

NEWS, NOTES & COMMENT

In his most recent paper, "The Shame of Science," William Stephenson accuses science of a dogmatic attitude toward subjectivity which has served to divide the world into the 'real world of science,' based on reductionism, and the 'world of life' which science has been unable to explain. Technology has increased productivity, but has not guaranteed equity--hence, medical-delivery systems have been improved, but for normative reasons have not been extended equally to alcoholic and socially well-motivated alike. How could we assure 'loving care' on a universal basis in 'the fleeting relationship of the emergency ward' or any place else where 'the world of life' is lived? Stephenson notes that loving care is a subjective feeling, as when a nurse or aide said 'I *like* fetching a glass of water for a patient,' 'I *enjoy* exercising a patient,' 'I get *concerned* when a patient coughs,' and so forth, all capable of treatment along Q-technique lines. When examined more abstractly, this gives rise to a theory of knowledge subject to the following preconditions: That subjective measurements can only be made by the person himself, that feeling is at the origin of subjectivity, and that consciousness is merely communicability. On the level of the single case, examined under multiple conditions of performance, operant factors emerge indicating which aspects of the self are given over to the caring relationship; at the level of several Q sorts, each representing a theoretical position vis-a-vis patient care, factors represent hypotheses superordinate to the Q sorts composing them, providing a formalized methodology for Polanyi's 'power of mind' and a solution to Newton's Fifth Rule. This theory of knowledge does not reject positivism, but goes further by incorporating the subjectivity which objective science has shamefully ignored but which is intrinsic to science itself. "The Shame of Science" is scheduled to appear soon in *Ethics in Science and Medicine* (former-

ly *Science, Medicine, and Man*), probably in the August 1977 issue (Vol. 4, No. 3).

Persons familiar with the influences on William Stephenson's intellectual development will be pleased to learn of the republication of James Ward's *Psychological Principles* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1920). The book, published in 1977, is Vol. VIII of "Series A: Orientations" of the multi-volume set, *Significant Contributions to the History of Psychology, 1750-1920*, and can be obtained separately (at \$25) from the publisher: University Publications of America, Inc., 5630 Connecticut Ave., Washington, DC 20015. Also bound in the same volume is Ward's "Psychology," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (9th ed., 1886), pp. 37-85, the publication of which Stephenson once referred to as the beginning of modern psychology.

Limited number of reprints still available, free while supply lasts: "Bibliography on Q technique and its methodology," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1968, 26, 587-613; contains almost 600 references up to time of publication, as continued in "Q Bibliographic Update." Contact S.R. Brown, Political Science Department, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242.

Social scientists utilizing Q technique will be interested in a recent paper by Ronald Brunner (*American Journal of Political Science*, August 1977) which focuses on the implications of the covering law (Hempel) and intentional (von Wright) approaches to behavioral theory, illustrated in terms of extensive (aggregate) and intensive (single case) studies of public opinion. A Q-technique study is used to illustrate the intentional-intensive standpoint.