?" and "What can you see there?" The children were extremely interested. If there had been more time, I would have had them go to their seats, draw their hiding place, and write a story about it.

Many of the children talked about blood veins and bones -- probably the only things they are really aware of inside them. For awhile I talked some about veins, arteries and the heart.

I am sure that the children would not have been able to go so far if they hadn't had several days of body awareness and three days of imagination exercises (Imagine you are furry, green, and Jimmy's Surprise.) All of these elements built up their ability to imagine and be aware of their bodies to the point where they could take such an inner trip.

HIDING

I'm hiding, I'm hiding
And no one knows where;
For all they can see is my
Toes and my hair

And so I just heard my father
Say to my mother--
"But darling, he must be
Somehwere or other;

Have you looked in the inkwell?"
And Mother said, "Where?"
"In the inkwell," said Father, but
I was not there.

Then, "Wait!" cried my mother,
"I think that I see
Him under the carpet." But
It was not me.

"Inside the mirror's
A pretty good place,"
Said Father, and looked but saw
Only his face.

"We've hunted," sighed Mother,
"As hard as we could
And I am so afraid that we've
Lost him for good."

Then I laughed out loud
And I wiggled my toes
And Father said, "Look, dear,
I wonder if those

Toes could be Bunny's.
There are ten of them. See?"
And they were so surprised to find
Out it was me!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Alfred. The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. H. L. Rowena Ansbacher. (eds.). New York: Basic Books, 1956.

Allport, Gordon. "Geneticism Versus Ego-Structure." Brit. J. Educ. Psychol. Vol. 16, 1946. pp. 57-68.

Allport, Gordon. "The Trend in Motivation Theory." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry. Vol. 25, 1953. pp. 107-119.

Allport, Gordon. Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Allport, Gordon. The Individual and His Religion. New York: The Macmillan Co., (1960a).

Allport, Gordon. "The Open System in Personality Theory." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. Vol. 61, (1960b). pp. 301-310.

Allport, Gordon. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.

Allport, Gordon. Personality and Social Encounter. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

Angyal, Andras. Foundations for a Science of Personality. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1941.

Angyal, Andras. "The Holistic Approach in Psychiatry." American Journal of Psychiatry. Vol. 105, 1948. pp. 178-82.

Angyal, Andras. Neurosis and Treatment: A Holistic Theory. Hanfmann, E. and Jones, R.M. (eds.), New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Ansbacher, H. L. "On the Origins of Holism." Journal of Individual Psychology. Vol. 17, 1961. pp. 142-144.

Barron, Frank. "Personal Soundness in University Graduate Students." Publications in Personality Assessment and Research. No. 1, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954.

Berlyne, D. E. Conflict, Arousal, and Curiosity. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Bernard, L. L. Instinct: A Study in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1924.

Bertalanffy, L. Von. "The Theory of Open Systems in Physics and Biology." Science, Vol. 111, 1950. pp. 23-29.

Bertalanffy, L. Von. "Theoretical Models in Biology and Psychology." Theoretical Models and Personality Theory. Krech, David and Klein, George S. (eds.) Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1952.

Bertocci, Peter A. and Millard, Richard M. Personality and the Good: Psychological and Ethical Perspectives. New York: David McKay, Inc., 1963.

Bettelheim, B. The Empty Fortress: Infantile Autism and the Birth of the Self. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Bischof, Ledford. Interpreting Personality Theories. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Bonner, Hubert. "Idealization and Mental Health." Journal of Individual Psychology, Vol. 18, No. 2, 1962. pp. 136-46.

Brown, George. Now: The Human Dimension. Esalen Monograph No. 1, Big Sur, California, Esalen Institute, 1968.

Bucke, R. M. Cosmic Consciousness. Philadelphia: Innes and Sons, 1901.

Bühler, Charlotte. "Human Life Patterns." Unpublished paper.

Carkhuff, Robert R. and Berenson, Bernard G. Beyond Counseling and Therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Coghill, G. E. Anatomy and the Problem of Behavior. London: Cambridge University Press, 1929.

Cohen, Sidney. The Beyond Within: The LSD Story. New York: Antheneum, 1964.

Coulson, William R. and Rogers, Carl R. (eds.) Man and the Science of Man. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1968.

Dabrowski, Kazimierz. Positive Disintegration. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.

Dewey, John. "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology." Psychological Review, Vol. 3, 1896. pp. 357-370.

Drews, Elizabeth M. "Beyond Curriculum." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. VIII, 1968. pp. 97-112.

Dunbar, H. Flanders. Emotion and Bodily Changes. 4th edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Dunn, Halbert L. High-Level Wellness. Arlington, Va: R. W. Beatty, LTD., 1961.

English, Horace B. and English, Ava Champney. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1968.

Erikson, E. H. "Late Adolescence." The Student and Mental Health. D. H. Funkenstein, ed., London: World Federation of Mental Health, 1959. p. 86.

Erikson, E. H. Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1968.

Frankl, Viktor. "Beyond Self-Actualization and Self-expression." Journal of Existential Psychiatry, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1960. pp. 5-20.

Frick, Willard. "Healthy Interpersonal Relationships: An Exploratory Study." Journal of Individual Psychology, Vol. 23, May, 1967. pp. 58-66.

Friedes, D. "Toward the Elimination of the Concept of Normality." J. Consulting Psychology, 24, 1960. pp. 128-133.

Fromm, Eric. The Sane Society. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1955.

Gardner, John. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Goldstein, Kurt. "On Emotions: Considerations from the Organistic Point of View." Journal of Psychology, Vol. 31, 1951. pp. 37-49.

Goldstein, Kurt. "New Ideas on Mental Health." Personal Problems and Psychological Frontiers. Johnson E. Fairchild, ed., New York: Sheridan House, 1957.

Goldstein, Kurt. "Health as Value." New Knowledge in Human Values. Abraham Maslow, ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

Goldstein, Kurt. Human Nature in the Light of Psychopathology. New York: Schocken Books, (1963a).

Goldstein, Kurt. The Organism. Boston: Beacon Press, (1963b).

Green, Hannah. I Never Promised You a Rose Garden. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Hall, Calvin S. and Lindzey, Gardner. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.

Hartshorne, Hugh and May, M. A. Studies In the Nature of Character. "Studies in Deceit," Vol. 1, New York: The MacMillan Co., 1928.

Herrick, C. Judson. The Evolution of Human Nature. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1956.

Hooker, Davenport. The Origin of Behavior. The University of Michigan, 1944.

Hooker, Davenport. "The Development of Behavior in the Human Fetus," Dennis, Wayne. Readings in Child Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.

Horney, K. Neurosis and Human Growth. Norton, 1950.

Huxley, Aldous. "Education on the Non-Verbal Level." Daedalus, Vol. 91, 1962. pp. 279-294.

Jackson, J. H. Selected Writings of John Hughlings Jackson. J. Taylor (ed.), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.

Johoda, Marie. Current Conceptions of Positive Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Krech, D., Rosenzweig, M. R. and Bennett, E. L. "Effects of Environmental Complexity and Training on Brain Chemistry." Journal of Comparative Physiological Psychology, Vol. 53, 1960. pp. 509-519.

Kubzansky, P. E. and Leiderman, P. H. "Sensory Deprivation: An Overview." P. Solomon et. al. (eds.), Sensory Deprivation. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Laing, R. D. The Politics of Experience. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Lecky, Prescott. Self-Consistency: A Theory of Personality. Island Press Co-operative, Inc., 1951.

Lecky, Prescott. Self-Consistency: A Theory of Personality. The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1961.

Lewin, K. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Linton, R. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1945.

Maslow, Abraham. "Resistance to Acculturation." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 1, 1951. pp. 26-29.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.

Maslow, Abraham. "Health as Transcendence of Environment." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1961.

Maslow, Abraham. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., (1962a).

Maslow, Abraham. "Lessons for the Peak Experiences." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 2, No. 1, (1962b). pp. 9-18.

Maslow, Abraham. "Notes on Being Psychology." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 2 (1962c). pp. 47-71.

Maslow, Abraham. "Further Notes on the Psychology of Being." J. Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 3, 1963. pp. 120-135.

Maslow, Abraham. Religions, Values, and Peak Experiences. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, (1964a).

Maslow, Abraham. "Synergy in the Society and in the Individual." Journal of Individual Psychology, Vol. 20, (1964b). pp. 153-164.

Maslow, Abraham. The Psychology of Science: A Reconnaissance. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Maslow, Abraham. "A Theory of Metamotivation: The Biological Rooting of the Value-Life." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1967. pp. 93-127.

Maslow, Abraham. "Theory Z." New Developments Within the Human Side of Enterprise. W. G. Bennis and E. H. Schein (eds.), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969. (In press).

May, Rollo. Man's Search for Himself. New York: W. W. Norton Co., 1953.

May, Rollo. Psychology and the Human Dilemma. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1967.

McCullers, Carson. The Heart is a Lonely Hunter. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1961.

McDougal, William. The Energies of Men. London: Methuen, 1932.

McLuhan, Marshall and Fiore, Quentin. The Medium is the Message. New York: Bantom Books, Inc., 1967.

Menninger, Karl. The Vital Balance. New York: The Viking Press, 1963.

Meyer, A. The Common Sense Psychiatry of Dr. Adolf Meyer. A. Liet (ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, 1948.

Montague, Ashley. The Direction of Human Development. New York: Harper, 1955.

Morris, C. W. Varieties of Human Value. University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Moustakas, Clark. "Heuristic Research." Bugental, James, F. T. (ed.), Challenges of Humanistic Psychology, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Mowrer, Hobart. The Crisis in Psychiatry and Religion. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1961.

Murphy, Gardner. Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origins and Structure. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

Murphy, Gardner. Human Potentialities. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

Murphy, Gardner. "Self-Realization and Mental Health." Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, Vol. 23, No. 3, May, 1959. pp. 81-84.

Murphy, Gardner. Psychological Thought From Pythagoras to Freud. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.

Murphy, Gardner. "Psychology in the Year 2000." American Psychologist, Vol. 24, May 1969.

Murphy, Gardner and Spohn, Herbert E. Encounter with Reality. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.

Offer, Daniel and Sabshin, Melvin. Normality: Clinical and Theoretical Concepts of Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Otto, Herbert A. Explorations in Human Potentialities. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas. 1966.

Rogers, Carl R; Kell, B. L. and McNeil, H. "The Role of Self-Understanding in the Prediction of Behavior." Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 12, 1948. pp. 174-186.

Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1951.

Rogers, Carl R. Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954.

Rogers, Carl R. "A Theory of Therapy, Personality, and Interpersonal Relationships as Developed in the Client-Centered Framework." Psychology: A Study of a Science, S. Koch, ed., Vol. 3, Foundations of the Person in the Social Contest. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959. pp. 184-256.

Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Actualizing Tendency in Relation to "Motives" and to Consciousness." Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Jones, Marshall R. (ed.), University of Nebraska Press, Vol. 4, (1963a).

Rogers, Carl R. "Freedom and Commitment." Paper delivered at San Francisco State College, (1963b).

Rogers, Carl R. "Toward a Modern Approach to Values: The Valuing Process in the Mature Person." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 68, No. 2, (1964a), pp. 160-167.

Rogers, Carl R. "Toward a Science of the Person." Behaviorism and Phenomenology: Contrasting Bases for Modern Psychology. T. W. Wann, ed., Chicago University: Chicago Press, (1964b).

Rogers, Carl R. "Some Questions and Challenges Facing a Humanistic Psychology." Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1965. pp. 1-5.

Rogers, Carl R. A Plan for Self-Directed Change in an Educational System. Mimeographed paper, pp. 1-27.

Ryle, Gilbert. The Concept of Mind. London: Hutchinson & Company, LTD, 1949.

Schachtel, E. G. Metamorphosis. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Shaw, Franklin J. Reconciliation: A Theory of Man Transcending. Jourard. Sidney M. and Overlade, Dan C. (eds.), Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1966.

Sherrington, C. S. The Integrative Action of the Nervous System. New York: Charles Scribner, 1906.

Sinnott, Edmund W. "Introduction to the Compass Edition." Smutts, J. C., Holism and Evolution, New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1961.

Smith, M. B. "Mental Health Reconsidered: A Special Case of the Problem of Values in Psychology." American Psychologist, Vol. 16, 1961. pp. 299-306.

Smuts, Jan C. Holism and Evolution. New York: Macmillan, 1926.

Snow, C. P. The Search. The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1960.

Storr, A. The Integrity of the Personality. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

Sutich, Anthony. "The Growth-Experience and the Growth-Centered Attitude," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 7, 1967. pp. 155-162.

Taylor, H. Art and the Intellect. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1960.

White, Robert W. "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence." Psychological Review, Vol. 66, 1959. pp. 297-333.

Whitehead, Alfred N. Modes of Thought. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958.

Whitehorn, John C. and Zilboorg, Gregory. "Present Trends in American Psychiatric Research." American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 13, 1933.

Witkin, H. A.; Lewis, H. B.; Hertzman, M.; Machover, K,; Bretnall, P. and Wapner, W. Personality Through Perception. New York: Harper, 1954.