THE FARTHER REACHES OF HUMAN NATURE

Abraham H. Maslow
Brandeis University

It is increasingly clear that a philosophical revolution is underway. A comprehensive system is swiftly developing like a fruit tree beginning to bear fruit on every branch at the same time. Every field of science and human endeavor is being affected.

While I will be considering some facets of this revolution as it is affecting psychology, the fundamental finding is the simultaneous development in other fields as well. This new Zeitgeist of humanistic reorientation is affecting social institutions, work, leisure, education, as well as the areas of science, philosophy, and religion. In all these areas similar work is being done by persons who are unknown to each other yet are linked by a common core of belief and intention.

It can be termed the Humanistic Revolution, the turn back to human needs. It is the new center of concern and the growing center of human knowledge. It is a centering of knowledge, of epistemology, of metaphysics, of science, and of all human concerns, with human needs and with human experience. While this may sound obvious, it is in fact a new departure from the prevailing German intellectual style of Kant and Hegel and Leibnitz. Their procedures of moving from the abstract and the a priori towards general solutions is edifying and elegant but not complete and often not useful. They derived specific answers for the concrete questions from the big abstract words which came first, so to speak. The danger is that these abstract words need not be derived from concrete experience and may become what I've been

a new departure

[1] Edited by Dr. James Fadiman from the tape of a lecture given at the First Unitarian Church, San Francisco (under the auspices of the Esalen Institute), September 14, 1967, Copies of this tape are available from the Esalen Institute, Big Sur, California, This lecture is the first public presentation of the emergence of Transpersonal psychology (fourth force).

calling "helium-filled" words. They sail right off the surface of the earth and have no ties to it.

primereality
- human experience

In psychology what is called the third force, Humanistic psychology, is coming back to the prime reality-human experience itself-and starting from there to derive the concepts, the necessary abstractions and the definitions of real human experience and human needs, goals and values. This orientation is in marked contrast to the two other forces in contemporary psychology, the behavioristic and the Freudian.

The behavioristic (the objectivistic, the positivistic) psychology can be simply described as having modeled itself upon the successful sciences. These having been physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, etc.-generally sciences of things, of objects. In psychology the rationale has been, "Look how physics is successful. The best thing for us to do is to emulate the best methods of physics, etc. Let us do our work their way." One result of this unspoken attitude has been the compilation of a large amount *of* information studying the human being as if he were an object, as if he were a thing. The same procedures, the same methods, the same concepts, the same definitions, and the same attitudes have been utilized as might be used in studying the nature of metal or light. This style of science has been called mechanomorphic. Its current popularity is due more to the prestige of the sciences it models itself after than to the results obtained by it or the kinds of questions it is able to answer.

The other major force in psychology can be called the Freudian, which includes a penumbra of modifications or reflec*tions* from the original ideas and methods proposed by Freud. To oversimplify again, this kind of psychology reflects another basic trend in science characterized by the Darwinian revolution. Psychologists of this persuasion treat the human being as if he were an animal, which of course he is, but as if he were merely an animal, *only* an animal, so that the animal characteristics which are unique to man are somehow not considered properly "scientific."

Freud, himself, had training in neurology, comparative anatomy and so on. The assumption is that that which can be studied scientifically about the human being is what he has in common with lower animals. If he does not share an attribute with lower animals, then it doesn't count, or it's not to be studied, or it's not scientific. The higher qualities that are unique to the human being, these higher qualities,

these higher aspirations, higher values, are handled by the Freudian orientation in an apparently irrational fashion. The tendency is to take such a quality, say altruism or kindness, and reduce it, to make an animal explanation of it or a pessimistic explanation. I keep in my files one called "Procto-psychology" following the medical specialty of proctology- the study of the rectum, the anus, and so on. While it is true that this is an entrance to the human body and it is one way of approaching the subject, to say the least, there are other ways.

higher human *qualities*

Humanistic psychology parallels the Freudian model to the extent of seeing human needs as biological in origin. The major emphasis in Humanistic psychology rests on the assumptions regarding "higher needs." They are seen as biologically based, part of the human essence or the species character. The term I use is "instinctoid," meaning it is not an instinct, but instinct-like in the sense of being genetic, to an appreciable extent determined by genes.

These higher human needs are therefore biological, and I speak here of love, the need of love, for friendship, for dignity, for self-respect, for individuality, for self-fulfillment, and so on. There is a considerable amount of evidence to make this a reasonable hypothesis. This is especially true for the love needs.

Perhaps human nature has been sold short in that the higher possibilities of man have not been seen as biological. The need for 'dignity, fOT example, can be seen as a fundamental human right in the same sense that it is a human right to have enough calcium or enough vitamins to be healthy. If these needs are not fulfilled, pathology results.

higher possibilities as human rights

If, however, these needs are fulfilled, a different picture emerges. There are people who do feel loved and who are able to love, who do feel safe and secure and who do feel respected and who do have self-respect. If you study these people and ask what motivates them, you find yourself in another realm. This realm is what I have to call trans-humanistic-, meaning that which motivates, gratifies, and activates the fortunate, developed, self-actualizing person. These people are motivated by something beyond the basic needs. The focal point, or the point of departure, into this transhumanistic realm comes when they answer the following kind of questions: "What arc the moments which give you the greatest kick, the greatest satisfaction? What are the

• This term was coined *by* Sir Julian Huxley in 1957. Since the time of this lecture the term has been replaced by "transpersonal."

great moments? What are the moments of reward which make your work and your life worthwhile?"

intrinsic *values*

The answers to those questions were in terms of ultimate verities. These are what Robert Hartman (1967) calls "the intrinsic values"-truth, goodness, beauty, perfection, excellence, simplicity, elegance, and so on. W11atthis amounts to is that this third psychology is giving rise to a fourth, "transhumanistic psychology" dealing with transcendent experiences and with transcendent values.

The fully developed (and very fortunate) human being, working under the best conditions tends to be motivated by *values* which transcend his *self.* They are not selfish anymore in the old sense of that term. Beauty is not within one's skin nor is justice or order. One can hardly class these desires as selfish in the sense that my desire for food might be. My satisfaction with achieving or allowing justice is not within my Own skin; it does not lie along my arteries. It is equally outside and inside: therefore, it has transcended the geographical limitations of the self. Thus one begins to talk about transhumanistic psychology.

One point is important to consider here. I am speaking as a scientist. What I have just been saying are things which can be confirmed or disconfirrnedby anybody who is interested. It can be checked; it can be verified. At another *level,* however, I am denying the whole modem history of science which has from its very beginning claimed the need to be value-free, value-neutral, value-rejecting. This was a correct thing to do. The world of objects and the world of things is, in a sense, value-free,However, human beings are not value-free; they live by values, they live for values. This can be *viewed* as a rejection of the model of mechanomorphic science. It is also a rejection of the tendency to technologize, to make something value-free, merely a matter of technique. This tendency is already rampant in education, nursing, social work and other professions (Maslow, 1966).

the good society

To give just one example, in the School of Social Work on my own campus everyone is working at doing things better, being more efficient, more capable and more expert. However, they don't have a social philosopher on the staff. Every time I raise the question with my friends in the school about "What is the good society," they change the subject. Last semester, I Ian a seminar on "Utopian Social Psychology." Not one social worker came to it. It reminds me again of the story about the test pilot who radioed, "I'm lost, but I'm making record time."

Another characteristic of this- new development is a resacralizing, a respiritualizing. Value-free science is a desacralizer; it makes things neutral and positivistic. It takes in what can be taken in, data which are available to the senses. With transhumanism we have something new. When you open the door to value and to value experiences and peak or transcendent experiences, a whole new level of possibilities is open to investigation. You find that the reports from people who have had peak-experiences frequently parallel the reports of the great mystics. Religious mystics, for instance, talk about "Unitive consciousness." They use words which, for value-free science, have been excluded from the jurisdiction of science. They have been excluded as not scientific, meaning (without it being said) not really knowledge. These words describe emotions, wishes, desires, states of being, alternate forms of knowing, but they are not really facts for value-free science-therefore their exclusion.

It should be clear that this discussion developed out of a value-orientation to begin with. The self-actualizing people I talk about are very healthy people, psychiatrically and psychologically healthy people. They could be called a superior segment of the population. Thus I, and others, have been studying not the whole human species, in an ordinary statistical sense, not the average of the species, but a select sample, Le., the most creative or most talented or perhaps most intelligent that we could find. This is a statistical approach, but an unusual one, following a biological metaphor I've learned to call "growing tip statistics."

The growing tip is where all the action takes place, this is where all the chromosomes are dividing, where all the growth processes are most vivid and most active. What I've done as a technique is pull out the best specimen rather than sampling the whole of the population. This can be justified quite apart from the startling things we have learned using this technique. Consider, for example, that an Olympic gold medal winner represents the limits of human potential in that event for every new baby born into the world. When I was a youngster and trying to run on track teams, it was humanly impossible to run a hundred yards in less than ten seconds, as it was humanly impossible to run a mile in less than four minutes. In each of these events what was humanly impossible became possible because somebody did it. Each time somebody did it, the potentials, the horizons, the ceilings for every newborn baby were lifted. These became potentials for every human being.

growing *tip*

Thus we are using techniques for selecting the most fully

S

developed, the *most* fully human persons we can find and suggesting that these people are what the whole human species can be like if you just let them grow, if the conditions are good and you get out of their way. This is not an average sample, it is a growing tip sample, the best part of the top one per cent.

new image of man

We are dealing with a new image of man. This is most important because from that everything else flows. All of man's work, all of man's institutions, which includes science-all the sciences, mathematics and physics are also human institutions-can be modified. The image of man is growing. There are more possibilities.

We are dealing with an increased awareness of interpersonal relations. Out of this has come already a greater conception of human love. There is a hierarchy of loves. Love at the highest level I've described is love for the being of the other *person,* something considerably more than mutual customer satisfaction. This Being-love is a higher conception of what is possible in the human being, not necessarily what exists in large quantities, but what is the human potential.

This is also true for sex. Sex can be seen at its higher levels, especially in a love relationship, as a trigger for peak-experiences, for mystical, unitive experiences-in short, as one of the gates to Heaven. This opens up a realm for science to explore because if you actually examine the sexual lives of most people, if you take a sample of the total population, you'll find that 99 per cent of *the* population doesn't really know what the possibilities of sexuality are. They don't know how high feelings can be.

higher *conceptions* of being

The concept of friendship is also hierarchical. There are higher levels of friendship which are possible. As you study what friendship can be, what it might be under the best circumstances; what friendships often actually are is cast into cruel and cold relief. There is a vision of a higher kind of authentic friendship that can lead one again to research, to therapeutic work, perhaps to try and bring it more into being. This is possible also for the family. It is possible for the teacher-child relationship, for industry, for management and leadership, etc.

The above examples are among the higher conceptions being generated out of present-day humanistic and transhumanistic psychology. The future, as uncertain as ever, appears more *promising* than *it* has been for generations.

I ought to separate the image of man from the image of

civilization. Civilization and its interests have been seen as necessarily in mutually exclusive contrast to the interests of the individual. Whatever is good for the individual is bad for civilization. That is, if he were selfsh, if he let himself go, if he were impulsive, if he didn't control himself, the society would fall. This was part of the Freudian conception. There is now available a new conception, of a higher possibility, of the healthy society. There are tools now available to judge and compare societies. One society can be judged to be better than another society, or healthier or possessing more "growth-fostering-potential." We can talk about the value of the society, or the function of the society-that is, the greatest corning to fulfillment of the people in the society.

judging *of societies*

111.i8point of view is also generating a different notion of reality and a different notion of objectivity. It is becoming clearer that there is a higher conception of objectivity than the one we know.

The notion of objectivity that the scientist now has is what you might can spectator-objectivity, of not caring, being neutral about the matter. It doesn't matter to him who wins or who loses. We have something emerging from the study of the Being-love relationship which indicates that you can have Being-love for the problem-not necessarily only for human beings. It is possible to have Being-love enough for a human being, for your child, for example so that it becomes possible to leave him alone (a great achievement). It is possible to leave him alone in the Taoistic sense because you love him so much the way he is that you just delight in watching him grow. This can be said for apple trees, too, or for animals, or for whatever. It turns out that it is possible to become objective, detached, non intrusive, noninterfering, able to leave it alone. So that you can let a thing be itself. And it begins to appear to me that from such a spirit may come the greatest accuracy of perception. Because the opposite of the leaving-it-alone perception is the selective perception, "Can I make use of it? Is it good for me? Is it bad for me? Can I profit from it? Is it threatening to me? Is it dangerous to me? Can I eat it?" This always means seeing in a necessarily abstract way. It means not seeing the whole of a thing, a phenomenon, a situation. It means seeing only, let's say, whether it's edible or not edible, which means seeing only part of it, i.e., seeing inaccurately. loving, non-interfering objectivity abstracts less and may, therefore, get more of the whole truth.

non-interfering *objectivity*

A word about religion. Let this one example serve for many of the areas I could criticize for technologizing or profes-

sionalizing, If you focus (as, I have) upon the peak-experience to have almost all the characteristics traditionally attributed to universal religions experience, not having to do necessarily with one creed or another, or one place or another, one can then talk of the religionizing or the sacralizing of all of life. I can report that these experiences can take place at any time, at any place, to practically anyone. This accumulation of data contrasts with the professionalizing or the specializing that has gone on in formal religion-specialization of the day, the building, the person, the words themselves-supposed to evoke spontaneous religious feelings. Characteristically there are holy places, or places when you walk in the door, then you are supposed to feel that religious feeling and have that religious feeling until you walk out the door. Then you drop it and you don't have a religious feeling until the next time or the next building.

Much the same argument can be present about contemporary education. Humanistic education means educationalizing the whole of life, rather than having education take place in one kind of building and not outside it. If the *New* York City teachers' strike had lasted long enough, we might have learned a great deal about real education. It was beginning with the mothers and neighborhood people and all sorts of non-experts coming into school. It didn't have a chance to get well underway before the experts took the controls back. Now things are well in hand again with education being sawed up into three-credit slices, like the slices of a tangerine, which somehow all turn out to be equal, and to be separate from each other.

pcrspective-*ultimatevalues*

The point I'm getting at is that all of life can be educationalized, can be religionized, can be scientized, can be esthetic-ized, can be philosophized, if you think in terms of the ultimate values rather than of the expertness, rather than being trapped in the technology or humbled by expertise. The same thing is true of the therapeutic experience and of the personal growth-fostering side of therapy. This can fill all of life as well. All of life, or any part of life, can be sacralized.

Is this optimistic or starry-eyed? The answer is that it is neither optimistic nor pessimistic. Our job as empirical people is to be realistic, to be good reporters, good observers of what actually is the case. All the possibilities I have been discussing here are, in fact, possibilities. These are possibilities which have been described in a fraction of one per cent of the population. It is possible to talk about the healthiest one per cent, or the most creative one per cent. These are

realistic statements; they may be put to the test. Also, it is possible to consider each of these statements in statistical terms, to talk about the degree of reliability. "How reliable is this? How sure are we that this is so? What does it mean about this 'growing tip' statistics that I talk about? Will it actually happen?" The answer, as far as I can determine, is that it is not necessary or inevitable that all this shall come about. The bombs and the buttons that men control are still waiting. It is possible that they may wipe us all out. Yet, it is also possible that they will *not* wipe us out. If we get the scientific vision-that is, the empirical vision of something which is in truth a human being and which, therefore, can be actualized-if we can realize that these are not pipe dreams but clear possibilities, then this realization will bring it all within the realm of human activity. What this all means to me is that there is scientific justification for much of what we hope for in each other and for all mankind.

scientific justification

REFERENCES

HARTMAN, R. *The* structure *of* value. Carbondale, Ill.: S. Ill. Univer. Press, 1967.

MASLOW, A. H. The psychology of science: a reconnaissance. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.