

# My Self in 1980: A Study of Culture

William Stephenson

*ABSTRACT: The author provides his own Q-methodological self study as an addendum to a previous study based on Lasch's theory of narcissism, thereby providing a British contrast to 10 Americans previously examined. Four factors emerge from eight conditions of instruction for a Q sample composed of pictures from Time magazine – the first factor representing ideals in identification with everyone (hence apart from narcissism), the second representing real-world problems and conversational possibilities, the third a personal uneasiness about technological progress, and the fourth focused on class issues. Cultural implications are discussed and amended in a 1989 addendum.*

## Introduction

The last of the doctoral candidates under my influence at the University of Iowa, Irvin Goldman, completed his dissertation in 1984 (Goldman, 1985): it is a scholarly work, erudite, con-

---

This article is published with the permission of the literary executor of the William Stephenson estate.

cerning Christopher Lasch's *The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations* (1978). With the time and concentration only possible for a doctoral candidate, over several years of effort, Goldman became expert in the knowledge of philosophy, sociology, psychology, science and mass communication theory, as those disciplines were studied about the conditions of culture, by scholars during the 1940-1980 decades -- for at least a hundred authorities, from Freud to Popper, from Marx to Marcuse, from Ludwig von Bertalanffy to Johan Huizinga. All of this scholarship about culture had been conducted in the Newtonian framework of determinism and linear causality: Goldman proposed, using Q-methodology, to lead it into the modern quantum theoretical mode of thought, of indeterminism and probabilistics, and to do so by studying as few as 10 Americans.

The purpose of the present adjunct to Goldman's dissertation is an additional qualification: it consists of *my* self description, that of an Englishman, to contrast with the 10 Americans. The concern is with cultural "self-images."

### *Modus Vivendi*

Although the discourse amongst the scholars during the 40 years from 1940 to 1980 was almost entirely within the Newtonian framework, there was one warning, to which Goldman makes reference (p. 39 of his dissertation), from Floyd W. Matson, in his *The Broken Image: Man, Science, and Society* (1966) to the effect that reliance by the social sciences "upon the root metaphors and routine methods appropriated from classical mechanics" has produced a "radically broken self-image" in Americans. He concluded:

The tragic history of the breakup of the human image parallels the disintegration of the inner sense of identity, the flight from autonomous conduct to automatic behavior in the modern world. (pp. v-vi)

The thought, but not the methodology, is echoed in Christopher Lasch's *The Culture of Narcissism*.

Lasch describes the U.S.A. as traumatized, helpless, in the throes of bureaucratic capitalism, including the mass media. He writes as follows:

The propaganda of death and destruction emanating ceaselessly from the mass media, adds to the prevailing atmosphere of insecurity. Far-flung famines, earthquakes in remote regions, distant wars and uprisings attract the same attention as events closer to home. The impression of arbitrariness in the reporting of disasters, reinforces the arbitrary quality of the experience itself. (p. 68)

In this context, Lasch suggests that the result is a pathological character disorder, described clinically as *narcissism*. It not only follows from actions of the American government which "inflames international tensions" and "unleashes an ugly aggressiveness" on misguided grounds of "national interest" (as at Vietnam, and in Latin America), but it reaches into the destruction of family life. Lasch concludes...

In the course of bringing culture to the masses, the advertising industry, the mass media, the health and welfare services, and other agencies of mass tuition took over many of the socializing functions of the home and brought the ones that remained under the direction of modern science and technology. (p. 154)

So, indeed, today there are about as many "experts" attending us in the U.S.A., at all levels of its culture, as there are people in the population. You can scarcely eat an apple, or brush your teeth, without "expert" advice, and this reaches to the very top executives of our great corporate businesses, whose conduct at their own secret board meetings is subject to "experts" in industrial management from Yale University!

It is not necessary to follow Goldman into the hundred pros and cons of Lasch's thesis. Mention should be made, however, of Herbert Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideologies of Advanced Industrial Society* (1969), and his *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (1966). Freud, in *Totem and Taboo* (1950), had equated the development of culture with that of a child's Oedipal beginnings, in

"murder of the father" ("in the beginning was the Deed"). The history of mankind, in the Freudian contest, is one of repression and male dominance, upon which civilization apparently wends its way. Marcuse took this seriously, but wanted to save mankind from its murderous course, and proposed that "playfulness" would be the *modus vivendi* for doing so. Every child has happy, playful times, and emphasis on this, rather than on Oedipus murders, could save mankind, while retaining Eros as its base.

It is truly naive, yet it touches a chord: Huizinga, we all remember, put "play" at the very heart of culture formation in *Homo Ludens*; and in Q-methodology, as well, there is my "ludenic theory" (Stephenson, 1964) and *The Play Theory of Mass Communication* (Stephenson, 1967).

I have not had time to deal as thoroughly with play theory as it deserves: a paper by John Shotter ("Prolegomena to an Understanding of Play," 1973) suggests what is at issue. The primal state of man was little different from that of animals, yet now man is a very different creature indeed. This, Shotter argues, could only have been brought about by man's own "creative power": he denies validity to the Newtonian mode of science, of investigating wholes by breaking them into parts (Shotter, 1973, p. 85). He adopts "a form of indeterminacy." There is not just *one*, but number of possibly real futures: and by this he didn't mean that there is a choice from predetermined futures, but, instead, a *structured indeterminacy* (his words italicized)...

(i.e.) that our actions are regulated or guided by something like definite, unambiguous and momentarily fixed systems of rules.  
(p. 85)

Shotter proposes that this *subjective* part is "I," and this is guided by his *objective* part "me," and that Self consists only of these two parts. It is the position represented by George Mead's *Mind, Self and Society* (1934).

In Q we reverse this purely grammatical "I" and "me" for a *psychological* pair. "I" is objective, for example John Shotter himself as we can prove by photography, birth certificates, etc.

"Me" is subjective, and indeed does consist of *structured indeterminacy* -- some of it is *him* in the case of John Shotter and some of it only *his*. This is James's Law (Stephenson, 1953) of me-mine. And of course we can operate within this framework along quantum-theoretical lines.

It is with this in mind, as *modus vivendi*, that Irvin Goldman undertook his demonstration, by using Q-methodology as precisely as possible, to see how far Lasch was justified in his extraction of narcissism in the context of the current culture of the U.S.A.

### *Modus Operandi*

He represented the culture by photographs appearing in *Time* magazine, covering religion, law, the military, business, automobiles, sports, education, medicine, and miscellaneous: this constituted the *concourse*. A Q sample  $N = 60$  was prepared, in Fisherian design. Ten subjects were chosen, following the George Carslake Thompson system for representative P sets, i.e. for an *Expert*, a person of *Special Interest*, and an *Existing Authority*, along with seven persons representing difficult *Class Interests*. Each individual performed eight Q sorts, with the following conditions of description:

1. What is important for you *now* in the way you live.
2. What has entered as a direct influence in your *up-bringing*.
3. What represents for you the "*ideals*" of life?
4. What are *personal problems* for you now?
5. What are the *real issues* in life?
6. What can you enter into *conversation* about most freely, with almost anyone.
7. What do you feel *class conscious* about.
8. What represents *you*, yourself?

The Q sorts, duly factor analyzed and conforming to "simple structure," were then analyzed by Goldman, who concluded that in all 10 individuals, there had indeed been significant

breakings in self image, to which narcissism could be given as an explanation. In short, Lasch was substantially supported.

What he hadn't done was to show that with the same material there could be a very different conclusion, namely for an Englishman who had lived in the U.S.A. for 30 years (at that time, from 1948-1980)\* but who retained something of the autonomy that narcissism was denying to Americans around him.

### *My Data*

The result of the factor analysis of my eight Q sorts is in the factor structure in Table 1. The factor structure indicates that A is *me*, and B, C, D *mine* (James' law). It points to considerable adjustment in terms of Rogers' Law -- Q sorts 1, 2, 3, 8 are all on A. What I am prepared to talk about (Q sorts 5, 6) are real issues, but they are not likely to lead to action on my part (Parloff's law indicates action when the variables are "me," not just "mine"). My personal problems are apparently pushed out of "me" (Q sort 4), as is class consciousness (Q sort 7).

What the factors *mean*, however, depends upon their factor arrays. That is, when the 60 photographs are spread out as a theoretical Q sort representing factor A, what meaning is apparent?

#### **Factor A**

We can grasp what A meant to "me" as I looked over the photographs by first observing which distinguished A from the other factors. They were as shown in Table 2. It is important to remember that factors are essentially *implicit*, i.e., the Q sorter is unaware of them until confronted with them. Usually, however, the factors are recognized as the Q sorter's own -- something of oneself is realized.

---

\*And had become a naturalized citizen (*Ed.*).

TABLE 1

Conditions	Operant Factors			
	A	B	C	D
1. Impressions Now	x	-	-	-
2. Upbringing	x	-	-	-
3. Ideals	x	-	-	-
4. Personal Problems	-	-	x	-
5. Real Issues	-	(x)	-	-
6. Conversation	-	x	-	-
7. Class Consciousness	-	-	-	x
8. Self	x	x	-	-

(x=significant loading)

But what is immediately so understood is likely to be the overt, not the covert (implicit) meaning: the latter is a matter for inquiry, by way of the Q sorter's associations and probes into matters at issue.

Thus, in the above case, manifestly the factor deals with childbirth, a happy family, and the functions of elementary schoolteachers, as well as a studious youth -- all positive in valency.

It is anchored about a zero point of feeling -- neutral (9, 55) or ambivalent (33, 57) -- I am the only person who could grasp the zero position, because I feel pity for the infantryman on patrol (33), but also anger that society puts this upon him. Also, *re* school busing, I know that sociologists wrongly advised the government on the matter, yet I am fully cognizant of the need for racial social integration.

On the negative side, manifestly it shows resistance to marginal religion (11, 1), to the laying on of hands (21), to the KKK (32), hypnotism (59), and oppression of poor peoples (13), also to U.S. soldiers, fully armed on patrol.

It is a fact of my life that I was at 17 a pupil-teacher for one year before going to college, and that study was congenial

TABLE 2

photo	Factors				Meaning
	A	B	C	D	
18	4	-4	0	3	childbirth
30	5	-5	3	5	family at TV
7	5	2	3	-3	teacher (class)
47	5	3	3	-2	teacher (desk)
17	4	3	1	0	youth writing
9	0	2	2	4	Nixon voters
33	0	5	3	-5	soldier camouflaged
55	0	-2	-3	-2	Dracula
57	0	-1	-3	-1	school bus convoy
11	-5	1	2	2	evangelist praying
13	-5	4	2	-4	soldiers, captives
1	-4	1	2	2	evangelist, Bible
21	-4	-2	1	1	woman supplicant
32	-4	2	0	3	KKK
59	-4	-2	1	2	hypnotist
3	-3	5	3	-5	soldiers on patrol

for me (photo 17 of the youth studying captures the mood well). It is also a fact of my life that I have fought shy of marginal quacks, since an early age, and identify with underprivileged people (I was a member of the Independent Labor Party Student movement in my early College days -- photo 13 hurts).

Overtly, then, I can accept factor A as very much in touch with my *upbringing*, and clearly part of my self, manifestly so. Teaching was my first youthful interest, and *education* my life-long avocation; my upbringing has deep roots in anti-evangelicalism, anti-humbug, anti-oppression.



All such is overt.

The problem is, what is covert?

First, as to *feeling*: running through the factor is a feeling of youthfulness and new-birth on one side (+), and ignorance on the other (-). Which touches at once feelings of compassion, of devotion to family, of a serious mein -- all extremely strong feelings for me -- as opposed to ignorance (marginal religions, bigotry, KKK, oppression, soldiers who fight without real knowledge of why, etc.). Birth is symbolical of nature at work *naturally*: learning has the same purpose. Thus, there could scarcely be a better example of a common basis of feeling, of compassion (with knowledge) and its opposite, oppression (and ignorance).

This is in the direction of implicitness: certainly I was unaware of any such feeling during the Q sortings. Then I go further by association: there is growing in me a return to my first love -- theory of education (e.g., *Quiddity College*). I was always doubtful that education as such could cure the world of its evils -- witness Hitler's Nazism for men educated highly by Western standards -- though Buchanan and Cantril (*How Nations See Each Other*, 1953) gave "more education" as the only advice they could to UNESCO, and most humanists have the same belief in the efficacy of education as a mitigation of ignorance. I now hold that *subjective science* holds the key to the world's sanity, and this is a science of common things (like childbirth, family life, helping children to unfold at common sense levels, with self involvement [the youth, card 17]) the key to all else. Nothing of this entered my thinking while the Q sorts were being performed.

There is no question, then, that I can relate easily to A at the manifest level, and accept it as my *self* in good part. Also as an *ideal* worth having. At the implicit level it bears upon some deeper feelings, of compassion for underprivileged persons and peoples, and of a profound feeling (irrational it may seem) that subjective science has to do something for the sanity of the world.

## Factor B

This concerns *Real Issues* (Q sort 5) and what I am prepared to enter into conversation about at any time with almost anyone (Q sort 6). Yet I do little if anything in practice about it. It concerns the *destructiveness* of war (+), as contrasted with the *healing qualities* of every day life (-).

TABLE 3

photo	Factors				Meaning
	A	B	C	D	
33	0	5	3	-5	black face soldier
13	-5	4	2	-4	Latin Amer, armed
23	-1	4	2	-3	tanks, armed men
53	-2	5	4	-5	wounded soldiers
12	-2	0	-5	0	youth in handcuffs
26	-3	0	-3	-4	gambling table
35	-1	0	-3	4	timpani player
39	2	0	4	0	old lady at desk
60	-2	0	-5	-1	garbage strike
28	-3	-5	4	-4	surgicenter
30	5	-5	3	5	family
18	4	-4	0	3	childbirth
34	1	-4	-1	0	men at auto engine
58	-2	-4	0	2	women with hypo

The photographs distinguishing B most from the other factors were as shown in Table 3. It is well-centered at zero: in relation to the positive and negative feelings, the zero posits are neutral: gambling, timpani-playing, garbage collector's strike, police action on a petty felony, and the composed old

lady at her writing desk -- none involves either war, or peaceful healing!

The positive side is entirely of soldiers in action, wounded, suffering, elated at success, on deadly patrol, etc.

The negative side is somehow amazingly on the opposite side, of curative pursuit -- surgicenter, childbirth, putting a car's engine right, infecting oneself for an illness, etc.

All of which I am freely willing to talk about to anyone, and they are "Real Issues," along a line of armed force (+ve) to constructive help (-ve).

Such is manifest. But what does it mean? I am not self-involved -- but my associations are immediate. The factor is not about *war* (destruction) versus *peace* (constructive), but about social wellbeing. In the present state of the world armed forces are a necessary evil; social concern for the sick, for health, should be a sufficient good for anyone. The implicitness is surely related to this, that I believe in armies as safeguards of public order, and in socialized medicine as a human right. I rarely mention that I was a Brigadier in the British Army in World War II, and have no medals and few relics of the experience. I have not disguised my preference for medicine as a human right; but again I am not identified with this (in the manner, for example, that Barry Commoner is identified with a new political party to weaken the power of conglomerate corporations).

Thus, the factor is *mine*, not *me*. But no one could have understood it without my associations with it. The factor is at first sight something of a puzzle, though logically one could have said war versus peace; the logic was untenable, however, because I feel that the danger to the world is the atom bomb, for which scientists, not armies, are to blame.

### *Factor C*

Factor C is defined by the Q sort for "Personal Problems," with loading also on "Real Issues." It is essentially my Q sort 4, since it alone was used as the estimate of the factor.

TABLE 4

photo	Factors				Meaning
	A	B	C	D	
20	1	3	5	1	communication ctr
36	0	0	5	-1	ultraviolet bather
50	3	4	5	1	telescope
28	-3	-5	4	-4	surgicenter
39	2	0	4	0	old lady at desk
8	2	2	0	3	nurses graduation
18	4	-4	0	3	childbirth
25	3	-3	0	1	art class (nude)
27	2	-1	0	-2	children, school
32	-4	2	0	3	KKK
40	2	3	0	1	judge, TV, books
49	3	-2	0	5	dressmaker (sales)
12	-2	0	-5	0	in police custody
60	-2	0	-5	-1	trash strikers
19	-2	-1	-4	-1	antinuke protester
22	-2	-1	-4	-1	protestors, police
54	-1	-1	-4	-3	toxic waste dump
57	0	-1	-3	-1	busing, police

Manifestly, as shown in Table 4, I have some concern about a communication center (20); cancer of the skin is a threat to anyone with my very fair complexion (36); surgery for hernia and prostrate remains a scar (28); I am aging, at a writing desk (39); and my concern with science (50) is replete with a problem -- in particular of the harm of nuclear bombs. All these are current, "personal problems." Yet I do not attribute my *self* to them -- they are *mine*, not *me* apparently. However all have positive significance, as though optimism is invoked.

At the other extreme there are problems, though I cannot call them me: all concern troubles in the social structure -- of crime (12), economic disputes (60), anti-nuclear protests (19, 22), toxic waste (54), and racial strife (busing under police guard, 57).

The neutral position (zero scores) seem a strange admixture, of joy at graduation (8), art (25), going to school (27), a lady buying a jacket (49), childbirth (18), KKK (32), and a judge (40).

None of these is a problem for me, of course, and a zero score is appropriate. Actually, manifestly, none of anything on the factor is a *felt* problem -- all are real enough -- but none gives me a sleepless moment. Even the "communication center" (20) is a *fait accompli*. And if I am aging, so what? Yet everything is in place manifestly: the positive end of the factor is optimistically problematic, the negative end an awareness of more pessimistic problematics. All could be *mine*: but *me* is absent from any real involvement in them.

What, then, is implicit?

The feeling I get is that something technological is giving me concern, running down the factors as in some sense *unease*. The communication complexities, the telescope, the ultraviolet light, the surgicenter, the gerontology (39) are technical matters, of physics and biology; the crime, social disputes, racial strife are social science problems. Even the zero elements have technological significance -- nurses graduating, childbirth, the judge (with Canon 35 in mind, of TV cameras in courts).

What the factor means, it seems, is a lurking uneasiness about technological progress, across the board, from astronomy to social science.

### Factor D

This is defined by "Class Consciousness." What, manifestly, could I be class conscious about? Again as *mine*, but not *me*. The discriminating photographs are shown in Table 5.

Manifestly, my background is working-class (14); my brothers and sisters are the primary family, and come to mind

TABLE 5

photo	Factors				Meaning
	A	B	C	D	
14	1	-3	-2	5	coal miners
30	5	-5	3	5	family
49	3	-2	0	5	lady buying jacket
9	0	2	2	4	Minn voting
16*	-5	-5	-5	4	male stripper
35	-1	0	-3	4	timpani playing
45	1	-3	-2	4	Beatles
5	2	-2	-2	0	art gallery
12	2	0	-5	0	handcuffed man
17	4	3	1	0	boy writing
31	-2	-3	-3	0	keep Pope out US
3	-3	5	3	-5	soldiers on patrol
33	0	5	3	-5	black face soldier
53	-2	5	4	-5	wounded soldiers
26	-3	0	-3	-4	gamblers
38	-1	-3	1	-4	surgicenter (pain)
46	3	2	1	-3	man fishing

(30); we put on a will-appointed demeanor (49); there is music in the primary family (my brother is a clever pianist and organist, my mother's family all musical) (35, 45); I vote democratic (9) which I associate with Minnesota as in advance of most of the other states of the U.S. The male stripper reminds me of the rough good-humor of my background. These thoughts were possibly conscious during the Q sorting: their roots are in self consciousness.

At the other extreme we frowned, we Stephensons, on soldiering (3, 33, 53), gambling (26), taking it easy (fishing, 46),

illness and pain (38). There is no doubt a class conscious pity for the millions of young men killed in the two World Wars of my lifetime: the armed forces were never gloried in my family (not one of my uncles served in either War). All such, with hesitancy in religious matters (we were not a religious family, the Stephensons), is redolent no doubt of 19th century plebianship and antipathy to all established privileges in England.

Thus, I could acknowledge the above connections with what one might have been class conscious about. But none of the above fazes me: I respect the connections, and only wonder why something of this didn't appear in my Q sort on "Up-bringing." The class consciousness possibilities relate, it seems, to my parents and grandparents. I respect what they meant to me: mother was copper-headed, handsome; father something of a spelling and arithmetic wizard -- he could spell every word in *Webster's Dictionary*, and did phenomenal arithmetical calculations "in his head." I was eldest son and grandson, and moved freely into father's and mother's families. My speech was Northern, but cultured: it came naturally, and remains unchanged even now.

All of which suggests a certain indifference, even disdain, for class: I was as good as anyone else, so to say. Yet it apparently is not *me*, only *mine*.

But what is implicit?

The overall feeling is of a defensive indifference: but it hides a deep implicitness. Anyone who knows how I live, the style I affect, the manner and demeanor of my ways, will recognize, surely, that I am being *English* -- my bow tie; my walking stick; my children educated at Bennington, Chicago, Yale; my large house in 10 wooded acres; my artist wife; my books, study, love of trees ... all affect a distinctly English style. I am pleased when supermarket attendants ask, am I English? The class I affect is Northumbrian, however -- like the Percy's of Shakespeare's *Richard II* -- as independent and self assured. Yet this is not *me*, only *mine*. I am really little aware of this affectation, and make no conscious use of it. But

it now seems clearly to be a defensive mechanism, response to much of what is embraced by the above factor.

### Discussion

That *self* is a most complex system of reflection upon oneself is the main theme of my theory of self. Self is recognized only in retrospection, in looking back upon events in which you participated. As I look back a thousand selves can be conjured up, each with its own attachments, sympathies, and "little constitutions and rights of their own," described eloquently by Virginia Woolf in *Orlando* (1928), to which I indeed made distinct reference in my 1954 *Psychoanalysis and Q-methodology*: the last pages of *Orlando* are literary alchemy, I have said, and psychological gold.

The immediate question, however, is Lasch's thesis, that Americans live for themselves, not for their history or future; they are narcissistic, with illusions of personal wellbeing. Everyone seeks professional status -- no one is an amateur anymore. How, then, do I fare with the above factors A, B, C, D?

My self, as of October 11th, 1980, bore witness to a return to my first love, of theory of education, made concrete by a volume of more than 20 chapters, called *Quiddity College*. This indeed was much on my mind, as I await publication of intimations of it, in a paper to appear in *American Psychologist*, entitled "Newton's Fifth Rule and Q Methodology: Application to Educational Psychology" (1980), and factor A has its roots firmly in this "attachment," with its own rights. It surely escapes Lasch's structure, since its concern is with *everyone*, with education in subjective matters most broadly conceived. Only if I am deluded, with delusions of grandeur, could there be any suggestion that in this I am living only for myself!

The other factors B, C, D, on the same October day, were admittedly *mine*, but not *me*. Factor B has many "attachments" to my past, of army service (to offset Nazi horrors), of compassion for the sick (my grandfather wanted me to be a physician, and I escaped this only by winning a fellowship to



study science instead). Factor C is as deeply rooted, ending in unease about technological advances, without due regard for subjective science. Both B and C, in other circumstances, on another day, could become central to myself, for both have mattered. At present, however, they are silent.

Factor D is very personal, and theoretically could be an opening into narcissism. I affect an Englishman's "attachments," defensively, covering up in part some elements of self consciousness for my upbringing. But I do not deny any of these "attachments," outside the scope of these notes, because indeed I have spent much of my life in rebellion, *against* prevalent psychologies, *against* current scientific methodologies in the social sciences, *against* the vast dominion of objective science over us. In the final analysis I may ask how far this is attributable to narcissism, to illusions of personal grandeur: and elsewhere (Stephenson, 1980) I answer that, yes, my *self* was a dominant force in the long process of success and failure in academia. It was not the social, academic conditions that set me off, at 16 years of age, to sound a call for compassion: it was *me*. But note the purpose, compassion. So, surely, Lasch's narcissism has no part in *me*.

### *Addendum (1989)*

It is nearly 10 years since I was engaged with Irvin Goldman's dissertation, and upon returning to it, the occasion could not be missed to beg that it mustn't become lost in a dusty library. It is a magnificent piece of work. When one thinks of the enormous intellectual effort involved in the hundreds of scholarly works he reviewed, by the most eminent sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, anthropologists, etc. of the 1940-1980 decades, from Marx to Freud, Karl Popper to Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Charles Peirce to Eric Fromm, and a hundred more, all about our culture, without a single check upon it that would at least lend caution to speculation -- one must demand an Irvin Goldman's salutary probing.

He could conclude that his study supports Lasch's thesis that American culture is narcissistic. My own self image, in

the same operational framework, complements this by demonstrating that the framework lends itself to descriptions the opposite of those Goldman found for his subjects. This is not to put English urbanity as a model of any kind.

Each of Goldman's subjects was unique. But all were clearly indicative of a decline in *public*, autonomous, culture in America, and its replacement by self absorption. All were described as wanting *personal* gain; objective feelings never materialized into collective (public) action; public and private matters are confused; there is exaggerated self worth; or else there is emotional isolation, self loss, alienation. The "new rich" bank manager, up from the ranks, identifies with the professional corporate class, a one-dimensional man.

In my case, all was for the *public* domain and its good; it has never sought personal gain; public and personal matters are totally distinct; there is merely self worth commensurate with autonomy; far from self loss, there is self gain in pleasurable multidimensionality. My gain, if personal, is for public regard -- all my papers have been requested by the Ellis Library and Western Historical Manuscript Collection Society's space at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The final chapter of Goldman's dissertation brings into focus other works related to his own. There is Ben Burstein's "The Narcissistic Course" (1977). Also Edwin Shur's *The Awareness Trap: Self-Absorption Instead of Social Change* (1976), and Hyman Spotnitz's "Narcissus as Myth, Narcissus as Patient" (1977). All remains speculative, the subject matter calling for experiments such as Goldman proposed, centered about self as image, operationally defined as in Q-methodology, and not merely a categorical attribution. Goldman, no less myself, have to contend that Q's communication theory and its Q-methodology, now with quantum theory roots, offers a powerful framework for the study of subjectivity, for all matters of *feeling* and *self reference*, and that reaches into the common stock of culture, its common communicabilities.

## References

- Buchanan, W. & H. Cantril (1953) *How nations see each other*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Burstein, B. (1977) The narcissistic course. In M.C. Nelson (Ed.), *The narcissistic condition: A fact of our lives and times* (pp. 100-126). New York: Human Sciences.
- Freud, S. (1950) *Totem and taboo*. (J. Strachey, Trans.). New York: W.W. Norton.
- Goldman, I. (1985) *Communication and culture: A Q-methodological study of psycho-social meanings from photographs in Time magazine*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1984.) *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 45, 2683A.
- Lasch, C. (1978) *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Marcuse, H. (1966) *Eros and civilization: A philosophical inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1969) *One dimensional man: Studies in the ideologies of advanced industrial society*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Matson, F. (1966) *The broken image: Man, science and society*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shotter, J. (1973) Prolegomena to an understanding of play. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 3, 47-89.
- Shur, E. (1976) *The awareness trap: Self-absorption instead of social change*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Spotnitz, H. (1977) Narcissus as myth, Narcissus as patient. In M.C. Nelson (Ed.), *The narcissistic condition: A fact of our lives and times* (pp. 85-99). New York: Human Sciences.
- Stephenson, W. (1953) *The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stephenson, W. (1954) *Psychoanalysis and Q-methodology*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Stephenson, W. (1964) The ludenic theory of newsreading. *Journalism Quarterly*, 41, 367-374.
- Stephenson, W. (1967) *The play theory of mass communication*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stephenson, W. (1980) Newton's Fifth Rule and Q methodology: Application to educational psychology. *American Psychologist*, 35, 882-889.
- Stephenson, W. (1983) *Quiddity College: Thomas Jefferson's legacy for moral science*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Woolf, V. (1928) *Orlando*. New York: Penguin.