

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

rent-control days). He called the occasion the most memorable event of his Chicago life.

Then there is another recollection. In England I knew Susan Isaac and her work, and must have talked to Larry about it: she was critical of Piaget's approach to cognitive development in children. But Piaget had already published his *The Moral Development of the Child* (1932), and well-read Larry knew this. He asked me how Q technique could be applied to children as young as 2-3 years of age. I remember drawing on some small cards in answer--a soldier, a fireman, a policeman, a burglar, a father, mother, child--and saying that with 8 of these cards, and the use of statistic *tau*, one could proceed merrily with the question of a child's feelings about moral problems.

There the recollection ends. From 1956 we never met again, and never corresponded except by Christmas card. In 1963 his Q study appeared, the first in the literary field, on "Psychological Analysis and Literary Form: A Study of Doubles in Dostoevsky." In 1972 he wrote his eloquent "Chicago, 1948-56," to honor my Chicago days. He clearly had not lost touch with Q, and it is with deep humility that I learn from his associate in research, Ann Higgins, that he read *Operant Subjectivity*. Yet, from the 1960s, he proceeded in a different methodological direction.

What had happened? In "Chicago, 1948-56" he reported on turmoil in and around psychology at the University. There was Carl Rogers and his Counseling Center Group, bent upon humanistic phenomenology. There was psychoanalysis, still in its hey-day, with Lasswell's *World Politics and Personal Insecurity* (1935) and a thriving Chicago Institute. There was Professor Thurstone's vigorous factor-analytic department, his *Psychometrika* already flourishing, from 1936. The background was functionalism. Carl was denying validity to psychoanalysis, and was already fixed in the humanistic belief that mathematics and factor statistics were not to be trusted. My appointment as Visiting Professor in 1948, and my peripatetic teaching there until 1956, was seen by Larry as a "natural fit" with the situation--Q could bring a solvent for the turmoil. Many

graduates, and members of Carl Rogers' staff, used Q in dissertations or research.

None, however, adopted Q for a life's work, including Larry, who probably knew more than others in what its promise consisted. I say this with good reason. He had either lent me (never to get it back) or had given to me (I hope I had bought it from him) his copy of a book I treasure--Justus Buchler's *Charles Peirce's Empiricism* (1939). Under Larry's signature of possession inside the cover page there are two page numbers, also in Larry's handwriting, telling me where to open to *abduction*. Larry's memorable event was his marriage. Mine remains as his mention to me of Peirce's philosophy, about which I was completely ignorant. Nowhere in Spearman, Kantor, Stout, Burt, Ward, or Eddington will you find a reference to either Peirce or abduction. The first pragmatist has entered all my thinking since Chicago days. One may understand why Larry mattered so much to me.

The Buchler book is heavily annotated by me. How much Larry and I discussed Peirce I do not recall. But he sensed that my attacks on the hypothetico-deductive methodology, then (and still) gospel in scientific circles, had support in Peirce's empiricism. There is no mention of abduction in my "Postulates of Behaviorism" (1953) written before *The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology* (1953), and only passing reference to abduction in the latter, where it was equated with "general theoretic propositions" (p. 247). The example I gave in a footnote was Carl Rogers' proposition that "most of the ways of behaving which are adopted by the organism are those which are consistent with the concept of self": this is truly abductory. It is not a proposition to be proved as fact, but a hunch that along that line, important phenomena are possible. This, I have to believe, Larry didn't understand. His life's work on stages of moral reasoning looked concretely for such stages, one more moral than another. A moral imperative lurked behind his quest. "Caring women" in stage three of his system (Good Boy/Nice Girl) appeared less moral than "steadfast businessmen" of stage four (System-Maintaining), higher in the moral order. In short, his stages of moral reasoning were ready-made for controversy.

Critics felt that his theory was merely an attempt at scientific justification for his libertarian values: to which Larry could reply that his approach was more than merely developmental--he was himself "indoc-trinative." Even so, reason was put where self reference (as Carl Rogers had guessed) was critical.

On January 18 I was writing about Larry's place in my life, the day before he walked into the shallow marshes of tidal waters, and his copy of *Charles Peirce's Empiricism* was on my desk beside me. Next day, in a newspaper column, I read "Professor Missing": it was Larry. There was nothing untoward about the coincidence, because the chances were very high that Larry's copy of *Charles Peirce's Empiricism* would be near at hand in my study.

What has to be understood, however, is his silence, except for the eloquent tribute to me and my family in his 1972 contribution to *Science, Psychology, and Communication*. Of his long illness and its pain I have no knowledge: he suffered for many years, and one hopes that Binswanger's *Case of Ellen West* wasn't Larry's fateful inevitability too. It is kind to learn that he remained interested in Q and read *Operant Subjectivity*. But he had left Q behind, to gather fame and obloquy for humanistic causes. My sense tells me that no other option was open for him--or for any of Kohlberg's peers devoted to humanism. For this, history will lay much blame on a factor-analytic community, headed by Thurstone: for 50 years, from 1936 (when I introduced Q in the first volume of *Psychometrika*, Thurstone's proud journal), a purely scholastic factor-analytic theory has dominated an important part of American psychology. Factorist Stanley A. Mulaik, in his review of *Psychometrika's* 50 years, now has to admit that "many of the younger Thurstonians came not to appreciate fully the earlier concerns and contributions of the British factor analysts" (Mulaik, 1986: 23). My paper of 1936 is now admitted as important--the only reference to Q in 50 years, except for another paper by Burt and myself in 1939, again introducing Q. Had there been wisdom and honest ability, Kohlberg and Carl Rogers of Chicago, alert to humanist needs, could and should have had the support that I alone tried to give them.

As a measure of the harm done by Thurstonian ideology I may mention only two relevant to Larry (as to Carl Rogers as well). First, both were on the "right lines" psychologically, both founded upon a quantum-theoretical phenomenology that is the subject of the fifth of my articles on "William James, Niels Bohr, and Complementarity: V. Phenomenology as Deeper Subjectivity" (1987). With support of the kind to which British factor analysts were beckoning, a very significant part of American psychology could have been 50 years ahead--where, now, it doesn't have credibility.

Second, those who are familiar with Larry's work will recognize a problem he set when assessing an individual for a stage of moral reasoning:

There is a rare drug that might cure Heinz's dying wife; a profiteering druggist wants an exorbitant price for it that Heinz cannot provide; was Heinz justified in stealing it?

There is no right answer in Larry's system. In a real-life situation of the kind there is a correct answer, by way of Q. Such is the measure of what had to be achieved--and it requires quantum theory to provide the answer.

It is with profound sadness that we say goodbye to Larry, as we give Lucille, Ann Higgins, his sons Stephen and David, our sympathies. I hope none will mind my placing him in a history book as an urgent, exceptional spirit. He ran guns to Palestine for freedom against the British. He ran psychology for what it was worth against social inequities in schools and prisons. But he walked slowly into the tidal marshes, of this I feel sure.

William Stephenson
April, 1987