CARL RANSOM ROGERS
(January 8, 1902-February 4, 1987)

Carl stands tall in humanistic psychology and in fostering a functional approach to counseling and psychotherapy.

In the years 1948-56, when I knew Carl well, the University of Chicago was proudly one of the three really great universities in the world. So others agree. And psychology there had the same significance. The legacy of Dewey, Mead, Angell and Carr called for functionalism. Angell's Department of Psychology had been the leading center of research and training in functional psychology: his graduates in 1910 included J.R. Kantor of interbehavioral fame, and L.L. Thurstone of *Psychometrika* and factor analysis. In this context, Carl Rogers' Counseling Center Group, with devoted staff and graduates, found a place for humanism. Psychoanalysis was still strongly in vogue, with Lasswell's *World Politics and Personal Insecurity* (1935). Here, indeed, we find Carl, resistive to psychoanalysis and Thurstonian factor theory alike, holding a place with wide recognition as functional and humanistic. And there came Q methodology in 1948, offering to add scientific substance to it all. The graduates, and a few of Carl's staff, found some such a possibility--as Kohlberg's acute "Chicago, 1948-56" (in Brown and Brenner's *Science, Psychology, and Communication*, 1972) indicates--but none held on to it. None accepted Q methodology, and Thurstone, of course, ridiculed it.

When I first met Carl, in 1948, I was alarmed: he didn't want to know what history (or anyone else) had to say about *self*, believing it was necessary "to keep an open mind." In the article he contributed to the essays honoring me in Brown and Brenner's volume, he paid tribute to Q technique: members of his staff were using it, but, as he carefully explained, by way of "Q-sorts of self, ideal self, remembered self, even the diagnostician's perception of the client's self," but not the "total concept of

Q-technique, with its base in factor analysis" (p. 312).

These of course are purely categorical matters. It was beyond him to take the essential step toward a science, by correlating the Q sorts and subjecting them to factor theory. Yet precisely this was what was required to answer the phenomenological questions, to give humanistic psychology a firm base, about which Carl was to spend the rest of his life unsuccessfully.

He himself provides the saddest note of all of this. It was at a meeting of the Association for Humanistic Psychology (San Francisco, 1985). The Association had launched its journal of humanistic psychology 25 years earlier, with the support of Rogers, Abraham Maslow, Gardner Murphy, Charlotte Buhler and other luminaries in humanistic thought, and was celebrating the event. The conference pointed to advances in its direction--of the present-day wide advances of the individual's "self-realization, values, choice and responsibility" in a society qualified by an "adjusted family, cultural and work environments." Psychoanalysis, against which Carl had raised his voice, was no longer dominant in psychotherapy. Tolerance was now widespread for the public discussion of rape, sex, homosexuality.

Carl was keynote speaker at the conference. He spoke, however, not of successes, but of failure. Humanistic psychology had made no inroads in graduate education and research. Textbooks still ignored it: they still teach sensation, perception, motivation. There is no official recognition for graduate programs in humanistic psychology: none was APA accredited. "We are perceived as having relatively little importance." Too much attention has been given to clinical and counseling service, too little to research.

Carl blamed the century-old straightjacket of logical positivism, but noted a change in the air: new views on scientific philosophy and methods were now acceptable--and he mentioned them such as Reason and Rowan's *Human Inquiry*, Polkinghorne's *Methodology for Human Sciences*, Bliss and Monk's *Qualitative Data Analysis for Educational Researchers*, and Bleicher's *Contemporary Hermeneutics*. The themes in these volumes, Carl indicated, are ideas "that

imperfections must be accepted" (precision can be a vice and vagueness a virtue), and that "there is no longer an illusion that we can obtain certain knowledge." The conflict about methodology, Carl concluded, is over: the Newtonian, mechanistic, reductionist, linear cause-effect behavior standpoint is now merely conventional, "and no longer reigns supreme." Instead there are multiple approaches and many new methodologies: and he described experiments recently completed in humanistic psychology. One used a "phenomenological approach with statistics"; another student interviewed graduates in physics and psychology about their most meaningful intellectual experiences, and found 58 "factors"--such as "increased self-awareness," "face-to-face contact," etc. The physics students were looking for "underlying simplicity," "playfulness," "aesthetically pleasing" experience. The students in psychology made no mention of such "factors."

It makes sad reading. Nearly 40 years earlier my teaching at Chicago had been to welcome Einsteinian scientific philosophy, which in no way accepted imperfections and vagueness as virtues, and kept precision precisely in proper perspective. The naive use of the word "factors" shows Carl oblivious of the Chicago days.

In his address he made reference to Jean Piaget, to the predicament he would have been in if he had to propose, today, a research project to a university faculty: "I propose to observe my two daughters, deeply and carefully over a period of several years" and hope, thereby, to "gain an understanding of the inner workings of a child's mind, its thought process." The audience at San Francisco roared as Carl described the faculty response: "You have no theory, no hypotheses to test, no research design, no control group, you have an N of two only. Your so-called research is totally unacceptable."

If Carl had been describing Q methodology, for an *N* of one only, the language could scarcely have been more acceptable! Yet precisely this is what the humanistic psychologists, and Carl, were deriding! As Thurstone had done 40 years earlier.

And how would humanist psychology go about matters? Carl repeated what he said to me 40 years ago--by an open-minded approach, well informed,

familiar with studies in the field, but information you hold in obeyance, so that you can make observations with minimal bias. He asks,

> Can you immerse yourself with your observations, and live with them until patterns begin to emerge? Can you do this without imposing your own prior ideas upon the patterns?[1]

A critic at the conference called it a building-block view of knowledge--"the more you know, the less you don't know."

Carl, even so, was representing the genuine phenomenological approach: *observation* is crucial. The patterns that emerge, however, are in Carl's mind and in those who follow the dogma of "deeper subjectivity," the term used by Roger Poole (1972) about it. But nothing acceptable, apparently, has emerged--nothing acceptable to the wider body of psychology and philosophy about such matters as "authenticity, creativity, personal growth, holistic healing, humanistic psychotherapy, confluent education, values, identity, and love"--all so enamored of AHP publications.

Yet all is grist to the mill of Q methodology. One has to say goodbye to Carl with deep sadness. He had been a friend when I needed it most in Chicago; many of his graduates were in some sense mine too. None, however, adopted Q methodology. I had forgotten until I looked at my files that Carl had invited me to a year's visiting professorship at the University of Wisconsin in 1959 where he was Professor in the Departments of Psychology and Psychiatry. I had just arrived in Missouri, and could not accept what could have been an interesting encounter. I doubt whether he knew that I had knowledge of phenomenology at its grassroots in experimental psychology, with David Katz who was with me at Oxford, and with Kurt Koffka to whom I was host at my college there for his sabbatical year in 1939. The roots of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology in quantum the-

---

1. Cited in Susan Cunningham, "Humanists Celebrate Gains, Goals," *APA Monitor*, May 1985, p. 16.

oretical thinking is the subject of my fifth paper in the series "William James, Niels Bohr and Complementarity: V. Phenomenology as Deeper Subjectivity." The patterns Carl looked for all his life are to be found in complementarity for every aspect of humanistic psychology. He was so near truth, and yet light-years away.

William Stephenson
April, 1987

LAWRENCE KOHLBERG
(October 25, 1927-January 17, 1987)

Larry, as we called him in Chicago days, left Mount Auburn Hospital in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on a "day pass" on January 17 in a depressed state. His body was found, washed from tidal waters on April 6. He is to be buried with Harvard honors in May. So he goes to rest, slowly, with much sorrow, much pity, much enfolding of long memory.

He was my research assistant in the Psychology Department at the University of Chicago, one of the ablest of the graduates during those years from 1948-56 when I was peripatetic Visiting Professor and lecturer there. His grasp of what was at issue then is shown brilliantly in the introduction he wrote for *Science, Psychology, and Communication* (Brown & Brenner, 1972): he is famous for his work on moral development, and for his humanistic efforts in education and social psychology.

But, for myself, personal feelings for him come first. He was married in our house in Chicago, the drawing room a temporary chapel, the arched-foyer and open stairway adding breadth to the illusion. The house was crowded. Bride Lucille's kindergarten children were upstairs, ready to descend at the ceremonial moment, each to give her a flower. He called the house "large, gracious, elegant...a little awesome to Chicago students" (it was rented, in