

posts were created—so-called Under-Secretaries of State; two of these posts were filled by Social-Christians and two by Liberals. Commenting on this reconstitution of the cabinet, the French newspaper *Le Monde* expressed the opinion (4-5 Sept. 1960) that there was essentially nothing “new” about it, and that “the Prime Minister will more than ever be paralyzed.” The nation-wide, violence-accompanied strikes which occurred in Belgium little more than 3 months later dramatically bore out this prediction. For now a “whole nation” seemed to be “revolting against itself” as, for 27 days, “nearly everything that keeps a modern nation going—trains, busses, trams, gas and light works, garbage and mail deliveries, schools, shops, ports, steel mills, coal mines, even football teams—stopped still” [C. Sterling, *The Reporter* (16 Feb. 1961)]. The origins of these strikes, of course, were very complex. But from one point of view they may be regarded as extreme outward manifestations of some of the contending, recalcitrant forces that continually threaten the progress of Belgian society.

11. It is informally estimated that there are at least 1200 separate university research institutes in Belgium. This number includes institutes in fields other than medicine, of course. Nevertheless, it suggests the wide dispersion and the duplication of research facilities and efforts characteristic of this tiny country, in which cooperation and collabora-

tion between different groups is so difficult to effect in any domain.

12. This law came into being on 14 December 1960, when it was signed by the King, the Minister of Public Education, and the Minister of Justice.
13. Thus far, the creation of these posts has had only a token effect in increasing the number of stable, prestigious, adequately remunerated positions in Belgian society from which one can do research. For only 30 such positions have been created in each of the four universities, and these 30 must be distributed between all the departments of the university. What is more, the problem of where the funds for financing these positions will come from has not been fully resolved.
14. In 1958 a new law was passed, giving these hospitals two additional formal obligations: those of caring for patients with prepaid health insurance and of caring for all emergency cases which occur within the confines of the commune in question.
15. These descriptions of what many Belgian researchers find absurd, inscrutable, and arbitrary about the atmosphere in which they work forcibly reminds one of the novels of Franz Kafka—especially *The Castle* and *The Trial*. In this connection it is interesting to consider that Kafka, a Czech, was also a citizen of a small country of Continental Europe. Perhaps that accounts in part for the striking pertinence of his writings to Belgium.

16. As a sociologist from a foreign society I was accorded a privilege that no Belgian enjoys: I was permitted to move freely from one university to another and between departments and institutes within each university. As a result, I was able to directly observe and discuss many things about which Belgians themselves can only conjecture. Most striking of all was the opportunity I had to see that, irrespective of the particular university settings in which medical research groups were located, they were all faced with many of the same problems. That this is only guessed, not really known, by Belgian researchers is suggested by the fact that many of them asked me whether, without being indiscreet, I could tell them if I had observed difficulties similar to their own in other groups that I had visited.

17. The materials on which this article is based were gathered during the summers of 1959, 1960, and 1961. The research was made possible by special grants from Columbia University's Council for Research in the Social Sciences and from the Belgian-American Education Foundation, and by a fellowship from the Guggenheim Foundation. I wish to thank Dr. Norman Kaplan for the opportunity of reading a first draft of a chapter he has written on “The organization of research in Belgium” and Dr. Francis X. Sutton and Carol A. Feist for critical readings of the manuscript of this article.

## Prospect for Psychology

A vision of the future, as reconstructed after one encounter with the hallucinogenic drug psilocybin.

Henry A. Murray

I shall skip the first, startling 30 minutes of my trance—the stabbing cortical sensations; the hailstorm of brightly colored particles, filaments, and figures; the kaleidoscope of celestial mosaics at the antipodes of mind; the rush of archetypes—and simply say that, after witnessing the birth in the Near East of the religions that shaped the souls of Western men and women, and after passing down the centuries to the agitations and enigmas of our own day, I found myself on the edge of a dark wood overlooking an existential waste of desolate absurdities with the straight way lost. Then, to my astonishment, I saw, floating down in my direction, an angel clothed in a cloud as white as wool. His countenance was as the sun in his zenith, beaming with encouragement to every benign form of life. In these features he reminded me so strongly of my cherished friend Edgar

Tranekjaer-Rasmussen (1) that, out of my lonely state, I would have hugged him if it had not been for the inhibiting awareness of his far-superior, winged status in the hierarchy of being.

“This evening I am to be your Virgil,” the angel said, “your appointed guide for the night hours of your journey into future time. Come with me. Over there is the forest path by which we must descend into the abyss of pain and woe and retributive justice.”

As we proceeded in the semidarkness the angel informed me that the year was 1985 and that the long-dreaded Great Enormity had been perpetrated as predicted. Barely 6 months before, a biological, chemical, and nuclear war between the U.S.S.R. and the United States had been started inadvertently—by the push of a button during a small group's momentary panic caused by a slight misunderstanding—and concluded

within a fortnight, leaving the essential structures of both countries leveled to the ground, their vital centers obliterated or paralyzed, their atmospheres polluted. Demoralized, isolated remnants of both populations, reduced to a molelike existence underground, were now preparing amid the wreckage to defend themselves with gas against invading forces, from China in the one case, from South America in the other.

“We are approaching the subterranean courthouse of posterity,” announced the angel, “where those accused of responsibility for the Great Enormity—or of irresponsibility—are being tried before the gods, of whom there is a multiplicity, I should say, in case you have not heard the news. On trial this evening is a host of academic psychologists of all breeds and nationalities.”

In a minute the two of us were entering a crowded underground cavern, constructed like the Colosseum, all parts of which were preternaturally illuminated. The tiers of seats that constituted the sides of the amphitheater were arranged in sections, each of which, the angel pointed out, was occupied by a different denomination of psychologists. At the opposite end of the oval arena, on a raised platform, was a long judges' bench behind which sat a row of unmis-

The author is professor of psychology, department of social relations, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. This article is adapted from an address delivered 18 August 1961 at the International Congress of Applied Psychology in Copenhagen, Denmark.

takable divinities. One of these bore a striking resemblance to Aphrodite and another to Dionysius, but the majority were essentially androgynous. I was informed that all of them had recently been created in man's image as visible representors of the major determinants of human personality, society, and history. Attracted by a masked figure that sat near the center of the bench, I was told that that was Alphaomega, the influential and often-propitiated god of Chance, whose unpredictable operations could result in either good or evil fortune. The angel informed me that several pagan deities, after a period of sincere repentance and character reformation, had been admitted to this high court and named anew, but that most of the more imperious deities of antiquity had been rejected—Zeus for juvenile delinquency, Jehovah for narcissism and delusions of infallibility, Allah for ferocity. Sitting at desks on both sides of the broad open space in front of the supreme court bench were the lawyers with their consulting sages. I recognized Buddha, Confucius, Moses, Thomas Aquinas, and a dozen more, engaged in whispered conversations with each other. One moody isolate was obviously Kierkegaard. As we took our seats, Socrates, attorney for the prosecution, was about to terminate his indictment of psychology.

### Indictment of Psychology

"And now, divine judiciary," he said, "as I approach the slippery task of summing up my argument, I am assailed by the mutterings of sundry doubts. I have much fear of erring. To appraise the activities and the retailed wares of these most learned and industrious psychologists is a perilous and presumptuous undertaking for an untutored, rusty man like me. And yet, were I to permit cowardice to silence the voice of my indwelling daemon, ye gods and ancient sages would rise up in judgment to denounce me as a traitor to what light I have received from you, as one who would buy smiles from men at the price of sinning against conscience—against you, oh Va! [Here Socrates punctuated his speech with a deferential bow to one of the chief jurists.] Va, supreme arbiter of the better and the worse, who can discern differences, imperceptible to ordinary mortals, between fine gradations of beauty, love, and truthfulness; and of sinning against you, immortal Co, god of creativity in nature and in man.

"And so, ye gods, because I dread your odium more than anything I can name, I shall go on, despite my qualms, and inquire whether these most eminent psychologists did anything or endeavored to do anything which might luckily have modified the course of events that finally brought about the Great Enormity? When the world's dire strait called for the full investment of rational imaginations, did or did not these privileged professionals remain aloof, virtually indifferent to man's fate? Did they, or did they not, behave as if they were quite satisfied to be superfluous, if not frivolous? Had they, or had they not, acquired any knowledge, or were they, or were they not, seeking any knowledge which might have served in any way to stop the instinct-driven rulers of this earth from pursuing their fatal foreign policies or to help them reach a more creative and humane solution of the world's ills instead of letting loose the fury which at this moment—A.D. 1985—seems to be heading toward the termination of millions of years of evolution?

"As you have surely noted, revered justices, I am an inept fumbler in the mansions of the social sciences, and, though I shall have to use it, correctly or incorrectly, from now on, I have no stomach for their lingo, so obnoxious to a Greek. But, in spite of these impediments and others, I shall perform the duty with which I have been charged to the best of my ability.

"If we were to state, for short, that the crux of the world's dilemma consists of a conflict between two different ideologies, thesis and antithesis, represented by two blocs of power-oriented social units, would not a miniature paradigm, or analogy, of this condition—one susceptible to direct and detailed psychological investigation—have to include at least two interacting hostile personalities, each astringently attached to a contrasting set of social values or religion? If the answer is yes, I should like to ask what proportion of psychologists were observing and conceptualizing on the basis of two or more conflicting personalities, each operating as a directed system of beliefs, emotions, wants, and higher mental processes? Did, or did not, a goodly number of extremely intellectual psychologists, insisting on the utmost scientific rigor, shun the complexities of personality and, in search of higher pecking status, plant their minds in biology, physiology, statistics, symbolic logic, or methodological per se? And, among those academic

psychologists who observed and tested persons, did, or did not, a rather large percentage conceive of personality as a galaxy of abstractions in a vacuum—a mere bag of traits, a profile of scores on questionnaires, a compound of factors without referents, or, perhaps some elaborate formulation of a conflict between oedipal hate and fear of punishment—giving little indication, in any case, of how the person would proceed, and with what outcome, in a vehement transaction, let us say here, with a specified type of ideological antagonist?

"I have been told that a large number of more statistically oriented American psychologists—social psychologists you might call them—constructed their propositions wholly in terms of the conforming majority of the population studied. If this is true, did, or did not, the conformists who confirmed their theories (and therefore behaved lawfully in the scientific sense) become equated in the minds of these psychologists with what was functionally right and proper? Since their results relegated to limbo the responses of the better-than-average members of the population mixed with the responses of the worse-than-average, did not the publication of these results reinforce, with the authority of science, the complacency of mediocrity? Did, or did not, these psychologists conceive of any better standard of values than was provided by the relatively well adjusted, happy exemplifiers of the so-called 'dominant' culture patterns of their country?

"And here, divine jurists," said Socrates with special emphasis, "comes the crucial question, which my daemon is impelling me to ask, harsh though it may seem: Did the psychologists see or fail to see that the dominant majority in pretty nearly every sovereign state had been rendered obsolete, in certain critical respects, by the discovery of genocidal weapons? Suddenly the old rules of evolution had been drastically revised. Were, or were not, the psychologists aware of this? And, if aware, did they, or did they not, bring their minds and hearts to bear on the problem of specifying what kinds of personalities would be fit to govern the nations of both blocs under these harrowing new conditions, as well as what kinds of men and women would be fit to support fit governments?

"To discover in what ways unfit personalities can become fit, could or could not psychologists have studied relevant transformations in depth of a few self-converted persons? The psychologists'

models of a human being were various and ingeniously contrived—an electronic mechanism for the processing of symbolic information; an empty animal reacting in a standard cage; a self-centered, solipsistic atom in a social void; and a dozen other imaginal concoctions amazing to an old Athenian. An elegant sideshow, I would hazard, of cleverly contrived freaks. But if you, divine jurists, could ever bring yourselves to look any one of these models in the eye, would you, I wonder, be convinced that man is worthy of survival, or, if not worthy in his present state, capable of becoming worthy? Were, or were not, a majority of clinical psychologists—Western, not Soviet psychologists—so attracted by odors of decay, by neurotic illness, degradation, criminality, and whatnot, that they were blinded to all else? And did not the constant advertisement of their brilliantly analyzed cases of psychological decrepitude only serve to generate, through imitation, more of the same thing? In short, immortal judges, would you, or would you not, declare that quite a few psychologists—with no terminology at all to represent better-than-average personalities—added what influence they had to the general trend of denigration which reduced man's image of himself to the point of no revival, stripping it of genuine potentiality for creative change, the only ground there was for hope that people could do anything but what they actually did do? This brings me to the end of my queries as to possible explanations of the non-entity of psychology outside the minds of its own practitioners. With these I rest my case."

At this point Yu, one of the jurists—god of charity and forgiveness—intervened. "Socrates," he said, "all you have done so far is to decry the all-too-human darkness in the minds of these distinguished scientists. Are you not capable of kindling a little light? What would *you* have done?"

### Miniature World Model

"Oh," exclaimed Socrates, "I foresaw, in dread, that one of you venerable deities would challenge me precisely on this point, and, after consulting with myself, I discovered that the senescence of my faculties had rendered me incapable of complying with your imperative request. Instead, I have a little parable to offer—the idle fancy of an aging cortex—which begins with a miniature world model that is quite close to

the personal experience of every one of these admirable psychologists, and also so compact that it lies within their sphere of feasible investigation. For this model, the scope of concern is not the world at large but a single, purely hypothetical department of psychology marked by an ongoing, bitter competition between two contrasting scientific ideologies represented by two blocs of faculty members, each with its ambitious, rivalrous, charismatic theorist-leader. One competing ideational system is derived from Existentialism and the other from Behaviorism. The two systems, the two faculty blocs, and the two prime protagonists are competing for the minds of the uncommitted students as well as for power and prestige, the directorship of the department.

"In due course, the two ideological protagonists, Asa and Bede by name, become involved in an overheated argument which ends in a sworn compact to settle their differences in the morning with nuclear weapons. There is no law against dueling in this area, and since each theorist has nerves of iron, the death of both is certain. Moreover, since the members of each bloc feel that the grandeur of their theory demands that they too defend it with their lives, the elimination of the whole department is inevitable.

"Here, in a nutshell, is the problem which faces the psychologist—in this instance a visiting Danish scholar whose scientific curiosity and prudence have kept him securely in the role of a non-participant observer. What can he do? First, do as he was trained to do: produce a flock of promising hypotheses. If he applies method 27 to Asa and Bede, the existing high level of belligerent emotions will be lowered; and if he uses method 39, under conditions of lowered tension, Asa and Bede will agree to a postponement of the duel, and so forth and so on. But suppose the psychologist's entire structure of smartly conceived maneuvers collapses at the very start, when private talks with Asa and then with Bede unambiguously reveal that the whole pride system—the ego ideal—of each of them is glued to the conviction that his particular ideology is the complete, perfect, ultimate, and saving truth, and also glued to the moral imperative that a man must be prepared to kill or be killed whenever the survival or expansion of the authentic truth is endangered by the falsehoods or heresies of others. Asa and Bede are not deterred from the duel because each is supremely confident that

he is quicker on the trigger and can kill the other before the other can discharge his weapon.

"The situation is clearly beyond remedy, and the visiting scholar, realizing that all his bright hypotheses have been invalidated, stumbles back to his room in a state of such abysmal melancholy that he turns to psilocybin for relief. Within an hour, Eureka! He has had a vision that engenders hope, and although it is long past midnight, he rushes out, calls on a few of his foreign student friends, gets them to dress up in the semblance of constables, and then at dawn, disguised as a sheriff, he conducts them to the selected spot outside the city limits. They reach it just in time to inform the two protagonists, with an ample show of authority, that a law against dueling was signed on the previous day and that if any man is alive after the shooting, he, the sheriff, will hang that man from the nearest oak tree. Faced by the absolute certainty of death, Asa and Bede, after a small hemming-and-hawing summit conference, agree to call off their war and return to the city with their two blocs of allies."

At this point Socrates, as if talking to himself, queried: "Is there no hint here of the power and advantage of world government?"

"The parable ends with the staunch friendship of Asa and Bede, and with their joint production of a grand synthesis—an experiential-behavioral system of psychology—which integrates the inner and the outer aspect of a personality in action. Both Asa and Bede acknowledge their indebtedness to the Danish scholar, without whose beneficent intervention they never would have reached their present peak of solid satisfaction, justified in each of them by his proved capacity to understand and to encompass an ideology that is opposite to his own. As for the young Dane, his energies have been spent from first to last in recording and conceptualizing the stages of affectional and intellectual transformation experienced by Asa and Bede as they progressed from a monocentric to a dycentric pride-and-value system. The final climax of the fable comes with the Danish psychologist's publication of a generative book of postulates, theorems, and graphic illustrations which represent the validated way to a solution of ideological antagonisms, a book which promises to mark a turning point in the history of interpersonal and interideational relations."

Socrates's whole oration—his charges

against psychology and his concluding mythical narrative—had been delivered in the gentlest fashion, words dropping from his mouth as leaves from trees. His benign manner was such as to intensify the guilt aroused in me by my awareness that his accusations were, in large part, applicable to me. As this estimable philosopher took his seat, the defense attorney—none other than the formidable Aristotle, I was glad to see—came forward and immediately commenced his argument, pacing back and forth before the judges' bench with measured gestures.

### In Defense of Psychology

"Honored deities," he said, "I trust you have not been deceived by the wiles of Socrates, his seductive way of mixing fact and fiction, comic and tragic flavors. I myself shall rely on simple, referential language to convince you first that this generally wise old man has been unjust in overlooking the tender age of psychology as science, still in its adolescence in the years preceding the Great Enormity. Look at the giant strides it took from the days at the turn of the century when its sphere was virtually restricted to the sensations and perceptions of healthy, educated, adult European males.

"Second, I shall show that Socrates has little understanding of the differentiated modes of science-making, of the garnering of data, here and there, particle by particle. He is attentive only to the overarching generalist who struts on the stage at some timely moment to devour and digest the spread-out produce of the toil and talent of numberless devoted specialists. Academic psychology was approaching but had not reached the timely moment for a great, integrative generalist. Give this young science 20 years more and you shall witness, I predict, the emergence of a creative thinker of the first order—a Newton, Darwin, Marx, Frazer, Freud, Pavlov, Jung, Einstein, or Niels Bohr.

"You might suppose, honored jurists," continued Aristotle, "that these psychologists were a bit retarded in their growth; and I must confess that occasionally in private I have thought that they would have moved more surely toward their destined goal if they had been less patronizing toward me and toward other anticipators of some of their recently vaunted concepts. Quite a few of them, I noted, failed to heed

my irrefutable affirmation that it is the mark of an educated man to know the degree of precision—precision of observation and of statement—that is most appropriate to each stage in the development of each realm of knowledge. In this sense, many psychologists, mostly American, were not educated, in so far as their zeal to approximate the technical perfection of the more exact sciences led them away from the phenomena which psychologists, and only psychologists, are expected to study and to elucidate by the fittest scientific means. Their tolerance of uncertainty was too low," said Aristotle with finality.

"I shall persuade you, however, that this methodological compulsion was a necessary expedient in effecting the emancipation of their discipline from the enclosing husk of one or another brand of idealistic or speculative philosophy. Give psychology another 40 years and you shall see one great embracement and the extinction of all separate schools. Monocentric schools, as Socrates has suggested in his preferred mythical mode of speech, are symptoms of adolescence. Medicine has no schools.

"The last and more agreeable part of my task will be to prove by reference to works and names how close psychology had come to an impressive status in the house of intellect, not only by way of its excellent technology but because of the genuine importance of its ordered knowledge."

Then Aristotle, starting with the first part of his announced plan of defense, proceeded systematically and logically, step by step, to annul the validity of each of Socrates's accusations. Though his performance was in no respect spectacular, the evidence he marshaled in our behalf was so copious, and his presentation was so lucid and concise, that within less than 30 minutes my guilt had turned to pride. This pride in my profession soared to even greater heights when Aristotle came to the last part of his oration, in which he made it apparent, by pointing to specific researches and results, that Socrates had not read the literature of the four decades preceding 1985.

Aristotle's masterful exposition of psychology's achievements was followed by a short, inaudible debate among the gods. They had been visibly impressed by the great Stagirite's facts and figures, and I had no twinge of apprehension in regard to the decision that was on the lips of Va, the chief justice, when he

stood up and faced the tiers of psychologists on trial. Unspeakable, then, was my dismay when, in one shocking sentence, he prescribed for all of us a period of purgatorial probation!

Upon the pronouncement of this verdict, the smoke of our collective shame swirled upward. The atmosphere became too dense for sight, and in a second I was elsewhere, wrapped in utter darkness without angelic guidance. Then, before my passive eyes there passed a startling succession of horrendous scenes: a bottomless abyss of fire and brimstone out of which emerged the notorious beast of the Apocalypse; then thunder, lightning, and a hurricane of deafening explosions; then a great expanse of scorched earth strewn with rubble and cadavers; and finally, a colossal earthquake which swallowed up the residues of all the wrecked creations of centuries of human toil and faith, all the damning evidences of man's inhumanity to man.

\* \* \*

Suddenly the turmoil and the clamor ceased, and in a moment out of the pervading stillness of the night came the voice of the lark, the flush of Eos along the horizon in the East, and I found myself standing by the side of a clear stream next to another shadowy, winged figure, younger than the first angel but no less mellow, whose all-comprehending eyes and roguish twinkle were so reminiscent of my crony Gerhard Nielsen (2) that my leaden spirits were transmuted by his alchemy into a golden state of cheerfulness.

### A New Psychology

"The year is 2085 and we're in Denmark, the most civilized country of our time," announced my new guide. "I might as well inform you right away that war is a thing of the past. Like cannibalism and dueling it is no more than an occasional fantasy in the minds of a few psychopaths excluded from the seats of government. After your last encounter with the future in 1985, just 100 years ago, a rapid succession of devastating wars, initiated by power-drunk dictators, finally brought the surviving members of your species to their senses. Taking to heart, at long last, what had been written on the wall in 1945, this saving remnant of humanity built, out of desperation, dread, grief, pity, love, and hope, a new Ark of the Covenant, devoutly dedicated, with sol-

emn rites and pledges, to the unity of all mankind."

Then eyeing me with kindliness, the angel said: "Since I know you are incurably naive when it comes to political science, I shall not describe the scope and structure of the unique supranational organization that was set up to insure the peaceful settlement of disputes. Even in your day, rationality had concluded that some form of world government was necessary—government, by definition, being the only class of institution empowered to suppress violence. But in almost every country rationality was emasculated by monocentric nationalism—the lust for profits, power, and prestige—and by ideological fixations, coupled with pernicious anemia of the imagination. Anemia of the imagination dangerously reduced the capacity of people and their rulers to carry out, in their minds, long-span, vividly-envisioned trial-and-error experiments and to learn in this way that a reorientation of their aims and strategies was essential to survival and the making of a better world. And so humanity had to learn as animals learn, by tangible and irrevocable suffering and injuries, the dire consequences of aggression in an age of absolutely lethal weapons.

"Unutterable agony! But fortunately today's world can be most thankful that not all that agony was fruitless. For out of it came the curing concept of holocentrism for all nations—each for all and all for each—in place of the lawless monocentrism of some 60 sovereign states bristling with pride. Another emergent concept was that of synthesis—the mutual embracement of two opposites—as of prime value at certain timely moments. For instance, in your day it was apparent that peoples of all societies would eventually demand and gain a fitting degree of *both* economic equality (guaranteed by some type of socialism or central regulation) and political equality (some type of representative government with certain guaranteed forms of freedom). Rationally viewed, it was simply a question of what degree of each of these desirable conditions was most fitting at a given historic stage of each society. But rationality—the possibility of arriving at just estimates through free discussions of ideological fundamentals in a calm, even-handed, and imaginative way—was canceled by the importunate fervor of the Apocalyptic myth which sharply

dichotomizes all mankind into the virtuous and the vicious. To the people of 2085, who reverence and cheer creative syntheses whenever these are feasible and promising, the most virtuous individuals are those who actively participate in conclusive ideological embracement, and so this country of Denmark, as well as other countries, enjoys a just and satisfying measure of planned economy, equality, liberty, and fraternity, not to speak of another *magnum bonum*, freedom from the plague of commercial advertising.

"At first," the angel said, "people were strongly bent toward holocentrism and synthesis as a consequence of having witnessed and experienced, on their own flesh and in their pulses, the horrors of 21st-century warfare. But since each generation of children from then on would be a fresh swarm of savages, potential killers of their own kind, the formidable task assigned to the social sciences in 2035 was that of designing a system of practices of child rearing, education, and self-development which, under favorable conditions, would produce generations of adult personalities who would prove progressively more fit, emotionally and intellectually, to live and (if called upon) to govern in a world capable of producing genocidal weapons. Within 5 years these scientists—mostly psychologists and sociologists—came out with their first, provisional version of a program based on a sophisticated learning theory which stressed the efficacy of exemplars, or models. Later reconstructions of this program resulted in a document of the first magnitude.

"Psychologists had always been able to agree quite well about negative values, about what was wrong (such as crime), below normal (such as neurosis), or obnoxious (such as prejudice and authoritarianism), but never before had they been able or inclined to agree about positive values outside their own profession, about what was genuinely good or right, *above* normal, excellent, or admirable. This was none of their business, they had invariably insisted. But this time they knew for sure that they were backed against the wall and must fight for life itself with saving, creative concepts. They bowed to the dictum that science is for man, not man for science, and that if civilization should collapse again, science would collapse with it, and the human species might ignominiously perish from the

earth. The only evaluative assumption which these psychologists had explicitly to put their minds to was this: that the best possible reciprocities between nations and between individuals (in friendships and in marriages) were of paramount importance, or, conceptually speaking, that creative holocentrism for the societies of the world, and creative dycentrism for men and women, were more desirable than arrogant, rivalrous, and hate-filled monocentrism.

"The humanistic psychology which was constructed with these two major orientations constantly in view is not a closed, logically deduced system of abstract values for adult intellectuals but an open, largely empirical, though partly ideal, developmental psychology which sets forth varieties of values for each stage of personological growth, for each sex, for each characterological type, and for each vocation.

"This psychology is ordered," explained the angel, "by the notion of three successive phases in the life of an individual and, by analogy, in the history of a civilization: the phase of childhood, marked by dependency, awe, and submission to authority; the phase of adolescence, marked by independency, egocentricity, and rebellion; and the phase of maturity, marked by interdependency, dycentricity, and creative reciprocities. This last is the phase that is enjoyably exemplified by the adults of this era. From this achieved position they can clearly see in retrospect that many Western people, especially Americans, in the years before the Great Enormity (children or grandchildren of the generation that gave the *coup de grâce* to all previously venerated sources and bases of authority—ecclesiastical, political, parental, and rational—in other words, many Americans of your time) were reveling blindly and irresponsibly in the transient sensations, half-baked pleasures, and senseless poses of inflated adolescent egotism. Since the young children of this new world are not deprived of an initial, preparatory period of firm and benevolent parental governance and tutelage, they can enter the phase of adolescence with characters of enough base for them to pursue some meaningful course of action with a heartening degree of genuine (not spurious) self-sufficiency and with a few implanted values to rebel against in the name of something better. All the self-centeredness, the self-pity and strident self-assertions, the

worship of powerful machines, of quantities of matter, of bigness, height, and speed, all the dazzling vulgarities and other sorts of hollow grandiosities so prevalent in your mid-century are regarded in today's world as more or less natural and tolerable eruptions of adolescence. But whenever dispositions of this nature are manifested by anybody over 25, they become the target of searing ridicule and scorn. Adults of this society prize quality above quantity, particularly the quality of their interpersonal relationships—marriages and friendships."

I could see a suburb of Copenhagen straight ahead of us as the angel declared with emphasis: "To understand how these seemingly miraculous metamorphoses of human nature were accomplished, anybody of your vintage would have to read, thoroughly and sympathetically, the world testament of these people. This testament, which is based on the humanistic psychology I spoke of, consists of a periodically revised collection of chapters—passages of prose and poetry by Eastern and Western authors, a few of whom were trained in your profession. There are excerpts, for example, from the writings of a Danish psychologist of your day named Erik Erikson. The testament eloquently represents the substantial core of their religion, a very deep and complicated matter, difficult to expound.

"Of special interest to you," the angel said, "would be the story of the vehement refusal, then the unconcealed reluctance, then the halfhearted willingness, and finally the eagerness of psychologists to contribute in some way to the composition of this testament. You would be surprised to hear how their initial, stubborn opposition to the very idea of a religion was gradually dispelled as they approached the dawning certainty, with no residual distrust, that a natural, not a supernatural, religion was intended (one with only entities and forces *within* the order of nature to be symbolized and commemorated), that the underlying propositions of this religion would be tested by their fruits and hence would be as susceptible as scientific theories to refutation and revision, and that the whole endeavor called for extensions rather than suppressions of their creativeness.

"The psychologists took their next stand on the ground that they and other educated, disillusioned people could get along as well—if not better—without religion. For them, science had displaced religion. That this was not so for every intellectual became apparent to these psychologists after some of them had been challenged by a virtual epidemic of existential emptiness, such as you, my friend, observed after World War II, when scores of agitated or spiritless young men avowed that there was no theme for them to live by, except the theme that they were

Grovellers between faith and doubt  
the sun and north star lost, and compass  
out,  
the heart's weak engine all but stopped . . .  
[Conrad Aiken]

It became apparent that in the psyches of these sufferers—among whom were poets and artists of the first rank—the lights of all traditional religions had flickered and gone out, and no existing political ideology had drawing power. These disaffected, alienated souls, in a state of spiritual deficiency which no consumer goods could remedy, seemed to be waiting for a Second Coming without a ray of hope that it would ever come.

"The psychologists' final objection," the angel said, "was to the use of the sacred words *testament* and *religion* to designate the work-in-progress—a compilation of visions and ideas some of which were being composed and re-composed, with the aid of consciousness, in the depths of anonymous creative men and women. The psychologists were told that they, of course, were free to use any less pretentious terms that suited them. But when the essence of the published testament eventually became, in the estimation of the world, a matter of superordinate, ultimate concern, their antipathies to the word *religion* dwindled. Having witnessed the fatal consequences of deifying nationalism, the sage composers of this new religion saw that above the separate sovereignties of states there must be a firmly implanted and respected representation of humanity's profoundest moral intuitions, a *world* superego.

"Another reason for calling the testament a religious document is that its purpose is to generate and sustain in-

terior emotional transformations—from anxiety to serenity, for instance, from hate to love, or from envy to magnanimity—all of which are impalpable experiences which cannot be veritably described or effectively induced by the conceptual language of science, philosophy, or political ideologies. The engendering of deep subjective changes calls for graphic models, mythic parables, emotive metaphors, archetypal symbols, personifications—in short, narrative and poetic speech, as in the Bible. The myths and symbols of this new religion have already supplied artists of all stamps with enough suggestiveness in depth to last them for two centuries.

"And in this connection," continued the angel, "I should tell you that the religion of this new world is marked by numerous efficacious rites and festivals which might be described, in your old language, as ways of cheering, checking, channeling, and controlling the wildest dispositions of the id. We shall soon be in the city, where you will be enlightened as well as entertained by a spectacular religious festival which was suggested a number of years ago by a young psychologist. It has been shown that the amazing decline in the incidence of discontent, criminality, and psychosis can be attributed in large measure to the cathartic efficacy of mythic festivals such as the one which is going on today. For this is Bacchanalian week, during which everyone reverses roles. At the university, for example, you will hear students, with masks and costumes concealing their identities, lecturing to their professors and telling them exactly what they think of them; and later, in the public square you will witness a ritual enactment of the death and recreation of the Kingship."

As we were entering the city of Copenhagen, the angel embarked on a strange, disjointed discourse about the riddles and mysteries of this new religion. But I could not follow him at all, and, being left behind with my own thoughts, I suddenly woke up and rubbed my eyes. The trance was ended.

#### Notes

1. Edgar Tranekjaer-Rasmussen was president of the International Congress of Applied Psychology.
2. Gerhard Nielsen was president of the congress.