

## Operant Subjectivity

*The International Journal of Q Methodology*

### Ten Pillars of Q-Methodological Wisdom<sup>1</sup>

William Stephenson  
*University of Missouri*

## Introduction

These ten manuscripts are given to the Graduate Department of the School of Journalism so that staff and graduates may have access to them, as in a library.<sup>2</sup>

It may seem that I have placed a burden upon the staff of the Graduate Department to foster their publication — and indeed this is true, if any time and effort can be spared in that direction. All need editing, and it is not unusual for colleagues to share in this. As occasions arise I shall myself seek publication for one or another of the ten — F. for example, is being read by a secular theologian at present, and a copy will be sent to Professor Torrance of the Divinity Department, Edinburgh University, to see what it merits. I shall keep in touch with Dr. Patterson about such efforts on my own part.<sup>3</sup>

One way to ensure publication is to found one's own press: J. R. Kantor did this for his books on interbehaviorism when there was probably little to encourage publication on corporate or University lines. His *Principia Press* was, in principle, open to any interbehavioral work — though none seems to have surfaced except his own — with the understanding that any profits from one book went into the publication of the next one. Kantor's daughter still directs the Press from her home, I believe, in Chicago. Something of the kind might be worth looking at for our "Institutes" and the Research Center. Perhaps our market experts can help?

Along with other manuscripts and published papers, it is a fond hope that, in their wake, along with books, theses and dissertations attending them, scholars might

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was delivered as the first of two "keynote" presentations to the first Summer Institute for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity (effectively the first Q methodology conference) held at the School of Journalism, University of Missouri-Columbia, July 20, 1985. Apart from some formatting in the journal's house style and the correction of a few typos, the text remains unchanged. [Ed.]

<sup>2</sup> These 10 unpublished manuscripts, together with many other unpublished works, and copies of most of his published articles, correspondence, and research materials were donated by Stephenson to what was formally known as the Western Historical Manuscripts Collection of the University of Missouri-Columbia, Ellis Library. The Collection was subsequently relocated to the State Historical Society of Missouri, Research Center-Columbia, Columbia, Mo. An Inventory to the William Stephenson Papers (Accession CA4878), can be found at <http://files.shsmo.org/manuscripts/columbia/CA4878.pdf> [Ed.]

<sup>3</sup> Joye Patterson was one of Stephenson's most accomplished doctoral students, conducting pioneering research in the journalism school on science communication [Ed.]

continue developing a science for subjectivity. If the word “communication” is defined our way, replacing “consciousness,” the fundamental concern is with subjectivity per se, and this can have no better abode than in a School of Journalism, guardian not only of the Fourth Estate, but now also of the Fifth, which is Newton’s Fifth Rule.

### **The Ten Pillars**

For convenience they are listed as follows:

- A. Intimations of Self (c. 1950)
- B. Self as Operant Subjectivity (1984)
- C. The Play Theory of Newspaper Reading (1964)
- D. Computer pScience (1977)
- E. Two-Way Communication in Management (1970)
- F. Newton’s Fifth Rule: Pro Re Theologica, Pro Re Scientia (1974)  
(F-1- Short version: “Cookbook” (1974-75))
- F-2. Newton’s Fifth Rule: Vol. I: The Abduction of Sin (1985)
- G. Newton’s Fifth Rule: Vol. II: The Abduction of Common Science (1985)
- H. Quiddity College: Thomas Jefferson’s Legacy for Moral Science (1970-80)
- I. Q-methodology and the Romanesque Concourse (1983)
- J. pScience: Symposium Series for Editors Report (1973)
- K. Psychoanalysis and Q-methodology (1954).

How to make ten out to twelve presents a problem: A and K, however, are retained by me and are not ready for library use. I found the “cookbook” version of F the other day, and make it available. The best general introduction to Q, however, is perhaps Chapter I of *Q-methodology and the Romanesque Concourse* (I).

I attend to the ten, B-J, *seriatim* below.

#### **A. Intimations of Self (1950)**

The beginnings of my work in the U.S.A. were in this manuscript, as if I was getting close to solution of an age-long problem of *self*. It began when I was Walker-Ames Professor at the University of Washington, Seattle (1951), and at the University of Chicago where I was Visiting Professor of Psychology (1948-1950). It remains incomplete and is not made available for library use because I have a constant itch to expand upon it, as the most significant of my writings and studies.

At that time (early 1950s) I had written about Q in three separate books – one *Intimations of Self*, *The Study of Behavior*, and *Q-methodology and Psychoanalysis*.

If all could have been published, matters might have been further developed for a subjective science: only *The Study of Behavior* was published (1953), against Professor L. L. Thurstone’s objection that he “couldn’t understand a word of it.” Core ideas in the other two volumes remain unpublished.

It should be said that at Chicago, and Seattle, there were exceptional graduates. Jum Nunnally (1952), David Ricks (1956), Helen Erskine (1956), Father J.M. Fuller (1958), and Larry Kohlberg (1953) – also Fred Kerlinger of New York University (1958) – are all fondly remembered. Nunnally wrote a book on *Q-method: Procedures and Applications* (1954) which was never published. Kerlinger prepared a *Workbook* on Q-technique for his students. Copies of these works are included in the materials I make available for library use.

In the 1950-55 years I found allies in Carl Rogers and David Riesman at the University of Chicago, if not in Q-methodology (for neither accepted it) then in Q-technique. Several of their doctoral candidates used Q-methodology. Chapter 6 of *The Play Theory of Mass Communication* (1967) on “Social Character” represents Riesman’s theory precisely in Q-methodological terms. In 1961 Lipset and Lowenthal edited a lengthy set of essays under the title *Culture and Social Character: The Work of David Riesman*. I was sorry not to have been included as one of the essayists and recommend that the essays make good material for an exposé on how Q could have answered every outstanding question by the many well-wishers!

Thus, I seem to arouse initial interest: but it evaporates. Jum Nunnally had his reasons for this even as a graduate student – he wrote in 1952...

...Eventually everyone wants to see large scale experiments with fixed procedures. The sooner this can be undertaken the sooner the experimenter will arrive at his prized general findings.

and also “I want to avoid *selling* one method”.

Yet there *is* only one method if one is to pursue subjective science.

The feelings of Nunnally were expressed violently in the review of *The Study of Behavior* by Cronbach and Gleser (*Psychometrika*, December 1954), to which I was invited by the Editor to respond in a “Comment.” The trouble is that Q is highly complex. The reviewers said so, and I agreed. (At about the same time, in an Obituary note on Sir Godfrey Thomson, [*British Journal of Psychology*, November 1955], I mentioned that Thomson had made reference to “theory of groups used by physicists in quantum theory,” so that I was more aware than my critics of further complexities ahead!). Even so, the reviewers could not restrain from commendations upon the highly innovative nature of my ideas: their conclusion, however, was devastating: in italics, they wrote ...

It is imperative to discourage students of personality and social psychology from copying Stephenson’s designs as he presents them.

In my response I made it clear that the reviewers were presenting a wholly biased position — their arguments were with R premises, not Q. So firmly implanted is the need, amongst psychometrists for “constants,” “universals,” “generalizations,” “normatives,” for Nunnally’s “fixed procedures,” that they are totally unable to grapple with indeterminate situations, the primary lesson of relativity and interbehaviorism.

My “Comment” deserves re-printing. The Review by Cronbach and Gleser remains a good example of “crooked thinking” (Thouless).

Even so, the point is valid: Q is a complicated matter. Yet compared with Lewis F. Richardson’s *Arms and Insecurity: A Mathematical Study of the Causes and Origins of War* (1960), Q is almost child’s work. All along I have kept the mathematical and statistical matters in the background, the better, I felt, to encourage *use* of Q, even if the users knew little about either quantum mechanics or factor theory. We use complicated computer programs now with just such a limited knowledge of information science.

Implication? There should perhaps be a *Q-methodology for the Masses* — which would *not* be the same as a *Beginner’s Q methodology* in cookbook style. (Sir Dennis Foreman, Chairman of Granada TV in England, recommended the title *Q-methodology for the Masses*: perhaps someone can take the challenge. It could begin, perhaps, by making

reference to my essay on Robert Burns, a copy of which is attached, as the first Existentialist.)

### **B. *Self as Operant Subjectivity* (1984) (64 pages)**

This was written, not as a “cookbook” on Q, but to introduce Q. It is material I needed for a reply I began a year ago to Aldous Huxley’s *Literature and Science* (1963), which was an effort on his part to deal with the problem raised by C. P. Snow in his *The Two Cultures*: Huxley wanted *new* science writing, comparable to Walt Whitman’s *Passage to India*, to idealize science. Huxley is a persuasive writer: I wanted to reply to his many errors in a series of *Canticles* — songs, so to speak, or little hymns from a Prayer Book. Satirical, but still musical. This essay contains the *substance* I wanted to provide, in the place of Huxley’s dalliance with both science and literature. The opening Canticles are still on my desk, at the bottom of a pile of other incompletions! The *Canticles* would be the real pillar of wisdom.

### **C. *The Play Theory of Newspaper Reading* (1964).**

I consider journalism to be *first* of professions in any society where the purposes are civic responsibility: there is need to develop this more, along the lines of one of my favorite Scottish scholars, Adam Ferguson, whose *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767) is a masterpiece (Ed. Duncan Forbes, Edinburgh, 1966). My adoption of journalism stems from graduate student days in London (1926-29) when I supplemented my income by free-lancing on Fleet Street, on psychological topics (Justice McCardie’s Suicide! Your Dreams Analysed!, etc.), and especially a nightly “intelligence puzzle,” called *Psycho-Zigs*, that ran for several months, five days a week. My feeling remains, that young literary-minded persons, who read a lot, and can write interestingly, are treasure-troves for journalism. The J-School has my admiration, therefore, for retaining its B.J. degree, to catch precocity where it is — in the young.

I’m afraid that my *Play Theory of Newspaper Reading* will rarely be read by such youthful aspirants to the profession. It was meant for graduates, on the way to research in communication theory.

But something could be written for B.J. candidates, surely.

As for the manuscript, it introduces thinking, during the 1950-70s, about news. From Q’s standpoint introduces three important concepts — play-theory, communication as pleasure, and factuality. Self-theory lies behind each. Play-theory proposes that people read newspapers, at best, skillfully — and that a paper’s format should set the play’s *course*, much as a tennis court does for tennis. Reporting deals mainly with *events*, which are more complex than *facts*. The reporter has to get at the facts — so it is said — but these are written about as events, in story form. Still a classic, Helen Hughes’ *Human Interest Stories and Democracy* (1937) tells compellingly the difference between reporting facts and telling stories about them, i.e. making them compelling stories that engage us in feelings and introduce us to personal matters ordinarily not accepted as “news.” I feel, a bit, that I let the J-School down in not developing more interest in the direction taken by Helen Hughes. But to say that journalists are experts at story-telling would have had a rough road to travel!

Then there is communication-pleasure, a concept taken from Szasz, to which I added communication-pain. This is of fundamental significance in self-theory.

For Rock and Roll music, perhaps all is communication-pleasure (witness the recent July 13, *Live Aid TV* program at Wembley in England, and Philadelphia in the U.S.A.). But is the current violence of television conducive to communication pleasure, or

communication-pain? I suspect the latter! Someone in the Graduate department should be researching the possibility — the model is my study of play-theory in advertising (Stephenson, 1979, *Homo Ludens: The Play Theory of Advertising*, *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche Commerciali* 26(7), 630-653).

In “The Magic of the Mass Media” (unpublished manuscript, September 30, 1971) I answer S. Bhattacharya of India (in *Viduri* 7[4], 1970) who argues that communication-pleasure may apply to people who can afford to buy newspapers in Bombay, London, or New York, but not to the poor in newly-developing nations, who need *information, instruction*, i.e. to *educate*, not to *entertain*. I reply that in revolutions it is song, story, myth, that carries the battle along, as for José Martí in Cuba, and Sir R. Tagore in India.

As for *factuality*, this, like story-telling, is a difficult concept to introduce to J-students. Facts in science, or events, are one thing; factualities in events are another. Both are equal in the conviction as to *truth* they command. Thus, that an accident happened at 10:00 a.m. may (or may not) be a fact; but that it was “God’s Will” is a factuality, i.e. believed in as firmly as a *fact*, as indubitable, true, by religious people. Our ideologies are mainly factualities, believed in as *truth*.

Apart from such involvements, *The Play Theory of Newspaper Reading* (and an article on *Ludenic* theory of newsreading) is still worth a reading by research graduates.

The manuscript owes much to some early graduates and still firm friends of Q – notably...

Doug H. Sunoo. *An Analysis of the Editorial Treatment Given News of Sputnik I and Explorer I by Six Selected Foreign Newspapers* (M.A. Thesis, 1959).

Tom Danbury. *A Comparative Study of Newspaper Readers* (M.A. Thesis, 1961).

Rose Ross. *Comparison of Reward and Value Theories in Newsreading Behavior* (M.A. Thesis, 1962).

Anna Cornetta. *A Study of Ego-involvement in Newsreading* (M.A. Thesis, 1962).

Wilma Crumley. *Newsreading Behavior and Anxiety* (M.A. Thesis, 1963).

Rose Ross’s thesis was especially important because it showed that newspaper reader types (M, N, P) didn’t differentiate in terms of *values* (in religion, economics, art, social, intellectual), but did so in relation to communication-pleasure. (One of our critics, Professor Nordenstreng of Finland should one day realize that Q’s concepts stem from just such research).

#### **D. Computer pScience (1977)**

The “p” is silent, as in psyche.

I thought it might be attention-getting, and first used it in pamphlets for the Regional Medical Program.

This manuscript of 1977 (?) was a response to Abbe Mowshowitz’s *The Conquest of Will: Information Processing in Human Affairs* (1976), in which he argued that modern societies are now at the mercy of (selfless) computers: mankind is about to lose its will — we are all victims of the computer, Mowshowitz says — homes, factories, businesses, banks, the military, space, etc. And there can be no denying that a computer age is upon us.

For myself, the computer has been a god-send: my “Rosetta” program for centroid factor analysis dates from 1958, and has been in use ever since, for hundreds of analyses.

But I am also sure that the computer can be used for trivial calculations and learning experiences, wasteful of dollars and innovation. Even so, is the “computer explosion” about to destroy our “will”?

I set about testing the proposition, essentially as a learning experience for students interested in Q in my information theory course.

Mowshowitz’s book is full of self-referential statements, and this manuscript shows what it is to cull concourses from the book’s chapters. It then takes a concourse, and applies Newton’s Fifth Rule to it, showing that far from Americans losing *will*, they are characterized by *achievement* and *sovereignty*.

The former (achievement) has been attested before, for example in McClelland’s work (*The Achieving Society*, 1961). The factor of *sovereignty* appeared in my response to S. M. Lipset’s study of four nations in the *American Sociological Review* (1963), called “The Value Patterns of Democracy” (1970). The latter paper is of considerable interest, and a copy is given among my unpublished papers. We find attestations toward sovereignty in the wide use of Royal suffixes in the U.S.A. (Tom Smith II), the adoration of “Queens,” the Senate’s refusal to forego sovereignty by signing international agreements on some 30 matters already signed by all other nations in the world.

The volume offers a good introduction to Q.

### **E. *Two-Way Communication in Management* (1970)**

This is a study undertaken for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company of St. Louis, and the copyright is probably theirs. But there can be no limit to its library use.

Many J-graduates go into *public relations* as a career, and I have published in that field (“Evaluation of public relations programs,” *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciale*, 1969, 16, 166-184). Manuscript E is an exercise of the PR art at work in a factory and business situation. My interest was stimulated by a letter from Lord Brown in the *London Times* (August, 1970), which asked, why, in business, is everyone so “bloody-minded” (Brown’s words)? He objected to the assumption that everyone is subject to boredom, or that the spread of education leaves people dissatisfied. To the contrary, he says, roles in industry requiring education and intelligence are increasing: automation requires more tool-making, more draughtsmen, more designers, programmers, and educated managers. Lord Brown, it seemed to me, had overlooked the relatively uneducated, the ordinary folks; and that much in industry would remain rather stultifying as such. Aren’t we to expect a world in which, in highly developed nations, there will be increased leisure, and not enough creative work (such as Lord Brown was contemplating) to go around?

Southwestern had said it had a problem of morale, in spite of every effort to keep its employees well-informed about its work practices.

By way of some weeks of *group-type discussions* at different functional levels of the company (discussions which I had found invaluable in my study of officers in the Indian Army, in India), using four or five individuals in a group, I put together the manuscript E.

What I found (because I went to look for it, if it existed) was that communication-pleasure, not more and better information, could be the real key to industrial morale. Most companies take care of the necessary *information* — though they no doubt can find that employees, “on the line”, can offer innovative suggestions for better efficiency or product value. Few know what communication-pleasure means (by any name). Some

make use of “Music While You Work,” and that can be in the right direction. What I found, however, was that company employees could “get together” informally, in “bull sessions,” *to talk about the company*. The two-way manuscript is full of suggestions as to how to maximize on communication-pleasure.

### **F. Newton's Fifth Rule**

This should be the central work, and I am sorry to leave it to rest for a while. It *must* be published sooner or later — I mean some version or other!

I had originally written *Newton's Fifth Rule: Pro Re Theologica, Pro Re Scientia* (1974) to capture something of Newton's spirit. I thought of it as a sort of D'Arcy Thompson *Growth and Form*. It is probably important to keep it alive in its original form, seventeen chapters in all. I mark the two volumes (Ch. I-XI; Ch. XII-XVII) *F*.

*F* owes much to Professor Talbott's interest and good services. Students left behind on the untimely death of Dean Mal McLean of Iowa University, most using Q, needed guidance and support, and I attended to their needs, and gained much for myself in the process, as John F. Murray Professor for 1974-78, on a part-time basis.

I would like to return to *F* soon: a very significant contribution to science is at issue. American psychology is clearly not ready for it.

*F-1*. A “short” version of *F* was put together in 1974-75, intended as “cook-book” instruction: it retains *F*'s introduction to correlation and factor theory, also a reference to the Rosetta program for computer use, and makes the *theological* part of *F* provide expository material on how to work with Q. It could be a valuable “handbook” for a graduate wishing to become knowledgeable about Q.

It should be “on loan” initially to Professor Chang, to see if it comports with software for the centroid method that used to be Rosetta.<sup>4</sup>

*F-2*. In 1985 *F* was separated into two parts, (*F-2* and *G*), to give emphasis to abductory inference. By 1978 I was very involved in quantum theory, and into *cosmic* subjectivity, and wanted to add something to the *Newton's Fifth Rule* manuscript to represent these interests.

*F-2* omits the “cook-book” section of *F*, adds the “comment” on Newton's Fifth Rule, and then uses some of the theology study to represent cosmic duration of Lasswell. I call it *Newton's Fifth Rule: Vol. I — the Abduction of Sin*. A copy has been sent to a Mr. Witherspoon of St. Louis, who is interested in what he believes are different “levels” of consciousness in relation to religious belief — he is a sort of secular theologian.

Next it will go to Professor Torrance of Edinburgh University, for more serious attention.

I am not a religious person, but could not of course escape religion's influences, as a choir boy in an Anglican church attached to the Durham diocese in the north of England, under the shadow of the Durham Cathedral, and in studies of the sociology and psychology of religion in my days as a graduate student in London as I studied for my Ph.D. in psychology in a humanities division of London University.

Thus, to study subjectivity in its most compelling form (looked at historically) it was obvious that I should attempt to put Newton's Fifth Rule to critical use in theology, regarded as a “science of religion” (as dictionaries tell us). As a *cosmic* problem, I took the scholarly work of the past century, on theology, as written by authorities.

---

<sup>4</sup> Won Ho Chang was a Korean professor in the journalism school and a director of the William Stephenson Research Center [Ed.]

For theology as such I chose:

Karl Barth, H. R. Niebuhr, P. Tillich and I. Illich.

For sociology I chose:

E. Durkheim, B. Malinowski, Max Weber and Karl Marx.

Each of the above authorities had spoken. Anything factual is open to proof or disproof, and is not our concern, which is with *concepts*. Anything self-referential is open to Q's regard, and it is from *concourses* that new concepts form — so we suppose. Are there any such, then, that these authorities missed?

My study resulted in three operant factors, one of which was particularly exciting: it called attention to the *gross inhumanity of man, as intrinsic to us*.

Another Niebuhr, brother of H.R. of the experiment, had noticed something of the kind — it is reported on pages 3, 4 of the Epilogue to *F*. The factor, however, seemed to me to be devastating in its implications — we continue to think of man as redeemable, harmless and virtuous, whereas *cosmic* conditions of subjectivity suggest the reverse. "History," as William James once said, "is a bath of blood."

### **G. Newton's Fifth Rule: Vol II: Abduction of Common Science.**

The other half of *F* is this volume, G.

It proposes to cover the abduction that there is need for a science about *everyday common events* in a culture, as distinct from modern science's concern with *uncommon events* (like quarks, electrons, black holes, quasars and all else of modern science). Modern psychology followed suit and is (in my view) in a quagmire of scholastic proportions because it has attempted the impossible: to understand subjectivity without reference to inherent self-referentiality. But we have in mind no simple A. B. C. of psychology, and nothing mysterious like ESP, telepathy, ghosts, etc. which were debunked decades ago.

The new approach is illustrated in my paper on the applications of *Newton's Fifth Rule to Educational Psychology* (*American Psychologist*, 1980). I reduced the Gospel according to Buddha (from his *Song*) to a concourse, thence a Q-sample, and got 10 children, ages 13-14, to provide a Q-sort each describing what they *feel* should govern their lives. The result was Buddha's philosophy. Yet no child could possibly have known this. It was intrinsic, inherent, to the concourse. I was suggesting to the 400 or more educational psychologists to whom I addressed the paper, that they should find out what children already *know* (and yet are unaware of) about a subject-matter, upon which to develop all else.

Interestingly enough, a recent work entitled *Changing the Subject* (1984) by a handful of young authors in London, deals with the same matter.

The five authors are:

Julian Henriques (Assistant Director, B.B.C.)

Wendy Hollway (Lecturer, Occupational Therapy, Birkbeck College, University of London)

Cathy Arwin (Lowenfeld Fellow, University of Cambridge)

Couze Venn (Senior Lecturer, Cultural Studies, London Polytechnic)

Valerie Walkerdine (Lecturer and Research Fellow, Institute of Education, London)

Their concern, they say, is with "subjects and subjectivity:" the former they regard as "dynamic, multiple," who are positioned in life to particular "discourses and practices" produced by their kind. Subjectivity is "the condition of being subject." Their search is for "liberation," for "individual freedom."



Clearly all categorical.

Their method?

“Listen to what people say.”

It turns out that they can do nothing with this, except to deny credibility to all that I have elsewhere called *R*. They refer to Piaget, to Susan Isaacs (who was chosen with me in London to be psychoanalysed for future research implications), to Margaret Lowenfeld (a friend of mine and my family). Typically, they are critical of Kleinian child analysis: Klein believed in the inherent aggressiveness of babies (who *eat* breasts); if the aggressiveness could be assuaged early in life, they might be got rid of for life. This, the authors argued (correctly), is rather like blaming present-day Episcopalians for Henry VIII's destruction of the churches in England in the 16th century.

A careful reading of *Changing the Subject* will show that these young scholars are in the same situation that I myself was in, 50 years ago, against the same "discourses and practices." I, too, departed from Kleinian doctrine to the extent of qualifying it with self-referentiality — my 1954 book on *Q-methodology and Psychoanalysis* was an effort in that direction. My conclusion, for therapy, is to be published in *New Ideas in Therapy* (Eds. Rubens and Delpratio, 1986).

In any case *G* (Vol. II) is worth reading, and it owes much to Dr. Joye Patterson's dissertation of 1966

#### **H. Quiddity College: Thomas Jefferson's Legacy for Moral Science (1970-80)**

This is a major work, covering many years of research, an outcome of my beginnings in *theory of education*, a life-long involvement.

Since I believe that subjective science will ultimately have due place as significant as objective, it followed that I should anticipate what kind of education it should entail. Quiddity College is an answer. It outlines a two-year college in which facts are taken for granted — so that a student could know enough beforehand about physics, chemistry, genetics, etc. — and everything subjective would be fostered in the College. And not *categorical* concepts in the humanities, philosophy, psychology, or history, but authentic, inherent subjectivity in all fields of knowledge, including modern science. This was a first look at the matter. Part I is a critique of existing educational systems at College and University levels, chapters qualified by Q-studies where possible. Part II puts its principles squarely with a version of the Scottish Enlightenment, represented by Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence. Quiddity College follows the lines of the Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge in England, with Fellows who *tutor*. The Fellows at Quiddity are named after the Jefferson Circle (Boorstin, 1948):

David Rittenhouse (1732-1796) (astronomer)

Benjamin Rush (1745-1813) (medical educator)

Benjamin Smith Barton (1766-1815) (botanist, culture)

Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) (chemist)

Charles William Peale (1761- 1827) (artist)

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) (publicist)

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826) (moral legacy)

Each fellow is responsible for a slice of subjective science, each appropriately — Thomas Paine, for example, for political science.

This is not to deny a necessary place for a University that caters to the professions — physicians, teachers, engineers, agronomists, economists, lawyers, etc. — which the

American Land Grant Universities serve well. And Quiddity could fit into this. But there is something else, vaguely represented by the *humanities*, which offers to give “polish” (character, etc.) to the nation’s young. What exactly is this “polish”? The first half of *Quiddity College* looks for answers and finds none. The second half dreams of a College — to replace the current humanities except when these teach languages — and concerned with subjectivity as a science. The College ends with students, hopefully, developing “authentic intentionalities,” in place of the “polish.” But they also live peer-group existences *par excellence*, as in the original Oxford-Cambridge form.

Part I has chapters as follows:<sup>5</sup>

- I: Oxford (run by Dons)
- II: American Universities (German idealism, with inflated Administration, run by politics)
- III: Attempts at “patching up” U.S.A. undergraduate Colleges
- IV: Unrest in Academe (1960s-1970s)
- V: Discovery of Subjectivity (Kate Haracz wants to be “me”)<sup>6</sup>  
(Also, the Nuns of Loudun)<sup>7</sup>
- VI: Quiddity and subjectivity (with communication-pleasure)  
(William James Q-sorted; truth-value for the best that the 19th century had to offer, his *Principles of Psychology*).
- VII: Truth-value for Keats’ *Odes*
- VIII: The playful college, achieved as character (social control) and creaturehood (convergent selectivity). The Jefferson Circle, from Boorstin’s *Lost World of Thomas Jefferson* (1948).
- IX: The Jefferson Legacy: moral science lies ahead, lost since his time, but now ready for a place in civil societies. Moral science takes precedence over positivist objectivism. *Common* science takes precedence over *uncommon* science.

Part II proceeds with a proposed *Curriculum*:

- XI: *Literae Humaniores*: (The Peale Fellowship). Subjectivity in literature. See my essay in C. R. Cooper (Ed.). (1985). *Researching Responses to Literature*, Chapter 13.
- XII: *The Tangled Bank*: (The Rush Fellowship). Based on Theodore Baird’s *Darwin and the Tangled Bank* (1946) and S. E. Hyman’s *The Tangled Bank: Darwin, Marx, Fraser, Freud* (1974). The theme: *metaphor*, the source of courses of action.
- XIII: *The Barton Fellow*: Neurophysiology? Introduction to D’Arcy Thompson’s *Growth and Form* (1948), and to Simone Weil (1909-1943), the French philosopher-psychologist who taught psychology in Paris much as I did in London earlier, and who introduces the culture of Languedoc (Toulouse) of the

---

<sup>5</sup> There are at least two complete versions of *Quiddity College*, the first with 13 chapters and a later one with 17. In the Contents listed above, Stephenson omits Ch. VII, “Newton’s Rules.” For some chapters he attempts to convey the content of the chapter rather than reproducing the title (see Appendix for the complete Table of Contents). [Ed.]

<sup>6</sup> Stephenson is referring here to a remark in an article by an undergraduate student, Kate Haracz, which appeared in *Change*, a magazine of higher learning, in 1970 (Haracz, 1970). [Ed.]

<sup>7</sup> Stephenson is alluding here to his description in the manuscript of the mentality associated with the 17th-century episode of demonic possession known as the Nuns of Loudun. [Ed.]

12th century, and the Romanesque Revolution. (Her quote: “The Roman Empire, deadliest phenomenon in history. It killed and almost destroyed all trace of several civilizations”). Are we any different? She says *no*.

XIV. *The Priestley Fellow*: science and religion. An example is my Newton’s Fifth Rule: Vols. I and II.

XV. *Political Science*: (The Thomas Paine Fellowship). See my papers distinguishing social and political democracies.

XVI. *The Rittenhouse Fellow*. The Hot Big Bang theory.

XVII. *The Jefferson Fellow*: “the self of intentionality,” not reached by classical, religious, scientific, or philosophical educational systems. Rooted in subjectivity.

What motivated these chapters?

I had spent a year for a *Diploma in Education* (1923-4), sandwiched between my Honours Degree in Physics, and research for a Ph.D. in physics, and I consider it the most formative year of my life, when I was free to read psychology and took a deep interest in early Renaissance educators. I have maintained these interests ever since. My first book, *Testing Schoolchildren* (1948) was essentially a criticism of the 1944 Education Act in England, which had promised “secondary schools” (comparable to U.S.A. high schools) for everyone, but ended by saving private Grammar Schools from bankruptcy — an event not remedied (in part) until 1980.

Actually, my years from 1924 onwards, especially in London, brought me into contact with some of the leading educators of those years: Sir Godfrey Thomson, Professor of Education at Edinburgh was my mentor — he asked to see me in London before I left in 1948 for the U.S.A.; Sir Percy Nunn, Professor of Education at the Institute of Education of London University co-sponsored my Ph.D. in the Arts Faculty of the University (his seminars were famous, attracting doctoral candidates from all parts of the then British Empire — I was the only Englishman during the two years I was at Nunn’s seminars); and Maxwell Garnett, known to me through factor-theory of which he was master, was also author of *Education and World Citizenship* and Secretary of the ill-fated League of Nations; he kept in touch with me, often visiting my laboratory at Oxford. One could not be but influenced by such men.

Thus, it would have been surprising if this interest didn’t find openings! Quiddity College has been with me now for over twenty years: it was not merely to be for education, but for subjective science, and thus for the ideal of a *civil society*. The reference is to Adam Ferguson’s *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767), a work of the Scottish Enlightenment, to which I shall be making reference in due course.

## I. Q-Methodology and the Romanesque Concourse (1983)

Originally, I called these chapters...

*Self-Reference as Operant Subjectivity: Relation to Q-methodology, Quantum Theory, and Newton’s Fifth Rule.*

and I toyed with...

*The Science of Common Things and Everyday Matters.*

Finally, I had settled on bringing Romanesque into the title, even though not all chapters bear directly upon this.

The volume is a set of essays covering much of my thought about Q and subjectivity. The first chapter is from my original *Intimations of Self*, and is the best introduction there is to Q. It could be published by itself, because it makes clear that *self* can be

reached non-categorically *only* by factor theories. Chapter II introduces the Romanesque theme. And so on. The volume provides the best possible introduction to Q-methodology. The chapter on “Homo Ludens: The Royal Wedding” tells something of my own history.

The copy made available (I) omits a chapter on “Statements of Problems” (Ch. X originally) — I was in a process of trying to shorten the manuscript by omitting a few chapters, so as to make a more generally readable volume. Preferably, I wanted to stress the Romanesque, as even “Homo Ludens: The Royal Wedding” does, since it links England to that period. There should be a volume with interacting chapters, as such — like I, II, IV, V, VI, VII.

But there was the overriding thought that the kind of humanity of the Romanesque centuries was inherently for a *civil society*. In the Epilogue, p. 8, I write:

To the scholars of medieval history... we owe this inestimable debt: they bring much that we are still grappling with in quantum and interbehavioral theories into focus, as widely under discussion at the close of the 15th century. Theologians had already developed a doctrine of probability and indeterminacy with regard to things in nature...

#### **J. *pScience: Symposium Series for Editors: Report 1973.***

I add this to the ten more as hope than achievement. With a generous grant from the National Science Foundation, I conducted seminars in the Midwest (1972-3) in which newspaper editors and publishers, academic scientists, and prominent public figures participated, to determine what was the “climate” about science.

The conclusion was that science had become secularized, notwithstanding feelings otherwise on the part of scientists. I have a paper to that effect which I offered to *Science*. It was rejected, I think because it stressed secularization and because its source was regarded as from “journalism.”

Thus, I feel that the endeavor remains incomplete, and it is my hope that in a while I shall return to the matter. It is dealt with in part, of course, in Volume II of *Newton’s Fifth Rule: Pro Re Scientia* (G) — *abduction of common science*.

#### **K. *Psychoanalysis and Q-Methodology* (1954)<sup>8</sup>**

This manuscript was written in 1953-4 and is now depleted and incomplete — sections of it appear elsewhere.<sup>9</sup> But it has been difficult to publish my work on psychoanalysis: this particular volume was reviewed by Dr. Pinkney, a psychoanalyst in New York, who recommended more studies to support it. He was friendly, and arrangements were made for me to undertake such studies in Washington, D.C. in 1955. For a number of reasons, chiefly mine, the opportunity had to be missed.<sup>10</sup> I am not sorry, because the work can now be given a definitive form, as some of my recent papers suggest, e.g., “Perspectives

<sup>8</sup> A later (1979) version of this manuscript was titled: *Psychoanalysis and Q-method: A scientific model for psychoanalytic doctrine*. [Ed.]

<sup>9</sup> A chapter from this manuscript was published in *Operant Subjectivity*: Stephenson, W. (2017). Fragment from case Martre, *Operant Subjectivity*, 39(1-2), 1-19. [Ed.]

<sup>10</sup> An account of this missed opportunity can be found in Good, J. M. (2022), William Stephenson and the U.S. National Institute for Mental Health: Lost Opportunity or Springboard for a Revitalized Career? In J. C. Rhoads, D. B. Thomas & S. E. Ramlo (Eds.), *Cultivating Q methodology: Essays honoring Steven R. Brown* (pp. 18-44). International Society for the Scientific Study of Subjectivity. [Ed.]

in Psychology: Integration in Clinical Psychology” (*Psychological Record*, 1985, 35, 41-48) and in “Falsification and Credibility for Psychoanalytic Doctrine” (unpublished manuscript, June, 1985).<sup>11</sup> Copies of such papers are available on request. Meanwhile, I cannot release this manuscript for library purposes: like any other manuscript however, it must now fall in line, for attention later.

### Middle Point

The notes have been provided to offer a little background for the manuscript. The problem is to make Q live on in an environment in which everyone wants to be different, to do “one’s own thing.” Physics wasn’t such, with a few to begin with — a Bohr, Planck, Einstein, Heisenberg. In psychology we’ve had William James, Freud, Jung, of the same calibre, but each disparate, each separate. Only William James could look back at a hundred years of change and be himself.

It is exceptional for an academic book which is more than of technical concern to be alive on a publisher’s list for nearly 30 years: such was *The Study of Behavior*. I must confess, at this middle point, that there is need for one book of its kind, not yet written or put together, which will live another 30 years, or, better (and this is my conceit), may live two hundred years on into the next century, as Adam Ferguson’s, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1797) has done from the 18th century into ours. What there is to offer is basically in Ferguson’s vision, but scientific *in esse*. The concepts of quantum theory, concurrence, factors as decision structures, conspiring, self-referentiality, the Law of Transformation of Subjectivity into Operant Factor-structures, Newton’s Fifth Rule, Peirce’s Law of Mind — these are stepping-stones across the current total neglect of subjectivity. Here and there in the above notes there are suggestions for further work, and some, I believe, are worth attention.

I have not provided a list of references — they can be found by any reader who wishes to have them, e.g. in *The Play Theory of Mass Communication*.

---

<sup>11</sup> Later published in *Operant Subjectivity*: Stephenson, W. (1988). Falsification and credulity for psychoanalytic doctrine. *Operant Subjectivity*, 11(3), 73-97. [Ed.]

**QUIDDITY COLLEGE:  
THOMAS JEFFERSON'S LEGACY  
FOR MORAL SCIENCE**

Foreword

PART I

The Quintessences

- Chapter I: Synopsis of Western Education
- II: The University in America
- III: Collegium Resartus [The College Re-patched]
- IV: Unrest in Academe
- V The Discovery of Subjectivity
- VI Quiddity and Subjectivity
- VII Newton's Rules
- VIII Truth Value
- IX The 'Playful' Cultural College
- X: The Jefferson Legacy

PART II

Quiddity's Curriculum: Modus Operandi

Sartor Resartus [The Taylor Re-patched]

- Chapter XI: Literae Humaniores
- XII: The Tangled Bank
- XIII: The Barton Fellow
- XIV: The Priestley Fellow
- XV: Political Science?
- XVI: The Rittenhouse Fellow
- XVII: The Jefferson Fellow: President of Quiddity