

Creativity, Humanistic Psychology, and the Emerging American Consciousness

by Mike Arons

I have felt for some time that the intense interest shown by American psychology during the 1950s and '60s in the subject of "creativity" was one of the more meaningful events in the history of that psychology. It was a moment when psychology was, so to speak, turning the corner. And it is no coincidence that the interest in this area generally paralleled the social outbreaks which have been leading rather rapidly towards a new consciousness in America.

Creativity, in a way, belongs to both past and emerging psychologies. It links the two. For the old psychologies in America - behaviorism and psychoanalysis - and, above all, for the methodology which became identified with psychology, creativity was a problem which had to be broached. But it also had to lead these psychologies to an impasse. The emerging psychologies, more humanistic, can readily begin with creativity but are obliged to transform the concept in the process of their development. Hence, as Frank Barron - one of the noted researchers in the area of creativity - put it, that which is essentially creative is likely to remain a mystery.

It seems a just irony that the greatest service that creativity can render is an heuristic one. It helps us to understand things other than itself. More importantly, it serves the function it has always served, that of obliging us to open ourselves up and alter our frames of reference.

The interest in creativity burst open in the early 1950s and became one of the areas in psychology holding the greatest interest during a period of 10 to 15 years. Today, one rarely reads much about creativity in the American journals. And yet nobody would claim that anything like a definitive study had been done on the subject. Rather, there is a feeling that the subject has been transcended. The outbreak of interest in creativity was initially ignited by J. P. Guilford (1) in his 1950 presidential address before the American Psychological Association.

In that address he lamented the fact that for decades practically no research interest had been shown in an area so important as creativity. He pointed out how few studies had actually been done in this area, than offered four reasons why he felt that an interest in creativity had been retarded:

- 1) Excessive preoccupation with I.Q. tests
- 2) The domination of Learning Theory
- 3) Prevalence of excessively rigid methodological standards
- 4) Inability to find agreement on criteria for researching creativity

The first three reasons cited propose that the directions which much of American psychology had taken were in some ways incompatible with the study of creativity. The fourth reason suggests an inherent difficulty encountered at the problem level.

Guilford, essentially an academician and researcher, did not mention Psychoanalysis - which represented a major area of psychology in which creativity had been treated. And Gestalt

psychology – which through its basic stress on intuition lent itself so well to an interest in creativity – was, at the time, only an insignificant force in the field. Furthermore, Gestalt psychology, through its attempts to accommodate to the rigid methodological standards of an atomized Behaviorism, had become practically undifferentiated from this latter.

The common link between all the American psychologies at the time of Guilford's address was their lack of vitality. They did not lack activity. Indeed, production rates were high - in the laboratories, in the diplomas issued, in the journals, and on the therapists' couches. Productivity was impressive, as it was in the society as a whole. And, while Guilford had made only inferential reference to this point, productivity was being identified with - both in psychology and the society - creativity. A mass of early studies on creativity dealt with the distinction between productivity and creativity.

What was lacking was vitality at the theoretical and methodological levels. Theoretically, both Learning theory and Psychoanalysis, in different forms, held as basic a homeostatic model of man - by which he is driven toward the least amount of pain, tension, or anxiety. This conservative stress was translated in much of psychology and the society as a whole - into the value of adaptation, often merely social adjustment, as the criteria for psychological health. At the extreme, particularly at the applied level, adaptation - "hence psychological health" - was interpreted to be the equivalent of social conformity.

The applied level encompassed more than business, industry, and education. It included psychology itself, as a field of work, where there came to exist inordinately narrow standards of proper behavior. Many of these were dictated by the apparent urgency for psychology to become a science, in that sense that science was interpreted by psychology. The methodological rigidity of this image of 19th Century physics worked to grossly narrow the range of personalities permitted into the field or who would choose the field. It worked to preclude any interests which were not amenable to the methodology, regardless of how relevant these were to an understanding of humans. The stress on the external, formal accouterments of 19th century physics - laboratories, equipment, and apparatuses, control and certification, down to the white lab jacket - required that psychologists conform to an almost laughable stereotype. The atmosphere clearly worked against risk, exploration, and speculation and towards safety, compulsive repetition, and rigid exactness. One can find here, as a necessary reaction, some seeds to the study of creativity.

The value on social adjustment had been built into the testing movement almost from its inception. While much testing was developed in the name of distinguishing individual differences, a tendency away from conformity, the growth of the testing movement in America owes much to its relationship with the social institutions - such as the military, business and industry, education and governmental social agencies. It is obvious that testers are employed by institutions to serve their interest. And it would have been difficult for the testing movement not to have been biased by these interests. But, further, the relationship of the testing movement to the prevailing scientism of American psychology meant that no findings could be considered reliable or valid which could not pass the rigors of this methodology. Unlike much of the purely academic research in psychology - that which was not destined for direct application - psychological tests, whatever their recognized or unrecognized limits and deficiencies, were

applied to masses of people in many sectors of the society. Since these were often used in selection procedures, the tests came to take on values by which judgments were made. The I.Q. test is a major product of the American testing movement. When imported from France in its early form, where it had been used in a limited and selective manner, it was given a standardized form to meet both the needs of scientific methodology and the needs for mass application within the institutions. Standardization already discouraged, if not totally precluded, "subjective" interpretations of test answers and permitted testing to move beyond the individual relationship between testee and psychologist, where the test results could be interpreted in individual context. The impetus for popularity of the I.Q. test came largely from the work of Lewis Terman at Stanford University. Based on extensive longitudinal studies, Terman (2) concluded that I.Q. test results were shown to correlate with a variety of physical and psychological characteristics and that success or failure on these tests correlated with success or failure in academic and social domains. Above all, Terman pointed out, nothing more characterized his high I.Q. subjects than their competence in "social adjustment."

Because of what he saw as their intellectual superiority, Terman went on to call his highest scorers "genius." Thus, the link was created between genius and social adjustment. That link ran counter to traditional stereotypes which offered the image of the genius as psychologically unstable and socially non-adaptive. Some psychologists, holding to the more traditional view, took strong exception to Terman's view in this matter. They pointed out - and Terman was obliged to acknowledge this - that few of Terman's "geniuses" had accomplished any major creative breakthroughs, though they had indeed "succeeded" in traditional vocations and occupations. Further, according to the Lange-Eichbaum studies (3), which Terman strongly disputed, the recognized creative geniuses of the Western world had shown a much higher proportion of emotional instability and social maladjustment than members of the population at large.

If the more romantic image of "genius" persisted in the public mind, the Terman image of "genius" began to dominate in the institutions, notably in formal education. Terman's studies had shown, at least at the extremes, high correlations of success and failure on the tests and in traditional education. These also had shown high correlations with success and failure in other dominant institutions - the army, business, industry, and the liberal professions.

Possible limitations or biases of the I.Q. test were first ignored, then forgotten as the instrument gained wide popularity, particularly in the school system. It reached the point where the greater part of all students were required to be tested. And students were often cursorily judged and academically slotted in terms of their scores. The abuses of I.Q. testing reached such major proportions that by the 1960s many of the major cities in the country had banned the test. Certainly much of the rebellion in the United States, aimed at education, was directed - if not exclusively at the I.Q. test - at the values which correlated so well to this test. It is no coincidence that the earliest studies on creativity after Guilford's talk focused on the limitations of I.Q. tests and showed, by implication, the extent to which these instruments and their use were reinforcing the most conservative and unoriginal dimensions of the society.

Getzels and Jackson (4) were able to demonstrate that I.Q. tests did not measure originality and that there was no necessary correlation between originality and intelligence as measured by the I.Q. What's more, those scoring high exclusively on I.Q. tests tended to share the traditional

values of their teachers and parents - they were highly goal-directed and achievement-orientated in terms of societal goals, lacked originality and a sense of humor, tended to be efficient and have little time for idle exploration, and tended to show minor interest in self-understanding. Those scoring significantly lower on I.Q. tests, but high on measures designed to tap originality, showed considerably greater independence of judgment, considerably more touch with their emotions and experiences, they permitted themselves to express greater emotional instability, accepted ambiguity, and tended to value self-exploration and philosophical questioning over efficient and success-oriented thinking.

Guilford himself had pointed out one key to this difference between the original thinkers and the high I.Q. scorers inherent to the I.Q. test itself. The standardized I.Q. test required, always, one correct answer. Evidently, this was an answer taken from public existing knowledge - hence, by definition, unoriginal. He called the thinking leading to success on these tests "convergent" - and differentiated this from original or "divergent" thinking characteristic of more creative individuals. An original answer could not have been designed into a test. And without any answer designed into the test, there can be no standardization of scoring. This basic realization hit indirectly at the heart of the so-called scientific method. It suggested that much of the work done in psychology laboratories was vulnerable to a like criticism - even the greatest attempts at "objectivity" were burdened by an atmosphere which permitted no spontaneity. And often, those dimensions of human experience which related to spontaneity were either excluded from research or reduced to forms which were manageable.

Much of the research devoted to creativity during the 1950s and 1960s was focused on variables which had ominous implications for dominant attitudes in psychology and the society. This research often took the form of correlational studies, whereby certain traits and tendencies purported to correlate with creativity or the creative person were teased out and differentiated from traits and tendencies not characteristic of this process or type of person.

The major scientific weakness of this type of research can be attributed to what Guilford cited as the fourth problem leading to retardation of the study of creativity. This was the problem of criteria. There had never been agreement on just what creativity was. Hence, if one researcher reported traits or tendencies which correlated with the creative act, process, or person, it was not certain that other researchers would acknowledge that these were creative acts, processes, or persons which were under study. Or could a child's scribbles be called creative, or even potentially creative - and hence comparable to the great and recognized works of art? To the extent that this sort of criticism is valid relative to a large proportion of research on creativity, these studies must be considered nonscientific, in the sense that science has been construed in American psychology.

But this very weakness implies the importance of these studies as seen from another point of view, that of social expression. From the expressive point of view more insight could be gained concerning the nature of creativity and, more essential, the nature of the problems existing in psychology and in the society - because there was a lack of hardcore criteria upon which an unequivocal definition of creativity could be based. Researchers had to begin with their own experiences - personal, cultural, and through their interpretations of history - to decide where to look for creativity. Hence, the frame of reference of the psychologist definitely had bearing on his studies. So as one might expect, this research taken as a whole had a particularly American

flavor to it. One can start with the observation that American psychologists showed a much greater, more concentrated, interest in “creativity” at that juncture in history than did their colleagues in other cultures. Even more basic, the very term “creativity” had only a relatively brief history in American jargon and was typical in its form to the type of jargon which had grown up with the American brand of social science. Creativity has the quality of something which is “study-able” if not quantifiable. There was no equivalent to the abstract noun “creativity” in French. (Though this term has recently been borrowed by French psychologists). The traditional term “creation” not only does not lend itself to the type of social science inquiry dominant in America, it carries strong historical, biblical and spiritual overtones. A study of “creation” could not avoid the implications of original creation. Whereas a study of creativity could be secular and limited to quite mortal and theoretically discernable human acts. Perhaps for this reason - the language and its cultural implications - the French had not come to study “creativity” as an isolated variable. Yet the French have long been recognized, particularly in America, as a very creative people and French geniuses, notably Poincare (5), were often cited in American research along with their introspections into their creative processes. But the concentrated American interest in creativity (during the 1950s and '60s) shows up more clearly as a social expression when we consider the types of variables researchers tended to select as relevant, when we consider what these researchers considered variables diametrically opposed to those seen related to creativity and, finally, when we consider the implications of some cross-cultural studies which had a bearing on creativity research.

A number of studies, as was mentioned earlier, focused on differentiating creativity from other constructs which had, in psychology and the society, become confused with creativity - e.g., I.Q. and productivity. Due to the methodology employed, it was essential that oppositions be established - e.g., I.Q. vs. creativity, productivity vs. creativity - and that each of the opposites have an array of satellite variables, correlated positively with it and negatively (or no correlation) with the opposite. High scores on I.Q. correlated with “convergent,” efficient, goal-directed problem solving, memory, or whatever. Creativity correlated with “divergent” open-ended cognition, old problems seen in new ways, etc. Added to the methodological exigencies, which already reflect preferred approaches in America generally, were the tendencies to build judgments of “desirable” and “non-desirable” into the oppositions established - i.e., “good guys” and “bad guys.” The research on creativity - certainly the earlier phase of it - implied such value judgments with creativity being very desirable (the “good guy”) and that seen in opposition as “less desirable” (or often the “bad guy”). This reflected a strong, if subtle, form of reaction against that which had been given such high value status previously in psychology and the society.

Examples of commonly cited satellite traits correlated positively with creativity were:

In the area of the creative product:

Originality, surprise, or the unexpected and unpredictable; The provoking or a new view or frame of reference, analogy leading to insight, formal appeal.

In the area of the creative process:

Psychological regression as well as progression; Intuition; Emotional instability and struggle; Risk, vulnerability, openness to experience; Tolerance of ambiguity, impulses, moods, childhood perceptions and conflicts, complexity of perceptions, etc.; The ability to “let go,” experience

freshly, ability to transcend polarities and apparent incompatibilities; Ability to seek truth or beauty beyond expediency and needs for tension reduction.

In the area of the creative person or personality:

Characterized by independence of judgment; Ego of such strength that it could voluntarily be transcended in the service of greater sensitivity; Fuller and more complex experience and awareness; Great reliance on intuition, impulse, or "inner voice"; Growth-centered, well-integrated but not fixed on integrations of the past; Preference for complexity, ambiguity, asymmetry; Tolerance for non-order, mystery; Characterized by playfulness, spirit, and humor; Is rebellious and critical; Accepts his/her unresolved conflicts (without trying to reduce these to facile expedient solutions); Incorporates many polarities such as the "primitive " as well as the refined, logical sides of his/her nature, etc.

Generally, these characteristics correlated with creativity offered a picture or model which was threatening to values dominant in psychology and the society at the time. These included stresses on predictability, repetition, and compulsive discharging of duties to teachers, employers, and institutions; "democratic thinking" where the majority opinion equaled truth; expediency values of socially-recognized achievement, material success, popularity; narrow specialization in well-defined areas, productivity; stress on external authority, neatness, precision; consensual validation, hierarchy, linear progress; disdain for intellectualism, delight in simplistic slogans, aphorisms, uniforms; efficiency, winning; fixed social patterns and sentimental traditions. Other traits included stress on incompatibility of polarities, on the extrinsic and competitive in terms of extrinsic goals, suppression of "unacceptable" emotions as well as ideas which deviate from accepted judgments, isolation from history except for chauvinistic purposes. Other characteristics which seemed in opposition to creativity traits were stress on the senses rather than critical thinking, affect or, above all, intuition; on product (finished) over "chaotic" resources and complex processes; reductionism to simple truths rather than attempts to deal with complexity; on segmentalization over integration; stress on childishness over child-likeness; on the simplistic over simplicity; on judgmental attitude over existential awareness.

Very few cross-cultural studies showed up in the literature on creativity research, but two such studies are revealing. They both suggest to what extent there was a need in American psychology for an expression, through the studies on creativity, of what was lacking in that society. At an early phase of the research on creativity two researchers, notably Asch and Crutchfield, had become interested in the problem of conformity. Independently these investigators conducted a series of studies with American subjects to determine the prevalence of conformity. The results of these studies were surprising in that they revealed that conformity - seen as non-independence of judgment - was a dominant mode of behavior even where it might be the least expected, at the better American universities. In one variation of these studies, a subject was asked to judge the longer of two lines (which were clearly different in length) after the subject had heard the (intentionally incorrect) judgments of other "subjects" which preceded him/her. A surprisingly small percentage of these American college subjects judged independently of what they had heard. Studies of this nature were repeated in Scandinavia and in France with university students and the percentage of independent judgments increased sharply in the former culture and even more sharply in the latter one (6).

Much more recently, Frank Barron, one of the most comprehensive researchers in the area of creativity, reported a study which compared a group of American-born Boston children who were of Italian ancestry with a group of Italian-born children in Italy. He discovered that the Italian children did significantly better on tests of creativity than did the Boston children. These results suggest, again, that the lack of creativity - and those characteristics correlated with this - has been more particularly an American problem. This, again, moves towards an understanding of why American psychologists have so intently focused on this area.

The American studies on creativity - both in their investigative and expressive aspects - paralleled and predisposed the shift towards a humanistic psychology and the radical shift in American consciousness.

The nature of these studies, and the level at which they were attempted, were responsible for breaking the backbone of a stringently positivistic psychology and for ushering in, for the first time in many years, a complex human being which psychology had to confront. Guilford's presentation to the American Psychological Association reflected the strongly positivistic bias which the research he encouraged was about to breach. He ignored or discarded as not of significant value the long-standing interest in creativity or related subjects by fields which American psychology had long cast as "pre-scientific" - interest and research in literature, in the arts, in philosophy, in Psychoanalysis and speculative Gestalt psychology, and even in the scientific but non-behavioristic research of Continental psychology such as that of Karl Buhler. Via Guilford's challenge, American behavioristic psychology was obliged to confront complex questions about Man which it had ignored and even suppressed. The most rigorous methodology of this psychology was totally inadequate to the problem of creativity. Even the most flexible tolerated methodology was sorely strained in the effort. But this methodological straining only served to impress on psychology the complexity of the human with which it was dealing. This opened the door at a point where the breeze of fresh air could not be ignored. Previously all work on complex human functioning could be dismissed as non-scientific or pre-scientific. What the Freudians, the Jungians, the early Gestaltists did was not - except in narrow circles - considered relevant to the mainstream of academic psychology. This latter group had been operating on much narrower, purer and simpler models of behavior. But the need to grapple with the complexities of creativity required of researchers that they enter that "pre-scientific" domain, contrasting this view with their own models.

If the methodology was expanded by being broken open, the theoretical underpinnings of a behavioristic psychology were put into serious question when its reductionistic and deterministic model of man was forced to confront a model of creative man characterized by spontaneity unconscious or pre-conscious dynamics, meaning, values, and inner direction.

Still, the general model of creativity was, in the larger sense, a behavioristic one and one inherently determined by the methodology. For creativity to be even considered present, it was obligatory that there be demonstrated some external creative product. Indeed, this appeared to be no problem, since it seemed self-evident that creativity would be product-centered.

Yet a major shift of emphasis occurred with the onset of humanistic psychology. Maslow, for one, distinguished two major kinds of creativity - one product-centered, the other growth-centered. The second was more like a style of life, a style characteristic of those whom he called self-actualizing individuals. It was extremely difficult to study such persons with a

rigorous scientific methodology, and Maslow's studies might well have been ignored completely had it not been for the wedge the studies on creativity had placed in the doorway of general psychology. The humanists were beginning to offer a different kind of challenge to psychological researchers - one of expanding their research techniques to be able to understand man at what Maslow would call his best (7).

In the meantime, humanistic psychology was becoming an umbrella for a wide variety of interests and approaches which shared (sometimes only this) a focus on psychological growth, or health psychology. While Maslow had argued for a humanistic psychology which adhered to scientific methodology, explorations into the far reaches of these new dimensions of Man were rarely carried out with anything like a semblance of scientific rigor. Indeed, Maslow preached science, but he himself rarely used it to the satisfaction of any scientific psychologist. In an important sense this was not hypocrisy on Maslow's part. For while he fully believed that there could be no progress outside of a rigorous science, including the use of operational definitions, he parted from logical positivists in that he did not see science as itself an absolute progressive step beyond other methods of inquiry such as the arts, philosophy, theology, or direct personal experience and intuition. Psychology, he felt, must take from all of these areas at every step in the evolution of Man's thinking. And so, according to this rationale, a man could be a psychologist - even a scientist in the larger sense of the word - without limiting himself to a rigorously conventional scientific frame of reference (8).

Other developments in humanistic psychology began to make the hope, or even the desire for ultimate scientific certification, questionable. The shift in emphasis towards development and understanding of the inner man predisposed a shift in emphasis from indirect to direct understanding. If for many centuries it had been believed that man could gain salvation through a scientific understanding of himself which could then be reapplied to him through scholarship or technology, the new thrust in psychology seemed to open up the possibility of direct understanding. Personal growth and self-understanding could be combined. Many of the techniques evolved in or employed by the growth centers began to offer such a promise. Academic psychology, even academic humanistic psychology, held less popularity for several years during the 1960s than did the growth centers which had blossomed up throughout the country. Even at the universities, the stress had been on personal growth and self-understanding through experiences. Indeed, the breach between the experiential on the one hand and the theoretical on the other has been one source of strain within the humanistic psychology movement. But this strain has been counterbalanced by another - that between an emphasis on personal growth and a transpersonal psychology. These two strains are tangentially related.

Maslow and others had already sketched out possible dimensions of human potential. Beyond those needs which he considered basic to survival and to which any kind of an "adjustment" psychology could legitimately address itself he elaborated a variety of higher level needs, all of which still postulated human potential. Many of these higher order needs, such as appreciation for aesthetics, have for a long time been readily understood - if not fully actualized - in the society. And to the extent that Maslow stressed these potentials inferred the extent to which they had not been actualized in the society of his time. But Maslow also went on to speak of experiences, or potentials, which were quite alien to the society. He spoke of transcendent

experiences and mystic experiences which were also a part of that human potential. Such experiences had been alluded to on occasion by other psychologists of the past - including Freud, who refused to consider them in his theoretical framework; Jung, who had been ridiculed for them; Bergson, whose little influence on American psychology rested on his more positivistic contributions to the philosophy of science; and James, who had also been far better remembered for other aspects of his thinking. Nothing could have been more alien to - nay, more antagonistic to - any conventional American psychology than mystic experience (9). Still, Maslow's was not the first recent introduction to such experience in experimental psychology. Reports of mystical experiences appeared on occasion in the research literature on creativity. In one instance, John Ferran, the American artist, had been cited as distinguishing between the mystic experience of the artist and the experience of the mystic. The artist, he claimed, would be drawn by inspiration towards completion of a work of art. The mystic would reinvest his inspiration in the interest of self-expansion and greater mystical unity. This distinction is not dissimilar to the change in stress we have discussed above - that change from a psychology occupied with a product-centered creativity and a humanistic psychology concerned with man as a product of his own creative life style.

But something akin to the mystic experience had been knocking at experimental psychology's door for some time prior even to the studies on creativity. This was the all-but-rejected pocket of research in the area of parapsychology, directed by Rhine at Duke University. There was no question but that this work was being developed experimentally, along the lines of the scientific techniques which American psychology had held so dear. Yet because of the nature of the subject, this matter remained virtually unrecognized in the field at large.

There was yet a third point at which experimental psychology had been introduced to what is now being called Transpersonal psychology. This is the research pioneered by Leary and Alpert at Harvard on psychedelic drugs. Reports of drug-induced experiences which bordered on the mystical were so prevalent in this project - and so controversial at that university, in psychology and in the society - that the investigators were obliged to leave the institution. Indeed, both Leary and Alpert left science, the former seeking direct salvation through the drug, the latter ultimately seeking direct salvation through naturally-induced mystical experience.

The general stress held common to all of the above became roughly merged under the heading of Transpersonal psychology. And here, perhaps as nowhere else, did a reintegration of psychology with philosophy, theology, and the arts become an historical necessity. From Gurdjieff and the inordinately broad range of Oriental psychology to the transcendental writers and poets of the West to the Judeo-Christian mystical tradition - all became relevant to the new kind of psychological experimentation which was rapidly developing. And this experimentation has divided up along the lines of the first strain mentioned above. On the one hand, there was a stress on direct salvation through an array of techniques, some borrowed from the Ancient past, some devised out of the most advanced electronic technology. On the other hand, there has developed the indirect approaches for understanding, including scholarship, theorizing, and rigorous experimentation.

The personal dimension of humanistic psychology - that which has generally been identified with humanistic psychology - was born with the same strain of emphasis between the experiential (or direct salvation) and theoretical-experimental (or indirect salvation). While Maslow was a

psychologist, and while most of the early theoretical positions leading to a Humanistic psychology came from academic psychology, some of the first important work in what was later to be called Humanistic psychology was developing in business, industry, and social organizations. It was in the society that the problems of alienation, mechanization, and inauthentic personal relationships had become the most pressing. It was mandatory that this situation, spoken of for so long by existentialists, be rectified. Yet psychology had been preoccupied with mostly irrelevant experimentation at the academic level and with classical forms of psychopathology at the clinical level. Maslow's writings were first taken seriously in economics and business, where success in the profit end of the enterprise had not correlated with success at the level of human relations. In fact, Maslow had theorized that profits could actually be increased if a being rather than deficiency model of operation were effected (10). The National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine had for a long time been operating an institute based on developing more authentic human relations in the business and industrial field. And an array of direct experience techniques had been evolved for this purpose. It was out of this experimentation that the "T-group" or the wide variety of other groups called "encounter" or "sensitivity training groups" emerged. This was the origin of the growth center phenomena. At these centers, of which Eselan Institute is the best known, persons from any walk of life could come for a series of growth experiences. These were generally "well-adjusted" middle class individuals or couples whose problems were much better characterized by the struggles in *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* than by anything in the traditional clinical literature. Indeed, if these persons were neurotic, the neurosis was much more rooted in existential problems discussed by Fromm, Rogers, Sartre, and Rollo May than those discussed in Psychoanalytic theory. These were problems of frustrated growth, where the pressures of the technological society - highly materialistically oriented - had been inhibiting personal development towards what Maslow called higher-order needs and values. This kind of "neurosis" was characterized by Colin Wilson in his *New Existentialism* as "the rust which forms on a non-moving organism" (11).

And so we can see that Humanistic psychology has a range starting with escape from the oppression of the technological society to the most ephemeral but heightened stages of awareness. And at all levels, the thrust is generally inwards - that is, towards the existing resources - rather than outward towards gratification through new productivity, accumulation, and external control.

The implications of this shift - though "inward" - will have a new meaning for the psychology, the society, and ironically, for the problem area of creativity. Let us consider some of these implications in a necessarily broad and speculative way. Bearing in mind that Humanistic psychology per se is still but a small though rapidly growing segment of American psychology. These implications are based more on what can be called the general humanizing of psychology and the society. The shift in values and interest in psychology and the society appear from what has been described above to have reached the dimensions of a major overhaul. Is the radical-ness of this shift more apparent than real? If we look at what has occurred less in terms of substance and more in terms of social expression, we might be led to a certain pessimism. The pattern of shifting from extreme to extreme in a short period of time has been a familiar American pattern. Mood shifts have always been relatively facile, extreme, and fashionable.

Another familiar pattern can be discerned if we look at the dialectical process suggested from the movements focused on in this paper. There has been a definite movement back and forth from cultural independence to cultural dependence. And this is true in two ways. American psychology and the society have become quite independent of its culture and of culture in general. Both have taken a pride in progressing beyond the relevance of historical contributions. Psychology had gained an autonomy in the universities unparalleled in most other cultures, particularly from philosophy, but also from the humanities in general. And history has rarely been an existential experience for Americans. Generally it has been seen in particularly utilitarian terms. The shift back to the “pre-scientific” domains in psychology as a result of a reawakening to the more complex and subtle human dimensions may have its parallel in the society through the recent traumatic experience of the Vietnam War. Indeed, the old ways - or what were considered the new ways - can no longer be depended upon to solve basic human problems. The important question becomes how psychology and the society permit themselves to experience the broader resources of history and culture. The very rapidity and radical-ness of the shift in values suggests that the mode of experiencing these resources may not have changed very much. Indeed, while a new respect has been gained for history and culture, there still appears to be little time for a profound reassessment of values in terms of these. Rather, there are indications that the new leaps outward - to the extent that these are rooted in the past and the culture - are being sustained by a utilitarian and pragmatic thrust to simply snatch out what appears relevant from the past in terms of immediate value to contemporary projects. Maslow was outspoken in this respect - particularly as regards phenomenology and existentialism, as well as poetry and philosophy generally - when he asked “What is in it for psychology?” He stripped existentialism and phenomenology to its pragmatic value in terms of his own project, discarded the fundamentally pessimistic mood of the existentialists, replacing this with an American optimism and goal-directedness, and evolved what Colin Wilson later called an optimistic existentialism. This snatching-out of what seems useful and dismissing basic problems attendant to the thinking borrowed from - i.e., not really asking why existentialists had focused on a nihilistic mood - has been quite characteristic of much of the work done in creativity and Humanistic psychology. It has led to the valid question of how much of this thinking, like that emerging from the growth centers, is more fashionable than durably insightful in its contributions. The other dimension of shift - from cultural dependence to cultural independence and back - expresses itself in the early confidence, if not arrogance, concerning the abilities of an American psychology to go it alone through technique. However, before the studies on creativity were very far along, the emphasis in a substantive way had shifted back - not only to philosophy, poetry, etc. - but to Europe, particularly to existential and phenomenological thinking. Phenomenology became relevant - less as a method than as an epistemology - when it was realized that the creative process (even when product-centered) rested on expanded awareness, the enriching of experience of the object, and intuition - rather than on perceptual blockage through segmentalized and reductionistic thinking. It was in the opening-up to experience (in the personal centering, in the tolerance for holding in abeyance) and in transcendence (in the form of intuition and inspiration) that the creative act much paralleled the phenomenological method. But phenomenology as a method was rarely used - other than in terms of what were called “subjective reports of experience” which, of course, had more in

common with psychological introspection of the 19th Century than with phenomenology. But let us return to phenomenology in a moment.

The characteristics of the creative person, as evolved out of the studies on creativity, so paralleled the characteristics of "authentic" man in existential literature that Barron and others came to lean quite heavily on this literature. It was through the intermediary of existentialism that Barron was able to expand (first) from his pure studies of creativity to (second) creativity and psychological health to (finally) creativity and personal freedom (12).

If the studies on creativity were instrumental in bringing continental philosophy to a point of exposure in American psychology, Humanistic psychology can be said to have started with basic premises of both existentialism and phenomenology. That one wing of Humanistic psychology - including those such as Rollo May or A. Giorgi, which had stuck generally to a rigorous phenomenology and existential frame of reference - has remained quite small, indicates to what extent humanists tended to use this thinking more as a jumping board than as a consistent and rigorous basis of operations. There are exceptions - such as Charlotte Buhler, whose roots in existentialism have deepened to the extent that she has blossomed out towards an original humanistic conception of personal development (13). But this grounding has not been characteristic of most Humanistic or Transpersonal psychologists. Rather, while establishing a strong American identity for Humanistic psychology these have come to shift for dependence to the other side of the globe - to ancient Oriental Psychology, from which the orientation now draws a goodly portion of its vitality, scope, and paradoxically, future. There is another pattern which has become evident in the development of the new consciousness in psychology which lends weight to a view that the changes occurring might be less real than apparent. This is the apparent fixation on technique at which Americans have always been consistently good. While the rebellion in the society and in psychology has been very much a reaction against an overvaluation of technology, both the Humanistic and Transpersonal fields have been less characterized by profound theory and philosophy - much of which was borrowed as mentioned above - than it has been characterized, both at the experiential and academic levels, by the development and proliferation of techniques. These techniques are often quite ingenious and effective, but this stress does not encourage the hope that a greater balance between perspective and technique is in process of being accomplished.

If the above signs seem not to indicate that an authentic quantum leap is occurring in the society and in psychology - one that some, including myself, had hoped would equal in importance the shift in values attributed to the 16th Century Renaissance - there are other signs that something truly major has been occurring over the past 15 years in America and her psychology. The impatience and zeal and the willingness to take broad leaps to the extremes - characteristic of the society - may well have offered quite original insights and experiences which would not be available to more mature and integrated cultures. Clearly, many of the techniques which have been evolved will have a long standing value in applied areas. But the unique way of integrating Western and Eastern thought - in this culture which shares oceans with both sides - shows promise of offering a synthesis which can have important implications for Europe and the Orient. But if we restrict ourselves only to the value in these transformations of values for the United States and for her psychology, we see definite evidence of fundamental change. The psychology and the society are in the process of breaking out of some clear-cut polarities by

which they have been trapped for many decades - a distinction is now being recognized between what Herbert Read called "freedom" and "liberty." This is the recognition that the rational bases of American freedom, of the entire American system, can only lead to "liberty" - that is, to a guarantee from constraint. Freedom becomes a psychological or a spiritual question, and is attained through psychological or spiritual growth at the personal level as well as at the level of the values the society takes on to encourage this growth. The counterpart to this recognition in the scientific context is that rational science, just as rational law, cannot be depended upon to bring personal salvation. Indeed, the very development of science to the point where it can make its fullest contributions to a health psychology depends on much which is not essentially scientific or rational.

An even more basic contribution of the emerging consciousness, which I believe will have a lasting effect, is the transcendence of the subject-object dichotomy - recognized in the studies on creativity, the development of Humanistic psychology, and through major contributions from phenomenology and Oriental philosophy. The turn inward - which characterizes the new consciousness - is, at the same time, a new turn outward. An alienation between subject and object is replaced by recognition that the object is the object of experience. That sensitization of the person - the turn inward - is the equivalent of enrichment of the world (of experience) through expanded awareness. The mystic experience suggests an ideal subject-object unity. And the possibility of intuitive understanding (direct salvation) now appears as theoretically viable as it did prior to the Cartesian split. Indirect under-understanding, in the form of science or any of the reasoned areas of understanding, must also be enriched - as mentioned above, by recognition that understanding outwards has its counterpart in enriched inner experience, that the most abstract conceptualization may be intrinsically related to the most concrete experience. Barron stated this discovery in the following way: "Thus the creative genius may be at once naive and knowledgeable, being at home equally to primitive symbolism and to rigorous logic. He is both more primitive and more cultured, more destructive and more constructive, occasionally crazier and yet adamantly saner, than the average person." The implications of this "Copernican Revolution" in subject-object relations are too varied to enumerate. Yet this has its most poignant implication in the realm of psychological and cultural health.

With the shift inward - to intensified awareness - and with the concomitant enrichment of the world, we can no longer see withdrawal in the same negative terms we viewed it in the past. Indeed, the current withdrawal of individuals and the society at large has been badly mistaken for a new isolationism, an escape from responsibility. It is my belief that this shift inwards can ultimately lead to a greater sense of responsibility, even in the old sense of the word, as well as a greater sense of the "ability to respond" as the word is now being construed by Humanistic psychologists. The shift inwards is towards enrichment of experience in the now - to replace the void between gratifications and security coming periodically from outside - in the form of an indirect science and technology. This shift is clearly leading to a new sense of value priorities, with the focus much more on the intrinsic than on the extrinsic. The world is being experienced for itself, and not so much for its utility to future salvation. And so that world, in itself, has gained enormous value - leading to the emphasis on ecology, for instance, over supersonic jets. The shift from the extrinsic (utility) to the intrinsic (fulfillment) creates the value whereby a much more authentic sort of responsibility can be engendered, the responsibility of care. Indeed, it is the

lack of this latter which seems to have led to the condition of our ghettos and to the dis-concern with one's fellow man and creatures when no utilitarian value could be discerned - or where the constraints of abstract morality were not implemented, such as in war. The real danger to this shift, as most Humanistic psychologists have indicated, is when there is a complete abandonment of basic or survival values.

It is perhaps here that Humanistic psychology and the emerging consciousness can make a major contribution in bringing together the best of the Orient with the best of the Occident. There is an awareness in current American thinking of the price - economically and politically - which the Orient has paid for its radical inward shift. And as a consequence, there exists now a growing technology aimed at complimenting the inward shift through survival "supports." Certain experimentation has been done in the many communes developed by the young in recent years which focus on this double aspect. Indeed, it is entirely possible that a technology of man - developing from Skinnerian Behaviorism - might be created to accommodate the survival needs. There is clearly some sort of accommodation in the offing between Skinnerian Behaviorism and Humanistic psychology.

This possibility brings us back to our original focus - that of creativity and the fourth reason cited by Guilford for what he saw as a retardation in the study of creativity. If these studies on creativity predisposed the emergence of a humanistic psychology, the emerging consciousness has created the need to reassess the notion of creativity. In a control- and external achievement-oriented psychology and society, creativity was essentially seen as product-centered. Indeed, Bronowski had stressed individualistic, product-centered creativity as characteristic of Man's search to control nature. He differentiated this from pure religious expressiveness, through craftsmanship, characteristic of the Middle ages (14). By making personal growth both a creative process and product, humanists seem to have expanded the term creativity to regain the breadth and depth of the more spiritual French term, creation. This shift from control of nature - and necessary adaptation to it for survival - to an identity with nature is bound in still other ways to affect the concept of "creativity." Creativity, as a contribution to a collective and progressive venture of domination, could be significant - even when it was one-dimensional. The inventor of the automobile engine was not required to account for the destruction which that engine could produce to lives and to the environment. With the value coming to be placed more on the intrinsic relationship with the world, a new more holistic criteria of creativity may well evolve, one which requires that the product meet a multiplicity of human needs. That is, that the criteria for practicality will be made much more stringent. This seems more applicable to invention than to the arts and sciences. Yet these latter will probably be looked on in more holistic terms, as well. Indeed, these criteria for creativeness have always, it seems to me, been more holistic in Europe than in the U.S.

There is yet another area which will probably be affected by the shift from a product- to a person-centered creativity. Women have generally argued that their lack of historical creative production was due to their having been kept in the house. This argument is currently in vogue among Women's Liberation movements. Yet it is now becoming clearer that much of the historical lack of creativity productivity among women can be attributed to the inordinate stress on control and external achievement by which creativity was measured. That is, creativity has been defined, essentially, in Male terms. With the Humanistic emphasis - more holistic and

growth-centered, with the stress on sensitivity and intuition - it appears that a more feminine era is upon us, one in which women will more easily, by definition, excel.

Perhaps the most important implication the new consciousness has relative to creativity derives from a new acceptance of ambiguity and diversity. For the first time in many decades, Americans are being asked to question monotheism - particularly as this has been applied to the value of progress. It is becoming clear that the values associated with I.Q. testing, those underlying Terman's stress on social adaptation, were values consistent with the "melting pot" frame of reference. Americans have always taken inordinate pride in their diversity. But they have been even prouder of the ideal that this diversity could be homogenized in terms of a shared way of life - or transcendent value system. Hence, differences have been paid lip service, but homogenization has been the assumed outcome. And in American psychology - as well as its society - success or external achievement has been the driving force of the value of homogenization.

There is much of this same achievement stress within the Humanistic psychology movement, with the shift of emphasis now being turned inward towards "self-actualization." Yet as this psychology develops there is a growing recognition of what the existentialists were alluding to and what appeared to be the ground for the pessimism of this philosophy. The world is hopelessly complex if one's views reflect the disappointment of giving up the possibility of a unitary answer. Or the world is simply complex, beyond the capacity of a man or society to reduce to an overriding truth. There appears to be a definite maturation in the society and the psychology from an adolescent attitude of omnipotence towards one of multi-dimensionality. This development, in the society, has been fostered by the Vietnam war experience. And it is being nurtured by the diversity of cries from minority groups - Blacks, Chicanos, Indians, women, homosexuals and so forth - who have not desired, or were not able, to adapt to a monolithic, one-dimensional frame of reference.

In psychology we discerned examples of the break-up of the monolithic value structure by Guilford's introduction of creativity and its value correlates. But since that 1950 talk, Guilford - alone - has been able to discern the existence of scores of mental abilities, many of which have never been accounted for in the field or in the educational institutions. Many of these are capacities at which minority groups excel. In the field of clinical psychology we see a breaking up of a rigid monolithic certification system due to the recognition that there is not one or a few routes to competency in this profession (15).

This new tolerance for diversity, associated with a diminution in the belief that a unitary answer is possible, must clearly affect our future concept of "creativity." The effect is radical. The fourth problem cited by Guilford - that of inadequate criteria for defining creativity - has not only been left unresolved, it has become an infinitely greater obstacle. "The phenomenon" of creativity has become more elusive than ever.

References

1. Guilford, J. P. (1950). "Creativity." *American Psychologist*, 5. 444-453.
2. Terman, L. M. & Oden, M. H. (1947). "The Gifted Child Grows Up." In L. M. Terman (Ed.), *Genetic Studies of Genius*, Vol. 4. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 448.
3. Lange-Eichbaum, W. (1932). *The Problem of Genius* (E. & C. Paul, Trans.). New York: Macmillan. 187.

4. Getzels, J. W. & Jackson, P. W. (1962). *Creativity and Intelligence*. London: Wiley and Sons.
5. Poincare, H. (1952). "Mathematical Creation." In B. Chiselin (Ed.), *The Creative Process*. New York: Mentor.
6. Crutchfield, R. S. (1963). "Conformity and Creative Thinking." In W. Henry (Ed.), *Contemporary Approaches to Creative Thinking*. New York: Atherton.
7. Maslow, A. H. (1959). "Creativity in Self Actualizing People." In H. H. Anderson (Ed.), *Creativity and Its Cultivation*. New York: Harper. 83-89.
8. Maslow, A. H. (1966). "I-Thou Knowledge." *In A Psychology of Science*. New York: Harper and Row.
9. Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a Psychology of Being*. Princeton, N.J.: Von Nostrand.
10. Maslow, A. H. (1965). *Eupsychian Management*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
11. Wilson, C. (1966). *Introduction to the New Existentialism*. London: Hutchinson.
12. Barron, F. X. (1968). *Creativity and Personal Freedom* (Revised Edition of Creativity and Psychological Health). Princeton, N.J.: Von Nostrand.
13. Buhler, C. (1968). "Fulfillment and Value of Life." In C. Buhler & F. Massarik (Eds.), *The Course of Human Life*. New York: Springer.
14. Bronowski, J. (1958, September). "The Creative Process." *Scientific American*, 199(3), 63-64.
15. Klee, J. B. (1970, March-April). "The One-Dual and Multiple." *Main Currents in Modern Thought*, 26(4), 116-120.