

Toward a Positive Psychology

LIMITED PRECONCEPTIONS

All human concerns, all human institutions, and all human raise bar cultures rest on human nature. Since we know little about human nature, theories (usually incorrect ones) about human nature have served in lieu of organized and valid facts and substantiated laws. Such theories, or not, have always been at the root of the various ideologies, political and economic philosophies, and sacral beliefs which mankind lived.

I am convinced. that the failure of the various value systems that have been tried in the past (power politics, war, religion, nationalism, the various economic, the rationalistic as well as the romantic philosophies, technology and engineering, mechanistic science) has been due largely to their being founded on erroneous conceptions of human nature and of society. And however paradoxical this may sound, I am afraid that a number of psychologists are also working with erroneous preconceptions and unconscious assumptions about human nature (and about society) which, because they are implicit and unconscious, can maintain and perpetuate themselves beyond the reach of testing for a considerable time to come. Meanwhile they are projected by the psychologist upon his data.

In this chapter I wish to discuss one such major mistake of these psychologists, namely, their pessimistic, negative, and limited conception of the full height to which the human being can attain,

their totally inadequate conception of his level of aspiration in life, and their setting of his psychological limits at too low a level. As things stand now in psychology, the science as a whole too often pursues limited or trivial goals with limited methods and techniques and under the guidance of limited vocabulary and concepts.

The science of psychology has been far more successful on the negative than on the positive side; it has revealed to us much about man's shortcomings, his illnesses, his sins, but little about his potentialities, his virtues, his achievable aspirations, or his full psychological height. It is as if psychology had voluntarily restricted itself to only half its rightful jurisdiction, and that the darker, meaner half. This is no extrinsic, superficial attitude; it seems clear rather that it is intrinsic and at the heart of the whole culture. It seems that it is quite as easy to be Hamiltonian (rather than Jeffersonian) in psychology as it is in economics, politics, or education.

In a word, I contend that psychology has not stood up to its full height and I would like to know how this pessimistic mistake came to pass, why it has not been self-correcting, and what to do about it. We must find out not only what psychology *is* but what it ought to be, or what it *might* be, if it could free itself from the stultifying effects of limited, pessimistic, and stingy preconceptions about human nature.

NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF PSYCHOLOGY

1. Where does this constriction and coarctation of psychology come from? It seems to me that no *ad hoc* or atomistic explanation will do; we are not dealing with a surface blemish on an otherwise healthy body. This blemish is clearly systemic. It is primarily an expression of the whole culture, of its characteristic genius or *eidos*, even though secondary specific determinants enter in as well.

Science in general and psychology in particular express the same ideology or world outlook, as e.g., orthodox religion, economics, or social structure. For instance, it is too pragmatic and

functional, so much occupied with expedience and the practical, with successful results that it criticizes too little the means used to get these results. It is too much focused on technology and technological excellences, and too little oriented toward basic humanistic principles, ends, and values, being on the whole amoral or muddled as a result. It stresses too exclusively behavior and too little the inner subjective life; it is Hamiltonian rather than Jeffersonian and democratic, it is too Puritan and Calvinistic, too worried, earnest, and grim, and too little oriented toward sensuousness, sensuality, pagan pleasure, gaiety, fun, loafing, and lazing, and toward the connoisseur's view of life; it is tense rather than relaxed, it is aesthetically and emotionally impoverished rather than rich.

2. Dynamic psychology was doomed to a negative derivation by the historical accident that psychiatry rather than experimental psychology concerned itself with the conative and emotional. It was from the study of neurotics and other *sick* people that we learned most of what we know about personality and motivation.¹

3. This voluntary blindness of psychology involves as well the character structure of human beings in general and of the individual psychologists in our culture in particular who made it that way and who keep it that way. For full understanding of this historical development we should have to make a careful study of the sociology and psychology of knowledge, of the intrinsically inevitable opposition between the creative discoverer and his epigones, e.g., Freud and the Freudians, as well as the equally inevitable war between the discoverer and the organizers and administrators of these discoveries, between the front-line soldier and the rear-area, spit-and-polish, chair-borne cavalry.

We should have to go thoroughly into the nature of science,

1 "There are those who despair of discovering fundamental human design through a direct consideration of the opposite data and hope to come upon it more easily by observing a sufficiently numerous and otherwise 'fair' sample of specimens. Can we not see that any such plan is doomed to failure by its inherent contradictions? That when we continue to add individual abnormalities, they will not cancel each other out but merely present to us a cumulative index of abnormality? And that falsely to call the cumulation of abnormality a 'norm' is only to bewitch and bewilder ourselves unmercifully?" (128, p. 496.)

its origins in human nature and human needs, and its contrasting functions, as (1) safety and order producing as seen by some, and (2) as safety and order destroying as seen by others.

In other words, I conceive the coarctation of psychology to have less a psychological origin than a historical-cultural-political-economic-religious one.

LOW-CEILING PSYCHOLOGY

What are the factors that maintain and perpetuate this constriction of psychology and protect it from self-correction? I wish to speak of only a few of the mechanisms that make this possible, since most of them are well known, e.g., repression, selective perception, various defensive mechanisms, the tendency to freeze and stabilize every flux and every process for increased safety and security, etc.

1. The most widely used and time-honored method for blinding oneself is the semantic one. It is simple, and consists only of defining science strictly in terms of the past and what is already known. Every radically new question, every new technique is then stigmatized as unscientific. Just as the old shoes feel more comfortable than the new, just as we tend to improve our homes by adding rather than by rebuilding, so do most scientists also prefer comfort, safety, and the familiar. Human beings that they are, they find it easier to work within a well-established frame of reference, with familiar techniques, concepts, and questions. The paradoxes that result are shocking.²

2 Examples:

1. A professor in psychology instructed the graduate students under his guidance to do what he called an apparatus experiment. It turned out that he divided experiments in general into those that used apparatus and those that did not, and earnestly followed on the superiority of apparatus experiments. It is my belief that this ludicrous point of view is more often held than psychologists would admit.

2. A student at a major university was forbidden to do the problems that she had outlined for her dissertation on the grounds that the results might be negative and then the dissertation could not be accepted. She was willing to take her chances, but she was forbidden.

3. A graduate student asked me with some worry to help him find a

2. One reason for this error has been pointed out by Kurt Lewin (1942, p. 25) in a passage that demonstrates that we study what *is*, rather than what *ought to be* or what *might be* under ideal conditions, because of the *old Aristotelian error of identifying the status quo with the ideal*. For example, the norms for IQ, for weight, life expectancy, for infant maturation. Do we wish to know what our life expectancy ought to be? If we do, we look up the norms for the life expectancy of people as they actually are. The fact is, of course, that all in the original standardizing group from which the average for the ideal tables are obtained might themselves be abnormal in some nonstatistical sense. It used to be normal for 75 percent of all babies to die before the age of five. It is normal in some groups to have syphilis. What we call human nature seems ordinarily to be this kind of average of the *status quo* and an acceptance of it.

3. Merton's concept (1936) of the self-fulfilling prophecy can help us to understand why believing something to be so makes it more likely to come to pass. Merton points out that sometimes situations and phenomena are so unstructured that the opinion of the onlooker becomes an extremely important determinant. For instance, if it is strongly enough assumed that the Negro is fundamentally happy-go-lucky, careless, lazy, uneducable, or whatever, this strong opinion itself becomes a determinant and tends

bibliography for his dissertation, since he felt that if he did not have a bibliography, he could not use that subject for a dissertation. When I suggested that any problem for which there was a large bibliography was probably *less* worth doing, he did not understand my point.

4. One student also at a major university was forbidden to use as a subject for his Ph.D. dissertation a study of love and friendship relations, the grounds being that 'this was not a scientific problem.'

5. Most graduate students have no time for research or writing or even self-selected reading because graduate instruction has slowly come to be the study of what *other* people have done rather than the doing itself.

6. I suggested to a graduate student that she visit Wertheimer's seminar at the New School on a certain Thursday afternoon. She did not go, and the excuse she gave was that she had to go to her class in systematic and historical psychology. It would be too pat to say that the lecture for the day at the class was on Wertheimer, but it might very well have been so. This can remind us only of what was said about a certain Swiss gentleman, that if he were given a choice between going to paradise or a lecture about paradise, he would choose the latter.

to produce a fulfillment of what it prophesies. If Negroes are considered to be uneducable, and this belief is firmly held, there is no use building schools for them; and if the schools are not built, the Negroes are uneducated and show all the bad effects of lack of education, stupidity, superstition, etc. The superstition, stupidity, and lower average IQ are then pointed to as proof that the Negro is not educable. The same is true of such a phenomenon as the fear of war. The fear of war itself tends to bring about war in ways that we are all familiar with now. Another example with which we are all familiar is the aristocratic syndrome, i.e., the belief that some people are sheep and some people are shepherds, that only a small proportion of the population is capable of self-rule, independent judgment, gentlemanly behavior, and the like, while the larger proportion of the population is stupid, suggestible, and is fit only to be led and taken care of. The fact of the matter is that when people are led, and when decisions are made for them, they steadily become less and less capable of autonomy, of leading themselves, and of making their own decisions. In other words, this belief is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

4. Some years ago a very telling criticism of behavioristic experimentation was made by W. Kohler. As the argument raged as to whether animals could learn by insight or whether they always learned by what was then called trial and error, Kohler complained that this question could never be tested because the main instrument used to demonstrate animal learning, i.e., the animal maze, could never demonstrate insight under the *best* of conditions. He pointed out that even a human genius in that situation could learn in no way other than the way in which the white rat did, namely, by trial and error. In other words, he claimed that the maze set an upper limit to the possibilities of the intelligence that the animal could show. If one measured the height of people in a low-ceilinged room that did not allow them to stand up taller than four feet, no human being could measure more than four feet tall. This of course we understand would be a function of the situation, and it would be a tragic error in method. It would be measuring the height of the ceiling, *not* of the people. It is my contention that the method and the concepts

and the expectations that are used as guides in many of the areas of experimental and clinical psychology are in this sense self-limiting methods. That is, they arrange the situation in such a fashion that the human being can never show himself at his fullest height, or at his ideal limits. Using these methods only will make it impossible ever to show that the human being is anything more than the cripple that the experimenter has in advance assumed him to be. Such self-limiting methods measure only their own limitations.

5. Such men as Hamilton, Freud, Hobbes, and Schopenhauer have built up theories of human nature that are based on the study of men at their worst. It would be as if we used as our main technique for studying human nature the study of men cast away on a raft in the middle of the ocean without food or drink and expecting at any moment to die. Certainly we should learn less about general human nature in this way than we should about the psychology of desperation. Hamilton generalized from poor, uneducated people. Freud generalized too much from neurotic people. Hobbes and other philosophers observed masses of mankind under very bad social and economic and educational conditions and came to conclusions that ought not to be generalized to men under *good* economic and political and educational conditions. This we may call low-ceiling or cripple or jungle psychology, but certainly not *general* psychology.

6. The self-derogation of psychology is another responsible factor. Out of the general cultural trends already mentioned, psychologists tend to admire the technologically advanced sciences, physics, chemistry, biology, more than they do psychology, in spite of the fact that from the humanistic point of view psychology is obviously the new frontier, and by far the most important science today.

Thus there is a tendency to ape the other sciences, and it is fashionable to try to treat our object of study, the person, first as if he were simply a physical object or machine, second, if this fails, as if he were simply one among the lower animals, and third, if this too fails, grudgingly and uncomfortably, he is treated as a member of a unique species, more complex than any other.

Rarely is he studied as a unique individual. We do not yet have the ideographic psychology that Allport has called for.

Just these complexities, *just* these unique characteristics, that can be found in no object, in no machine, in no rat or dog or monkey, *just* that subject matter that neither the physicist nor the biologist, but *only* the psychologist is uniquely qualified to handle, *just* that has been assiduously neglected.

7. Strictly speaking only actualities can be measured, never potentialities (unless we redefine them as we have in this book). And some actualities are never so fully developed as potentiality could permit; measurement is too low. We cannot measure how tall a person *might* be, only how tall he *is*. Never how intelligent he *could* be under best conditions, only how intelligent he *is* under actually existing conditions. So, unless a mathematics is invented for measuring the ideal limit to which the actual approaches (calculus), measurement of the actual will be too pessimistic.

8. Last I mention a minor point, perhaps a little more feelingly than it deserves, because I have myself experienced it as a source of discouragement and pessimism. If one is preoccupied with the insane, the neurotic, the psychopath, the criminal, the delinquent, the feeble-minded, one's hopes for the human species become perforce more and more modest, more and more

From dreams of peace, affection, and brotherhood, we retreat until life's ambition becomes getting good beds for the poor schizophrenics, or training 100 more psychologists a year, or instituting better vocational guidance systems at the state penitentiary. The exclusive study of our failures and breakdowns will hardly breed inspiration, hopefulness, and optimistic ambitions in either the layman or the scientist.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS IN PROCEDURE

I can suggest at least one procedure that is immediately available that can circumvent and avoid many of these limitations. It consists simply in accepting as suitable experimental

subjects only relatively perfect representatives of the species, rejecting psychotics, psychopaths, neurotics, those who are well adjusted to the sick culture, those who are maladjusted to the healthy culture, those who do not use their general human or their idiosyncratic capacities, and those whose basic needs are unfulfilled for whatever reason. In a word, if we are interested in the psychology of the human species we should limit ourselves to the use of the self-actualizing, the psychologically healthy, the mature, the fulfilled, for they are more truly representative of the human species than the usual average or normal group. The psychology generated by the study of healthy people could fairly be called positive by contrast with the negative psychology we now have, which has been generated by the study of sick or average people.

Certainly there are not many usable subjects left over after culling so ruthlessly. This presents us with our practical difficulty of getting together large enough groups of individuals with whom to do statistically sound experimentation. This I have managed without too much loss of principle by arbitrarily using the best one out of one hundred of the general college population (the psychiatrically healthiest 1 percent). The other 99 percent are then discarded as imperfect, immature, or crippled specimens. This follows the classical Linnaean taxonomical custom of selecting as the type specimen of a species, a fully grown, perfectly formed individual with a full development of all those characteristics that define the species.

This is a technique for studying the human being at his full height. It comes close to making synonyms of the ideal and the actual, thereby resolving the ancient dichotomy between them as well as that between potential and actualized.

In previous chapters we have seen that a good many time-honored "laws" of human nature may actually be phenomena of mild, pervasive psychopathology. I am convinced that this would true at many points throughout the whole of psychology if we systematically repeated all the experiments we know with *exclusively healthy* subjects.

I feel optimistic also about the methodological and conceptual by-products of such a procedure. So many important new problems would thereby be opened up for research, and so many trivial and peripheral problems would be spontaneously discarded, that it is quite probable that psychologists would automatically develop higher levels of aspiration, greater impatience with artificial methodological limits, low-ceiling techniques, and self-shackling conceptions of research.

At least the following *types* of changes could be expected as consequences of lifting the limits of psychological study.

1. A different choice of content and of subject matter for our experiments.
2. Different vocabulary, e.g., the study with self-actualizing people indicates that many subjective words need qualifying subscripts, such as *S. A.* or *Neurotic*; many new positive words are needed in the vocabulary of psychology (198).
3. New central concepts for psychology, e.g., growth, spontaneity, self-choice, acceptance, autonomy, actualization of potentiality, etc.
4. A different approach to psychological statistics, research theory, and experimental design.
5. The resolution of many conventionally accepted dichotomies, and polarities.
6. A different role for psychology in our culture and almost certainly an
7. Less stress on technology and more stress on characterological development.
8. Dissatisfaction with the average person, with the concept of adjustment and adaptation, with *what is*.
9. A redefining of psychology, its tasks and jurisdictions, that would be reflected, e.g., in different tables of contents for most textbooks of psychology, considerable changes in training of graduate students, etc.

In the Appendix, I have tried to point out some specific examples of low ceilings, artificial limits, low levels of aspiration,

and pessimistic conceptions of the possibilities of human nature in addition to those already discussed in previous chapters of this book. This will demonstrate at the same time the operational fruitfulness at the point of view espoused in this chapter and throughout the book.

Appendix:
Problems Generated by
a Positive Approach to Psychology

LEARNING

How do people learn to be wise, mature, kind, to have good taste, to be inventive, to have good characters, to be able to fit themselves to a new situation, to detect the good, to seek the truth, to know the beautiful, and the genuine?

Learning from unique experiences, from tragedy, marriage, having children, success, triumph, falling in love, being ill, death, etc.

Learning from pain, illness, depression, tragedy, failure, old age, death.

Much that passes for associative learning is actually canalization (225): it is intrinsic and required by reality rather than relative, arbitrary, and fortuitous.

With self-actualizing people, repetition, contiguity, and arbitrary reward become less and less important. Probably advertising of the usual sort is ineffective with them. They are much less susceptible to arbitrary association, to prestige suggestion, to snob appeals and to simple, senseless repetition. Perhaps even they have negative effect, i.e., make them *less* likely to buy rather than more likely.

Why does so much of educational psychology concern itself with means, i.e., grades, degrees, credits, diplomas, rather than with ends, i.e., wisdom, understanding, good judgment, good taste?

We do not know enough about the acquisition of emotional attitudes, of tastes, of preferences. The “learning of the heart” has been neglected.

Education in practice too often adapts the child to the convenience of adults by making him less a nuisance and a little devil. More positively oriented education concerns itself more with the growth and future self-actualization of the child. What do we know about teaching children to be strong, self-respecting, righteously indignant, resistant to domination and exploitation, to propaganda and blind enculturation, to suggestion and to fashion?

PERCEPTION

Perception is too much the limited of mistakes, distortion, illusions, and the like, Wertheimer would have called it the study of psychological blindness. Why not add to it the study of intuition, of subliminal perception, of unconscious perception? Would not the study of good taste enter here? Of the genuine, of the true, and the beautiful? How about aesthetic perception? Why do some people perceive beauty and others not? Under this same heading of perception we may also include the constructive manipulation of reality by hope, dreams, imagination, inventiveness, organizing, and ordering.

Unmotivated, disinterested, unselfish perception. Appreciation. Awe. Admiration.

Plenty of studies of stereotypes, but practically no study of fresh, concrete, Bergsonian reality.

Free-floating attention of the type that Freud spoke about.

What are the factors that make it possible for healthy people to perceive reality more efficiently, to predict the future more accurately, to perceive more easily what people really are like, that make it possible for them to endure or to enjoy the unknown, the unstructured and ambiguous, and the mysterious?

Why do the wishes and hopes of healthy people have so little power to distort their perceptions?

The healthier people are, the more their capacities are interrelated. This holds also for the sensory modalities that make syn-

aesthesia in principle a more basic study than the isolated study of separate senses. Not only is this so, but the sensory equipment as a whole is related to the motor aspects of the organism. These interrelations need more study.

EMOTIONS

The positive emotions, i.e., happiness, calm, serenity, peace of mind, contentment, acceptance have not been studied. Neither have compassion, pity, charity.

Fun, joy, play, games, sport, are not sufficiently understood.

Ecstasy, elation, zest, exhilaration, gaiety, euphoria, well-being, the mystic experience, the conversion experience in politics and religion, the emotions generated by orgasm.

The difference between the struggle, conflict, frustration, sadness, anxiety, tension, guilt, shame, etc. of the psychopathological person and of the healthy person. In the healthy person these are or can be good influences.

The organizing effects and other good and desirable effects of emotion have been less studied than its disorganizing effects. Under which circumstances does it correlate with *increased* efficiency of perception, of learning, of thinking, etc.?

The emotional aspects of cognition, e.g., the lift that comes with insight, the calming effect of understanding, the acceptance and forgiveness that are products of deeper understanding of bad behavior.

The affective side of love and friendship, the satisfactions and pleasures that they bring.

In healthy people, cognition, conation, and affect are much more synergic than antagonistic or mutually exclusive. We must discover why this is so, and what the underlying mechanical arrangements are, e.g., are hypothalamic-cerebral interrelations different in the healthy? We must learn how, for instance, conative and affective mobilization helps cognition, how cognitive and conative synergic supports affect emotions, etc. These three aspects of psychic life should be studied in their interrelations, rather than separately.

The connoisseur has been unreasonably neglected by psychologists. Simple enjoyment of eating, of drinking, of smoking, or of the other sensuous gratifications has a definite place in psychology.

What are the impulses behind the construction of utopias? What is hope? Why do men imagine and project and create ideas of heaven, of the good life, of a better society?

What does admiration mean? Awe? Amazement?

Study of inspiration? How can we inspire people to greater efforts? To better goals? etc.

MOTIVATION

The parental impulses: why do we love our children, why do people want children as all, why do they make so many sacrifices for them? Or rather, why does what looks like a sacrifice to someone else not feel like a sacrifice to the parent?

The study of justice, equality, liberty, the desire for liberty, for freedom, and for justice, Why is it that people will fight for justice at great cost to themselves or even give up their lives? Why is it that some men with nothing to gain for themselves come to the aid of the downtrodden; of the unjustly treated, and the unhappy?

The human being to some extent pursues his goals, purposes, and ends, *rather* than being driven by blind impulses and drives. The latter of course also happens but not exclusively. The full picture requires both.

So far we have studied only the pathogenic effects of frustration, neglecting its "healthogenic" effects.

Homeostasis, equilibrium, adaptation, self-preservation, defense, and adjustment are merely negative concepts and must be supplemented by positive concepts. Everything seems directed towards preserving life and very little towards making it worth living (299, p. 286). Weber in same article quotes H. Poincare as saying that his problem was not to earn his meals but to keep from being bored between them. If we were to define functional psychology as the study of usefulness from the point of

view of self-preservation, then by extension a *metafunctional* psychology would study usefulness from the point of view of self-perfection.

The neglect of higher needs and neglect of the differences between lower and higher needs dooms people to disappointment when wanting continues even after a need is gratified. Gratification produces, not cessation of desire, but after a temporary period of contentment, substitution of higher desires and higher frustration levels, along with the same old restlessness and dissatisfaction.

Appetites and preferences and tastes, as well as the brute, life-and-death, desperate hungers.

Urge to perfection, truth, justice (same as straightening a crooked picture? Or completing an incompleting task? Or perseveration of an unsolved problem?). The Utopian impulse, the desire to improve the external world, to set wrong things right.

Neglect of cognitive needs, e.g., by Freud, as well as by the academic psychologists.

The conative side of aesthetics, the aesthetic needs.

We do not sufficiently understand the motivations of the martyr, the hero, the patriot, the unselfish man. The Freudian nothing but, reductive explanations do not alone explain healthy people.

How about the psychology of right and wrong, the psychology of ethics and of morality.

The psychology of science, of the scientist, of knowledge, of the search for knowledge, of the impulses behind the search for knowledge, of the philosophical impulse.

Appreciation, contemplation, meditation.

Sex is customarily discussed as if it were a problem of avoiding the plague. The preoccupation with the dangers of sex has obscured the obvious fact that it is or should be a very enjoyable pastime.

INTELLIGENCE

Must we rest content with a definition of intelligence that is derived from what is the case, rather than what should be the case? The whole concept of IQ has nothing to do with wisdom;

it is a purely technological concept. For example, Goering had a high IQ but was in a very real sense a stupid man. He was certainly a vicious man. I do not think there is any great harm in separating out the specific concept of high IQ. The only trouble is that in a psychology that limits itself so, the more important subjects—wisdom, knowledge, insight, understanding, common sense, good judgment—are neglected in favor of the IQ because it is technologically more satisfactory. For the humanist, of course, it is a highly irritating concept.

What are the influences that raise the IQ—effective intelligence, common sense, good judgment? We know much about what harms them, little about what improves them. Could them be a psychotherapy of the intelligence?

An organismic conception of intelligence?

COGNITION AND THINKING

Change of mind. Conversion. Psychoanalytic insight. Sudden understanding. The perception of principle.

Wisdom. What are the relations with good taste, with good morals, kindness, etc.?

The characterological and therapeutic effects of sheer knowledge.

The study of creativeness and of productiveness should have an important place in psychology. In thinking we should pay more attention to the study of novelty, of inventiveness, of the production of new ideas, rather than to the finding of solutions to predetermined puzzles of the type so far used in thinking studies. Since thinking at its best is creative, why not study it at its best?

Bergsonian intuition. How do so-called intuitive people come to correct conclusions so quickly?

The psychology of science and scientists, of philosophy and philosophers.

Thinking in the healthiest people—if they are also intelligent—is not only of the Dewey type, i.e., stimulated by some disequilibrating problem or nuisance, and disappearing when the problem is solved. It is also spontaneous, sportive, and pleasurable, and

is often emitted or produced without effort, automatically, as the liver secretes bile. Such men *enjoy* being thinking animals, they do not have to be harassed into it.

Thinking is not always directed, organized, motivated, or goal bent. Fantasy, dreaming, symbolism, unconscious thinking, infantile, emotional thinking, psychoanalytic free association, are all productive in their own. Healthy people come to many of their conclusions and decisions with the aid of these techniques, traditionally opposed to rationality but in actuality synergic with it.

The concept of objectivity. Disinterestedness. Passive response to the nature of reality *per se* without injecting any personal or ego elements. Problem-centered rather than ego-centered cognition.

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

In general, we should learn to see as psychopathology *any* failure to achieve self-actualization. The average or normal person is just as much a case as the psychotic, even though less dramatic and less urgent.

The aims and goals of psychotherapy should be positively seen. (This is of course true also for the goals of education, of the family, of medicine, of religion and philosophy.) The therapeutic values of good and successful life experiences should be stressed, as for example, marriage, friendship, economic success, etc.

Clinical psychology is not the same as abnormal psychology. Clinical psychology may be the personal, individual case study of successful and happy and healthy individuals as well. Clinical psychology can study health as well as illness, the strong, the courageous, and the kind as well as the weak, the cowardly, and the cruel.

Abnormal psychology should not be limited to the study of schizophrenia, but should also include such subject as cynicism, authoritarianism, anhedonia, the loss of values, prejudice, hatred, greed, selfishness, and the like. These are *the* serious diseases from the point of view of values. Dementia praecox, manic depression, obsession-compulsion, and the like are the serious dis-

eases of mankind *from the point of view of technology*, that is, in the sense that they limit efficiency. But it would have been a blessing, not a curse, if Hitler or Mussolini had broken down with obvious schizophrenia. What we should study from the point of view of positive and value-oriented psychology are those disturbances that make men bad or limited in the value sense. Cynicism, then, is certainly more important socially than depression.

We spend a great amount of time studying criminality. Why not study also law-abidingness, identification with society, social conscience, *Gemeinschaftsgefühl*?

In addition to studying the psychotherapeutic effects of the good life experiences, such as marriage, success, having children, falling in love, education, etc., we should also study the psychotherapeutic effects of bad experiences, particularly of tragedy, but also, illness, deprivation, frustration, conflict, and the like. Healthy people seem able to turn even such experiences to good use.

The study of interest (as contrasted with the study of boredom).

Our present knowledge of personality dynamics, of health, and adjustment comes almost entirely from the study of sick people. Not only will the study of healthy people correct this and teach us directly about psychological health, but I am sure it will also teach us much more than we know now about neurosis, psychosis, psychopathy, and psychopathology in general.

The clinical study of ability, capacity, skills, craftsmanship.

The clinical study of genius and talent. We spend far more time and money on feeble-minded people than on intelligent people.

Frustration theory as usually conceived is a good example of cripple psychology. In too many theories of child raising, the child is conceived of in the original Freudian fashion, as a completely conservative organism, hanging on to already achieved adjustments; it has no urge to go on to a new adjustment, to grow, and to develop in its own style.

To this day, the psychodiagnostic techniques are used to diagnose pathology, not health. We have no Rorschach or TAT or

MMPI norms for creativeness, ego strength, health, self-actualization, hypnosis, resistance to disease. Most personality questionnaires are still modeled on the original Woodworth model; they list many symptoms of sickness, and a good or healthy score is the *absence* of positive responses to these lists of symptoms.

Since psychotherapy improves people, we miss an opportunity to see people at their best by failing to study the post therapeutic personality.

ANIMAL PSYCHOLOGY

In animal psychology, the stress has been on hunger and thirst. Why not study the higher needs? We actually do not know whether the white rat has anything to compare with on higher needs for love, beauty, understanding, status, and the like. With the techniques now available to animal psychologists, how could we know? We must get over the psychology of the *desperate* rat, the rat who is pushed to the point of starvation, or who is pushed by pain or electric shock into an extreme situation, one so extreme that human beings seldom find themselves in it.

The study of understanding and insight should be more stressed than the study of rote, blind association learning, the higher levels of intelligence as well as the lower, the more complex, as well as the less complex, the higher limits of animal performance have been neglected in favor of averages.

When Husband (110) showed that a rat could learn a maze almost as well as a human being, the maze should have been dropped once and for all as an instrument for the study of learning. We know in advance that the human being learns better than the rat. Any technique that cannot demonstrate this is like measuring people who are bent over in a room with a low ceiling. What we are measuring is the ceiling, not the people. All that a maze does is to measure a low ceiling and not the height to which learning and thinking may go, not even in the rat.

It seems very probable that the use of higher animals rather than lower animals would teach us much more about human psychology.

It should always be kept in mind that the use of animals guarantees in advance the neglect of just those capacities which are uniquely human, for example, martyrdom, self-sacrifice, shame, love, humor, art, beauty, conscience, guilt, patriotism, ideals, the production of poetry or philosophy or music or science. Animal psychology is necessary for learning about those human characteristics that man shares with all primates. It is useless in the study of those characteristics which man does *not* share with other animals or in which he is vastly superior, such as latent learning.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Social psychology should be more than a study of imitation, suggestion, prejudice, hatred, hostility. These are minor forces in healthy people.

Theory of democracy, of anarchism. Democratic, interpersonal relationship. The democratic leader. Power in a democracy and among democratic people and in the democratic leader. The motivations of the unselfish leader. Sound people *dislike* having power over other people. Social psychology is too much dominated by a low-ceiling, lower-animal conception of power.

Competition is studied more than cooperation, altruism, friendliness, unselfishness.

The study of freedom and of free men has little or no place in social psychology today.

How is culture improved? What are the good effects of the deviant? We know that culture can never advance or be improved without deviants. Why have they not been more studied? Why are they generally considered to be pathological? Why not healthy?

Brotherhood and equalitarianism deserves as much attention as class and caste and domination in the social sphere. Why not study the religious brotherhoods? The consumers' and producers' cooperatives?

The culture-personality relationship is usually studied as if culture were the prime mover, as if its shaping force were inexorable. But it can be and is resisted by stronger and healthier

people. Acculturation and enculturation work only to an extent with some people. The study of freedom *from* the environment is called for.

Opinion polling is based on the uncritical acceptance of a low conception of human possibilities, i.e., the assumption that people's votes will be determined by selfishness by sheer habit. This is true, but only in the unhealthy 99 percent of the population. Healthy human beings vote or buy or form judgments at least partially on the basis of logic, common sense, justice, fairness, reality, etc., even when this is against their own interests, narrowly and selfishly considered.

Why is there so much neglect of the fact that leadership in democracies is very often sought for the opportunity of service rather than to have power over other people? This has been completely neglected even though it has been a profoundly important force in American history and in world history as well. It is quite clear that Jefferson never wanted power or leadership for any selfish benefits that might come from it, but that he felt rather that he should sacrifice himself because he could do a good job that needed to be done.

The sense of duty, of loyalty, obligation to society, responsibility, the social conscience. The good citizen, the honest man. We spend much time studying the criminal, why not these?

The crusader. The fighter for principle, for justice, for freedom, for equality. The idealist.

The good effects of prejudice, of unpopularity, of deprivation, and of frustration. There is little effort among psychologists to get the full many-sidedness of even pathological phenomena like prejudice. There are certain *good* consequences of excluding or ostracizing. This is especially so if the culture is a doubtful one or a sick or a bad one. Ostracism from such a culture is a good thing for the person, even though it may cost much pain. Self-actualizing people often ostracize themselves by withdrawing from subcultures of which they disapprove.

We do not know as much about the saint, the knight, the do-gooder, the hero, the unselfish leader as we do about the tyrant, the criminal, the psychopath.

Conventionality has its good side and its desirable effects. The good conventions. The contrasting value of conventions in a healthy and in a sick society.

Kindness, generosity, benevolence, and charity have too little place in the social psychology textbooks.

The rich liberal, like Franklin Roosevelt, or Thomas Jefferson, who, quite in contradiction to the dictates of his own pocketbook, fights against his own economic interest, in the interest of fairness, and justice, etc.

While there is much written about anti-Semitism, anti-Negroism, and xenophobia, there is very little recognition of the fact that there *is* such a thing as philo-Semitism, Negrophilia, sympathy for the underdog, etc. This illustrates how we concentrate more on hostility than on altruism, or sympathy or concern for people who are treated badly.

The study of sportsmanship, of fairness, of the sense of justice, of concern for the other fellow.

In textbooks of interpersonal relations or of social psychology the study of the love, the marriage, the friendliness, and of the therapeutic relationship might very well be paradigmatic for all the chapters that followed. As of today, however, they are rarely taken seriously by extant textbooks.

Sales resistance, advertising resistance, propaganda resistance, opinion-of-other-people resistance, maintenance of autonomy, suggestion resistance, imitation resistance, prestige resistance are all high in healthy people, and low in average people. These symptoms of health should be more extensively studied by applied social psychologists.

Social psychology must shake itself free of that variety of cultural relativism, which stresses too much man's passivity, plasticity, and shapelessness and too little his autonomy, his growth tendencies, and the maturation of inner forces.

Either psychologists and social scientists will supply empirical value systems for humanity or no one will. This task alone generates a thousand problems.

From the point of view of the positive development of human potentiality, psychology was very largely a complete failure dur-

ing the last war. It was used by very many psychologists as a technology only and was allowed to apply only what was already known. Practically nothing new in psychological theory has come out of the war yet, though there may be later developments. This meant that many psychologists and other scientists allied themselves with the short sighted people who stressed only the winning of the war and neglected the winning of the peace afterward. They neglected entirely the point of the whole war, making it into a technological game rather than a value struggle which it actually was, or at least was supposed to be. There was little in the body of psychology to prevent them from making this mistake, no philosophy for instance which separated technology from science, no value theory which enabled them to understand clearly what democratic people are really like, what the fighting was all about, and what its emphases were or should have been. They addressed themselves generally to means-questions rather than end-questions and could have been put to as good use by the Nazis as by the democracies. Their efforts were of little avail in preventing the growth of authoritarianism even in our own country.

Social institutions, and indeed culture itself, are customarily studied as shapers, forcers, inhibitors, rather than as need gratifiers, happiness producers, self-actualization fosterers. "Is culture a set of problems or a set of opportunities?" (A. Meiklejohn). The culture-as-shaper concept is probably a consequence of too exclusive experience with pathological cases. The use of healthier subjects suggests rather culture-as-reservoir-of-gratifications. The same may probably be affirmed for the family which is also seen too often to be a shaping, training, molding, force exclusively.

PERSONALITY

The concept of the well-adjusted personality or of good adjustment sets a low ceiling upon the possibility for advancement and for growth. The cow, the slave, the robot may all be well adjusted. The superego of the child is ordinarily conceived of as intro-

jection of fear, punishment, loss of love, abandonment, etc. The study of children and adults who are safe, loved and respected indicates the possibility of a positive superego built on love identification, the desire to please and to make others happy, as well as on truth, logic, justice, consistency, right, and duty.

The behavior of the healthy person is less determined by anxiety, fear, insecurity, guilt, shame, and more by truth, logic, justice, reality, fairness, fitness, beauty, rightness, etc.

Where are the researches on unselfishness? Lack of envy? Will power? Strength of character? Optimism? Friendliness? Realism? Self-transcendence? Boldness, courage? Lack of jealousy? Sincerity? Patience?

Of course the most pertinent and obvious choice of subject for a positive psychology is the study of psychological health (and other kinds of health, aesthetic health, value health, physical health, and the like). But a positive psychology also calls for more study of the good man, of the secure and of the confident, of the democratic character, of the happy man, of the serene, the calm, the peaceful, the compassionate, the generous, the kind, of the creator, of the saint, of the hero, of the strong man, of the genius, and of other good specimens of humanity.

What produces the socially desirable characteristics of kindness, social conscience, helpfulness, neighborliness, identification, tolerance, friendliness, desire for justice, righteous indignation?

We have a very rich vocabulary for psychopathology but a very meager one for health.

Deprivation and frustration have some good effects. The study of just as well as of unjust discipline is indicated, as is also study of the self-discipline that comes from being allowed to deal directly with reality, learning from its intrinsic rewards and punishments.

The study of idiosyncrasy and individuality (*not* individual differences in the classical sense). We must develop an idiographic science of personality.

How do people get to be unlike each other instead of like each other (acculturated, ironed out by the culture, etc.)?

What is dedication to a cause? What produces the dedicated, devoted person who identifies himself with an ego-transcending cause or mission?

The contented, happy, calm, serene, peaceful personality.

The tastes, values, attitudes, and the choices of self-actualizing people are to a great extent on an intrinsic and reality-determined basis, rather than on a relative and extrinsic basis.

It is therefore a taste for the right rather than wrong, for the true rather than the false, for the beautiful rather than the ugly. They live within a system of stable values and not in a robot world of *no values at all* (only fashions, fads, opinions of others, imitation, suggestion, prestige).

Frustration level and frustration tolerance may very well be *much* higher in self-actualizing people. So also guilt level, conflict level, and shame level.

Child-parent relationships have usually been studied as if they *were* only a set of problems, *only* a chance to make mistakes. They are primarily a pleasure and a delight, and a great opportunity to enjoy. This is true even for adolescence, too often treated as if akin to a plague.

MOTIVATION and PERSONALITY

A. H. Maslow. BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

HARPER & BROTHERS • PUBLISHERS • NEW YORK

MOTIVATION AND PERSONALITY

Copyright, 1954, by Harper & Brothers

Printed in the United States of America

All rights in this book are reserved.

No part of the book may be used or reproduced
in any manner whatsoever without written permission
except in the case of brief quotations
embodied in critical articles and reviews. For
information address Harper & Brothers
49 East 33rd Street, New York 16, N. Y.

H-E

Library of Congress catalog card number: 54-10712