

Excerpts from tape recording

Present: Jack Cooper, Frank Haronian, Frank & Hilda Hilton, Georgina Hauser, Ed Moles, John Parks, Ed Riegel and Bertha Rodger.

Opening speaker John Parks, M.D. on The Will.

Parks: During the past month I have zeroed in on the Will and it has been an eye opener to me because, first, psychiatry has been very deterministic - Freudian theory is very deterministically oriented; everyone is the victim of his own conscience, so to speak.....The whole training in psychiatric hospitals is really against the theory of the freedom of the will.

As you know I sent out a letter inviting you and others to experiment with the exercises in the Training of the Will and perhaps we can discuss your experience later. But first let us do some rational thinking about the will before going into experiences. This is the most important because ~~far~~ from my understanding of Assagioli he said the thing is to get out of theorizing and rationalizing and get into the activating and use of the will. He lays a stress on the empirical results of experiments on yourself and your clients. And that is the crucial area into which future research in psychology is going to move. So with that in mind I would like to summarize of the Western thinking.

Augustin was the first to come out with a strong statement "Men are wills," that they have freedom of choice; man ~~is~~ <sup>has</sup> within himself the freedom to choose right from wrong, good and evil. Then the faculty psychologists of the Middle Ages - Thomas Aquinas, St. Thomas (?) - the will was the great part of their discussion. They divided the mind into three parts: the will, the reason and the sensations. And the great argument was whether the will was primary or the intellect. Thomas' idea was that the will and the reason are intermingled but that the will in the last analysis determines only in absolute terms, by the absolute good. But by necessity the will chooses to be absolute good; but in relative everyday terms there is no necessity; in other words, it is not forced into these decisions it can make free choices. Certainly Thomas Aquinas is the strong pillar standing

in front of the freedom of the will as far as theology and the faculty psychologists are concerned.

An argument occurred between Dunn Scodas(?) and Thomas. Scodas felt that the will is primary - the will gave the energy to the reason to think whereas Thomas Aquinas used to feel that you have to have knowledge in order to make a choice; knowledge and reason must be there before you can make a choice so Thomas in a sense, if he had to make a choice, put reason first. But both of them were very much concerned with the freedom of the will. Ultimately they were both theologians; when they talked on Determinism....on the Absolute Good their faith in the Absolute Good overrode everything and everyone is ultimately determined by that.

This was very much the background of the modern philosophers and psychologists. There was the Renaissance and then getting into modern psychology the one I am most sympathetic towards is William James. He had studied and imbibed all the 16th, 17th and 18th century psychology and philosophy. He made some statements about the will that I think are very important. Then they were getting into the realm of Experimental Psychology - the German Wundt and the various Germans had done a little work, but James set up the first experimental laboratory at Harvard. Then he moved from physiology and psychology into philosophy - his father was a Swedenborgian. Swedenborg was a mathematician who had a spiritual experience and moved into theology and philosophy. William and Henry James were his two sons. It was said that Henry James could write novels like a psychologist, and that William James could write psychology like a novelist; but the atmosphere in the family was one of intense intellectual discussion; they would invite the professors over from Harvard and that sort of thing.

A crisis came in his life - and it is important to look at this in dealing with the will - in his twenties after he had taken medical school where he dealt with the purely physical approach whereas his love was with the ideas, the realm of thought, and psychology. He found medicine lacking and so did not know what to do with himself. So he quit, traveled to Europe - he had sufficient income without

having to work. He had read a lot of philosophy and he found himself getting depressed and there was a statement in this book, the best biography of William James by Ralph Barton Perry. At this point in the biography he is at the point of disidentifying from medicine and trying to find himself. He went through an important psychological discovery in which the crucial aspect is the will." Three forward steps are noted in James' biography despite the many lesser oscillations: the spiritual crisis of 1870, the commencement of his teaching in 1872, and his marriage in 1878. By his spiritual crisis I do not specifically refer to the attack of melancholia expressed in his autobiographical statement in the writer's religious experience(?) Now the spiritual crisis was the ebbing of the will to live for lack of a philosophy to live, by, a paralysis of action occasioned by a sense of moral impotence.

On February 1st 1870 James acknowledged in his diary "I resolve to acknowledge the supremacy of morality. Today I touched bottom and perceived that I must face plainly the choice with open eyes. Shall I frankly throw the moral business overboard as unsuited to my nature or shall I follow it and it alone making everything else merely stuff for it. I will give the latter alternative a fair trial in order that the moral interests may become developed. True I have tried to fire myself with moral interest in the accomplishing of certain utilitarian ends." "But the personal problem was not solved for the devotee of morals may be driven to despair by the existence of evil. Can one with a full knowledge ever sincerely bring oneself to sympathize with the total process of the universe as hardly to assent to the evil which seems so inherent in its details. Is the mind so fluid and plastic; if so, optimism is possible or, on the other hand, are the private interests and synthesis of the individual so essential to his existence that they can never be sought without his feeling for the total process. Does he nevertheless imperiously crave a reconciliation or unity of some sort. Pessimism must be his portion. But, if as in Homer, the divided universe be a conception possible for his intellect to rest in, at the same time he has a vigor of will to look (?) at the universal death in the face without blinking and lead the life of a moralist. A militant existence in which the ego is positéd as a monad and good is its end in the final consolation of that.....

hatred. Though evil slay me she cannot subdue me nor make me worship her. The brute force is all at her command but the final protest of my soul as she squeezes me out of existence gives me still in a certain sense the superiority."

You have to remember that he was a psycho thalamic (?) person towards the end of his life. He would go through mood swings - down and up - and near the end of his life he was in a down phase; so his intellectuality is colored to some extent by his moods. This one has to remember. He was reading much western philosophy - certain philosophers have written on the freedom of the will and others on determinism and he was grappling with this. But when he wrote this he was down, and not knowing where to go. And then he goes on to say:

"If one adapts the alternative of moralism, whether this assumes the form of a hope to conquer evil or resolve to die bravely" in other words you take a forward impetus; and if you believe this you need the vigor or will which springs from the belief in the freedom of the will. He puts his belief in the freedom of will even if it may not be absolutely true. If you build this and follow it, then you build this freedom of the will into you, it is better hope to live by. He read the philosopher Rouvenet(?) and says "yesterday I think was a crisis in my life. I finished the first part of Rouvenet's second essay and see no reason why his definition of free will - the sustaining of the thought because I choose to when I might have other thought the sustaining of a thought when I chose to - need be the definition of an illusion, but I will assume that it is not an illusion." He was wrestling with relativity and the absolute; and if I choose to believe that there is a free will and although it could at this point <sup>be</sup> an illusion, I am going to ~~not~~ believe it and then follow it. So my first act of free will is to believe in free will. " So he is saying that "I may be wrong but I will-to-believe." He wrote books on the will-to-believe and this type of thing.

With this James went into an introspective analysis of will and says: "The process is the following. In your mind there are a lot of images and they flow in the stream of consciousness." They are moving images; for example, you have the thought of a car and you think of a certain ~~xxx~~ kind of car, a certain type of engine, or see

yourself at the wheel driving it so that in the idea of the car there is the idea of a moving image. So in the stream of consciousness there are a thousand moving images and in the process of will the observing ego watches the stream go by. Somehow or other the observer picks certain images, and then the process of attention comes in - which do you attend to, the image of the car or of a beautiful woman, etc.? So the process of the will in the outer world is a sort of <sup>scanning</sup> ~~stemming~~ or attention and then <sup>a</sup> is zeroing in. You choose car, you think about it and there ~~ix~~ are desires as well as the intellectualizing and very soon you are down at the car dealer's buying it. The impetus of the process stirs into outer action the physiological process - you read books about the car and think how you will get the money to obtain it. When you center on it, you begin to do it because thought leads to action. But it must be a concentrated thought on something that is valued. Once the image is concentrated upon the rest takes place automatically. In that sense your actions are determining, so the idea of freedom comes in as to "which image?" If you take a roulette wheel, do you have any freedom as to where the ball is going to land? James thinks if you choose to believe, you do. He says that once that the image is attended to and valued, when you have chosen, then you don't have much choice - the physiology will go ahead and do what you have decided. That is his idea of it.

Heronian: Let me react here to a couple of things that might fit in with what you have been thinking. I hear you saying that in <sup>a</sup> ~~prt~~ our actions are determined by pre-actions, in the sense of images that we are willing to entertain. If I am wanting to do something particularly difficult I can facilitate it by doing something that is easier. The easier thing is to imagine doing the thing that is difficult, to entertain images - not so much the thoughts - of doing the thing. It is a grading down of the problem to a level that I can control.

Parks: But what is the process by which you fix on an image? Is it an image that arises within you or something that is being imposed by another person? If an outer image is projected you may become possessed by it and hung up in it, but sooner or later you will break free if it isn't your image.

Haronian: I think there is a tentative ~~answer~~ answer to that that I don't hear coming out of James. The exercise of will, in the way of positive action, is preceded by the exercise of selection of a particular image. I think the choice of images is pre-selected by our value orientation and is unconscious unless we actually make it conscious. If we are truly open and not ego involved then it becomes an orientation to the whole evolutionary process, to growth in general. On the other hand, if we become ego involved we block that particular value orientation and thinking.

(Parks: I agree) In other words, there is an intervening value orientation which if we are open we will naturally orient towards it. What will make us open if we are closed, and what is the nature of being closed?

Parks: I think James would say that it is to watch the stream of consciousness without prematurely forcing, in the sense of "I like this image"; somehow to withhold judgment. Earlier this morning we were discussing when do you <sup>grasp</sup> an idea and when to do you leave it alone. Maybe you have to <sup>grasp</sup> it for a while and then you will reap the results of that - if you grabbed it too fast, etc. It is a mental thing, but I have the feeling that in psychosynthesis the Dis-identification Exercise the idea is more to identify with the self that is back of the stream of consciousness, so that it can watch these things and say "this has a valance of ten and this has a valance of 1 or this has a valance of 100, and this is the one I must watch out for. Of course, you have to live, you need food in your mouth and money to live, so that necessity is going to force some choices. But on the other hand, if you see it as a choice, seeing several images, and if the process of dis-identification is emphasized. Like the medievalists who argued that "God is not this, is not that" but the thing that you feel driven to choose, watch out; you may be a fanatic! If you can identify with the observer watching the stream of images then you are better off than if you get hung up in one of them.

Riegel: I was reaching for a way of opening up, reaching for the interpersonal as a way of opening up the personal. Not necessarily the interpersonal within the therapy setting; more in terms of Buber's "I - Thou" experience. In the sense of letting them be their selves and opening up (Parks: What do you mean by their selves?) Revealing

of their feelings, it allows you to open yourself up and there can be a mutual feeling. You begin to relate honestly.

Parks: I think if the Thou and the I are the observers, that together watch the stream of consciousness without valuing, maybe. If you add values you have to reap the results of being a ~~fanatic~~ fanatic in some way.

Heronian: But the "I - Thou" creates its own value; there is a synthesis right there. Perhaps the relationship ~~is~~ is the value.

Parks: It's a question of watching what is flowing through without letting your own fanaticism block it. <sup>There might be</sup> ~~fanaticism~~ fanaticism on your part or my part, and then we screw up the stream of consciousness.

Cooper: What I hear from William James is that this is so - the assumption of the stream of consciousness - and then he takes off from <sup>one</sup> assumption to another. In some <sub>^</sub> sort of way this may be a mistake.

Parks: In the philosophical thought you get down to your basic axioms. In psychology, what will you stake your all on? ~~Descartes~~ Descartes said "I think therefore I exist" then there is ~~a~~ the Polish philosopher that Assagioli quotes who says "I will, therefore I think and I am." With him the will is primary, which is very similar to what some of the medievals said. The basic thing is will - but immediately a thing is posited, then other things are implied. You get into ~~hang-ups~~ hang-ups. You posit black so white is implied. Your thought is like a computer yes-no, and this immediately gets you in a hang up despite considering that at this point you ~~always~~ have a choice of yes or ~~no~~ no.

Cooper: Does the brain excrete thoughts so that we can sit there and select, or is there a stream of consciousness to which the brain tunes into?

Parks: William James considered this problem, and he did take the second point. He hates to think of the brain secreting thoughts like the liver secretes bile. He would prefer to think of higher energies coming in - like TV tube, the energies comes through and paint a picture.

Cooper: If I interpret Roberto Assagioli aright, he places great stress on the images other people place upon you. This raises another question: do the images

of other people impinge on your stream of consciousness? Using the analogy of the TV tube again, is there interference?

Parks: I certainly feel that. When you go into a room you can tell who is influencing who, and who has the greatest power. Recently I was involved with a psychologist who has a somewhat dogmatic, one-track idea and I saw certain wisdom in it and to that degree I became involved but then this past week - since working on the will - I realized "this not my thought, this is his!" I said that I had chosen but I did not really choose his thought; I got hung up in it. And now if I back out now we will both be hurt, but it is better to choose the hurt. So at the start I did not really ask "is this what I want, according to my values?" There is a value in his one track mind but only to a certain degree; in a deeper sense it betrays my own sense of values; and therefore I have to dissociate from it. In a way it is like a bad marriage: why do you keep going and at what point do you make the decision to break it up? At a certain level you are in each other's images, but at another level you have to be more basically true to yourself, and at that ~~it~~ point you may decide on a divorce. And what hangs people up is fear of the pain of the disidentification.

To go back to this psychologist, I chose his image but it wasn't a free choice in that there wasn't enough reflection on the value on the part of the deeper part of myself.

Cooper: Why put in the adjective "free", in free choice? Why not just say "I chose", "I chose to explore his images and now I choose to withdraw."

Haronian: But when he got to the point of seeing that it was something that he couldn't go along with, then he felt that there had not been that free choice...and if he wanted to recapture that freedom. To be able to choose is to be free.

Ted Riegel: Does the other psychologist give you the freedom to disagree?

Parks: No; and that is one of the reasons why I disagree with his views.

Hilton: John, doesn't this point up the importance of the stages of the will that Dr. Assagioli speaks of? You made a decision without going through the preceding stages of evaluation and deliberation.



Parks: Right. As I look back on it I felt there was a precipitous choice, a going along with this other man's image without looking within myself to see if I ~~am~~ really valued it.. Superficially I evaluated it but there wasn't enough deliberation; so I felt that I made a mistake.

Cooper: And in the case of "Fran", all the time she was using the determination aspect without really choosing or deciding.

Parks: I have a problem as regards intuition. Sometimes I have the feeling you just have to do something but then I think that may be precipitous. If I was to meditate on it for a day - like Romney who would go three days before making a political decision - would I be in a better position to choose? I tend to do things fast but then so many things come up and one does not have time. Then with many problems you have multiple choices - and speaking of one choice is deceptive because often you have many choices during the day, maybe a 100. Some you must spend a lot of time deliberating ~~but others~~ <sup>but others</sup> you have to make intuitively.

Riegel: I have found three categories of things that happened in my life: by chance, by choice, or by commitment. By chance, my family identification, or many of the things that I have no control or choice about. Choice - such as the courses I take, girls I date, etc. Then commitment - where I take a job and they ask me to give courses that I am not supposed to do. I made a commitment to the job and they made a commitment to <sup>me</sup> you but for certain reasons the courses had to be changed. These happen <sup>ed</sup> within the situation to which I was committed. As it turned out I thoroughly enjoyed the change.

Cooper: At another level you chose your attitude in regard to this commitment...you were still using will.

Hilton: I think that both the choice and the commitment are identical, because your commitment is a value against which you measure your choice. Whenever you make a choice you are comparing respective values.

Riegel: My commitment is <sup>to</sup> something beyond myself, whether to my job or something in the world. This is something to which I commit myself - a religion, a god, a value, and so

Haronian: That commitment then is only to yourself in so far as you are part of a larger whole.

I'd like to offer you another view of the situation, the comparison of the free versus the determined act. When I think of acting willingly I always find myself thinking in terms of supervening goal or decision - the first stage of the will, in a sense, a purpose and that always has a value. The free part is the choice of the goal according to certain values and to act willingly may require that one has a goal that transcends any present single act. But the act, in order to be effective, has to be appropriate to the demands of the immediate situation; so you have an interesting kind of duality here. The act has to be aimed; to act willingly the act has to be aimed at something that goes beyond itself but it also has to be appropriate to the particular situation in order to be effective. To the extent that the first applies and that there is a transcending goal there is a free aspect, but the second is the determined aspect. One may freely choose a long range goal because of its value but one has to respond to the actual field forces or the structure in the situation as the Gestalt people say, and that is the determined aspect.

Moles: If it is appropriate then isn't it commensurate or <sup>compatible</sup> ~~inadequate~~ with the images projected by the other people? (Haronian: That is going to complicate things)

Parks: But people are part of the limited situation.

Cooper: There is a story that fits this very well. There was a notice in this restaurant which said "If our waitresses don't smile you eat free" and someone asked one of the waitresses who was smiling all over the place so that it <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ very pleasant being around her; and she said "the first smile I give you is for the management, but all the others come from myself." In other words she was willingly participating in this thing she was committed to by the management.

Parks: To some extent the situation determines you but you are free within the situation.

Cooper: Yes, the second and third smiles came from the waitress herself, she chose willingly to smile. In trying to teach people about the will I say to them "you feel you have this commitment; fine, go ahead and do it but then go on and do more - willingly."

Haronian: The more I think about the will the more I think in terms of values. There was a book published in 1932 by the Russian psychologist Louri (?) and the last chapter

is on the will. He points out that if you take someone suffering from Parkinson's syndrome and give them a bulb to squeeze and they can't do it - the ergograph comes out very weak. But if you change the task in one small way and tell the same patient "squeeze the bulb six times or as many times there are points on a star, etc." and he has no problem doing it all. I am not sure what the implications here are for the will; but I think that you have here in micro an illustration of the ability to do something the act of which transcends that act for a larger purpose. That is beyond the act of simply squeezing for the sake of squeezing.

Hilton: But doesn't that simply mean that I am making the decision for you - I tell you "squeeze it six times". The decision angle comes from outside suggestion.

Heronian: Yes, but you don't need the experimenter. I as an individual can say there is something that I value very much and in order to achieve that value I must realize I must do this and this and this. But without that sense of value and that path of a.b.c.d., I cannot act. I can choose that value, I don't need the experimenter to tell me. I understand your point Frank, and I agree with it; but this is only an illustration of how behavior was facilitated by an experimenter; one can be one's own experimenter.

Cooper: You place the value first, and then exercise the will. That is the order as I understand it. I run into this all the time with the inmates at the Penitentiary. They say "well, what is this going to get me?" They are saying "what value is this?" Although in the case of "Fran" we told her to choose something that had no value whatsoever and then later we were able to move her into a situation where we could explore values.

Hilton: But you were giving her the one value that no one else had given her - her own free choice.

Parks: As we can all see the question of values gets us into a problem unless we sit down and study our own will. As Assagioli says, one must start by first seeing a value of training the will. In other words, study the process instead of just talking about it intellectually. And to study the process we have to do some things and it is

a question of what exercises are possible for ourselves that will develop the will. I have a few interesting case reports from people who have made some progress. They report on some of Assagioli's exercises on the will that they have been doing.

The first one is a nurse; a very capable person, a strong personality and very helpful to clients but she has a problem of being able to accept a sister-in-law's jealousy. The sister-in-law is also a nurse but not as effective and is very jealous and angry. No matter what this client of mine does the other one stays angry and this became so painful to her, for a number of reasons, she became depressed and started drinking. No matter what she did - turned the other cheek, etc. - the sister-in-law would smack her down in anger. My client couldn't disassociate herself with the anger in the other person. Consequently she became more depressed and went into hospital and she asked me to go and see her. The hospital is about 30 miles away so I sent her the Assagioli Questionnaire which she answered. Then the next thing I did was to send her the Will Exercise and asked her to work on them. She had said that maybe the will was something she ought to work on. In this report she says:

"In regard to the will I hate and hesitate to go into the homes of patients for the first time regardless of status in the community, but once I am involved and meet the people I seem to go all out - their troubles are my troubles and I have to solve them all." She gets very involved and identifies with other people's emotions. "Yes, detachment must be developed..." the Will Exercise, standing on a chair for ten minutes, and this is her stream of consciousness as she wrote it up afterwards. Assagioli explains that you have to be aware of your experience then afterwards to sit down and succinctly write it up.

"The hardest part of the procedure was starting it. I put it off for a few hours, thinking that my legs were too tired and that I would rest first for a while. But I did not get rested to the right degree so I took myself by my will, checked the clock so that I would be sure to stay long enough, and ~~was~~ perched myself up on a chair with my arms folded in front of me, resigned to staying no matter what. I looked around the room, and politely asked our Lord to help me and then I planned to meditate and choose a subject. I looked at the clock and three minutes had gone by and

I had not found a subject on which to ponder. My mind did not want to work that hard. After five minutes I shifted my arms to my back, and in spite of a crippled knee I was relaxed. The last three minutes I had a sense of well being and was surprised that the ten minutes were up. I was not as anxious to come down as I thought I would be. And again, a small amount of will was necessary before I got down. I was very comfortable, much to my surprise. My feelings about the whole procedure were first, the opposite of what I thought which was that I would be picking the paper off the walls and getting the fidgets which didn't even happen.

Day No. 2: "Dinner was over and I went to my perch, looked at the clock and the time was one minute earlier than yesterday. Strangest to me was the lack of deliberation needed to get on with it. I stood in the stands(?) arms folded in front of me. During the entire time the shifting of my weight on my legs was less. My intention at the beginning was to relax my mind also as it seemed to do yesterday and to ask God's help and to tell me what I should do about the dissention in the family, to be strong enough to accept their actions and to enlighten me in solving them. The inner voice told me that I could do nothing and even though I knew there was suffering in some of them I must patiently wait for them to come to me and to receive them with love and detachment at the same time. Again I was surprised at how fast the time passed."

"Day No. 3: no good - too high strung and tired; my knee was paining; I stayed the ten minutes but did so without any relaxation."

"Day 4: much better; time went faster; more relaxed did not look at the clock more than three times; not tired when the time was up."

"Day 5: missed the procedure; went to sleep, woke up at 8 and had a bad day, etc."

"Day 6: left knee was injected by the doctor" (she has an arthritic knee which is paining her) "Prayer and meditation made the time pass quickly; felt better immediately afterwards."

"Day 7: I am beginning to look forward to my ten minutes. After a difficult work day my thinking was rather a jumble of things. I tried to have this time for communion with the Lord, to acquire peace (this was referring to family difficulties, the

sister-in-law had dislodged another member of the family) "we have a son who left Sunday for the army and will spend a year overseas. I find prayer the only comfort."

"Day 7: I took my perch in a very bad mental state - exhausted on the job my daughter and I wanted to go out for an evening meal and all during the whole deal my father and husband were very much a wet blanket, etc....again I have accomplished" (this is just after seven days) "is no alcohol since January the 27th" (she had been drinking considerably. This was written in the middle of March) I have eased up on valium (?) and elevum (?) pills during the day; but I must load up with pills at night to sleep. I will try to get out at night and walk enough to put me to sleep, when the weather is better."

She seems to turn to religious thoughts when she is up on the chair; the records show some of the resistances, and I do not know how much movement there has been because this is only one week's experiment.

I have another case of a boy aged about 21, fairly intelligent with a high school education. He went to work in Dayton, Ohio and then came back to Kentucky. He was working in a factory up there but was very bored because it was mechanical assembly line stuff. And he got the feeling of "what X am I doing all this for?" finally he became very introspective and depressed; there was a lot of dissension in his family; he started thinking that he could not do anything and quit his job and simply stayed in the house. He had a fear of going out and started thinking he had a mental illness and he became fixated on the idea. One of his fixations was "I cannot move my muscle." He would say "really, to pick up my hand and move it over there is an awful lot of work; and I would rather just stay in." He is not schizophrenic but more a depressed introverted kind of guy with depression. So I ~~thought~~ thought that the will is one of the main things to work with on this guy. He said that he would be willing to go out of the house and walk, so I said "Let's do that". So we set that up.

"During the last week I carried out an assignment to strengthen my will power. It was nothing that was too hard and yet it works as an effective training of the will power. In my particular case it was designed not only to stimulate my will power but

to help me overcome a fear through my will power. My assignment was to walk three miles a day for seven straight days. It would be unfair to say that this exercise worked wonders, but it has helped me to cancel out some of my fears during the physical exercise so that I can fully enjoy what I am doing. I have a fear of muscular activity in the slightest manner; it used to be too much for me to take, but I have gradually progressed to the point where I can use my muscles in an effective way without worry. Last week's assignment was helpful to me, not in a big way did it do anything, but it is a start. The fact that the activity did impress me enough was to make me set up a schedule for several days of walking during a week's time until my feelings have changed. In time I believe the will power will take its toll; will power cannot erase the fear all at once, but once the will power wins over the fears so many times fear can die down to just a memory. Some of the experiences I had during the war pointed out the use of strong will in order to overcome fear. During the first few days I worried because I did not think my will was strong enough to overcome fear of moving my muscular system. Throughout my first few walks fear was dominant, for the first half of the three miles and then it would pass away. There would be a balanced amount of fear and will power for a while; as if one was telling the other to quit - fear would tell my will power that he was the strongest and my will power would tell my fear that I was going to keep moving. During the last half mile fear did not maintain its strength and I was at peace most of the way after that. During the last three days the will power was dominant, fear would hang over my head during parts of the walk but would fade after a period of time."

There is a lot of repetition here and then the last part of his report he says: "I am anxious to get well and I will try just about anything. Even though the past week's assignment has only helped me slightly I am finally on to something and I have been confused too long. A strong will power is the answer to my problem then I will continue for as long as I can." (in answer to a question) The way his fear began was that he said that he kept thinking about muscles - how does the muscle hook on to the bone and how do you move that and so on. He was very athletic in high school - sports and football, etc., but he has become paralyzed, so to speak. When we discussed

what ~~we~~ we would do next he said "I would like to run". I would like to run half a mile and walk half a mile." So I told him to do that and write it up. He started by telling me he was willing to walk. In a sense he comes to the doctor and expects him to tell him what to do - and there is a game in that! But the thing is to get him to do what he is willing to do. And now he is willing to run as well as walk; and he brought that up, not me.

This boy is so obsessed with thinking, and he lost an interest in the outside world. He has a feeling of unreality and said "when I see people, they seem strange - I am like a Martian come down to earth." But what I think it is is that the inner tension became too great staying in the house. He agreed that he had been spending too much time in the house so I asked him if he would like to pay more attention to outside things and he said that he would. I gave him the Assagioli thing of looking at a picture and trying to notice how many items there were in it, or how many items he could see in a room so he is beginning to get his attention out. And he is going out more now.

In giving him this second exercise I told him "close your eyes. You have been sitting a long time in this room; tell me what you have seen." He listed a few obvious things but did not give many details so I told him to do this - using the picture every day and now he is working out on the details of the picture; and in his outdoors observations. I tell him to pick up a different picture each time, to choose his own and look at it for a minute. At first I said all that I want are numbers (of the items), but I want you to start looking. And then to also notice outdoor things instead of looking inward."

At first he played the psychiatrist game - "Am I schizophrenic, what medicine are you going to give me?" etc.

Riegel: As you were talking I was thinking of the definition of depression as frozen rage; and you mentioned all his exercise in high school as a method of getting out his energy. Now he is beginning to think about his energy rather than really getting it out.

Parks: In high school he was very athletic but in this period of withdrawal he was frozen. His mind was thinking but it thought circularly(?) without getting anywhere.



Now he is beginning to move out.

Cooper: That is one of the most fatiguing things - to think of movement and not doing it. That is what happens on TV; people are watching violent action but are not making the appropriate movements so at the end of an hour they are pooped. You get this exhaustion phenomenon as a result of no movement (Haronian" But isn't it the stimulation of adrenals and the stimulation of the emotions?) Yes, but without any discharge. It is not passive watching at all - if you measure it with EEGs and see what is going on on a muscular level but it is not externalized.

Haronian: This brings up the question of Casriel's approach; where a patient is in a state of congealed or frozen rage and does not want to even move his hand, would you be willing to ask him if he would be willing to express that rage?

Parks : You mean act out or pound a pillow, etc? He doesn't see that as a problem. I asked him what about his emotions and he said that he was a little irritated with his parents. But this only came up in the last interview and we intend to go into it next time. I think there is some anger towards his parents; and he also says that he is irritated with himself. There is irritation there and he has some frozen anger but as for having him beat a pillow or something like that it would be sort of artificial unless it came up and he started getting angry and I could see the anger coming up.

Haronian: This question of anger interests me very much and...Casriel says that he finds there are four levels of anger: the verbal intellectual level, the riddance anger "go away, leave me alone!", the murderous anger, "I get my hands on you I will tear you apart!", but behind that and deeper than that, if a person can be helped to experience beyond that level, there is an anger that now becomes not aggressive but self-assertive, one that says "dammit, people have been hurting me; I have let them do it and I am not going to let them do it any more." Which says in effect "I do not deserve to be treated that way and I will not let people treat me that way," but it is not an aggressive thing it is an extremely freeing type of experience. I was very impressed by Casriel's ideas but did not see it demonstrated in that particular group. I am wondering if you have come across anything of this sort and how we would fit it

into our concept of psychosynthesis - and particularly with the type of person you have just brought up.

Cooper: Casriel uses the game that they play at Synanon and Day Top; they use the "as-if" technique which we also use in psychosynthesis. He is talking at the present time about dis-identification - you move from these various types of emotion and then to an expression of the will; it is a process of dis-identification where you come into the "I am willing now to do something about my particular feelings."

Parks: I have used what Joe Wolpe (?) calls "rehearsal". It is a role playing. You get the patient to say "I am angry with my father!" and keep repeating it and pretty soon he is shouting it as the anger comes out (Haronian: That is what Casriel does) Sometimes you can use the tape recorder so the patient hears himself and in that there is some dis-identification by the very fact of "rehearsing". The idea is "I am angry but I am also looking at my anger." That is dis-identification.

Cooper: That is the important thing I see in Casriel - that he brings it out in the groups, so that you can look at it and observe it. This is ~~dis~~ dis-identification.

Haronian: But it seems to me that the dis-identification comes after one has totally identified with one's anger.

Cooper: Here in the Penitentiary I am now beginning to get some of Casriel's failures. They have been in these confrontation groups "as if", and they have failed. One man I have had been in the Synanon game for nine years and he just cannot make it; so has given me a beautiful chance to explore and see what psychosynthesis can do. And to see him now compared with as he was when he finished with the Casriel technique is like day and night.

Haronian: Are you saying that Casriel's technique is not psychosynthetic?

Cooper: I say that there are elements of it but they are not using them to the full extent. Casriel will still go back to the analytic approach every chance that he gets. He is under tremendous pressure and is still a member of the Analytical Association, and they are giving him a hard time because he uses this kind of approach. Some of ~~of~~ them stick the label on it of "Casriel's disease." Anyhow, I may have the opportunity to work with a number of Casriel dropouts; I had one the other day, one of the most

traumatic (dramatic) of the bunch and which shows how the will comes into play, and the battle of wills. The guy had retired completely from the population and gone back into his cell, living like an animal, dirty, eating with his hands, really regressed. One of the other men in my group who had also been in the Day Top business and was himself neat and clean and coming on good, saw him in his cell and said "hah! they have got you just where they want you!" This brought a battle of the wills, a sudden insight came into this man and almost in a matter of minutes he began to straighten up and cleaning himself up so that he got out of the cell in a short time. He has come a long way since then, he is exercising and building his muscles and is really beginning to participate. But it took Bruno saying "they have got you where they want you!" which brought out the will. He was going to show that they were not winning. Once he saw that he was willing to do something else.

(Following comment from afternoon session during the Riegel debacle which in part harked back to this discussion. FH)

Parks: From the viewpoint of the Ouspensky system negative emotions such as anger are illusions, images that you believe in. <sup>that</sup> ~~but~~ the analyst believes in. In their view the only real emotion is love. It is not so much that you got anger out but that you were able to experience love; you suddenly became a person because you experienced positive emotion (Haronian: Why didn't you say that before? This answers the question I raised three times.)

Hilton: This morning, John, you gave us x reports from people to whom you had given the exercises on the will but then we got side-tracked and I have the feeling that you still have a lot to give us.

Parks† There were a few more persons who worked on the will exercises † and I can give you a few cases. This is one of our group therapists in our clinic in Kentucky; and she is much interested in the will. She was raised as an orphan, her parents were killed in a plane crash when she was one year old, and she had got an image of herself as an orphan in an orphanage an impersonal system where there is a certain distance between yourself and the authorities. In a sense, you are overly determined, the relationship with the higher, the parents, etc. is questionable; you become

overly self-sufficient. She has a problem within herself of either being overly self-sufficient or else getting into a relationship with a person and losing herself - she has an intuitive ability to get inside another person and knows exactly how they feel. She feels that she might get trapped in them and not get out. These are her words, this is her image. So then I asked her if we could anything with will about this. This is what she says and it goes back to what we were saying about values and motives. She has read Assagioli's writings on the will and this is one of her statements after she had thought about it for a few weeks:

"As an exercise in training my will I have thought to look at motivations and why I have become involved in each specific situation that arises before I reach a decision? I have become increasingly aware of my need to seek involvement in programs, lectures and with other people. My motivation apparently being to seek knowledge, truth and strength or whatever was being offered by the other person. Truth is outside of myself. I feel that if I do examine my motivations I will grow and in turn help others with techniques or methods I have discovered. In evaluating this procedure I have become aware of the harm I have done to myself by allowing every wind and tide to carry me away, by being sucked into other people's games. I have lost touch with my inner voice, communication, cliches of truths influencing people who trusted me to do the same.(?) I have a strong will and I am aware of this. I can do that which I will, so it is especially dangerous to use this gift unwisely." (Parks: She sees the potency of making a decision to become involved, and in the decision to stay uninvolved.) "It is especially dangerous to use this gift unwisely and if I don't carefully consider every person. In order to discipline myself I put aside 15 minutes at the end of my meditation (Parks: She observes a period of meditation every morning) "to contemplate carefully each project or person she is in love with that has been presented by each situation that has been recommended to me (Parks: That comes in front of her vision, the possibility of involvement) "I ask ~~me~~ myself 'whose needs are being met? why do this thing?' if it is basically my need, I question my motives intensely; in other words, if I want to learn something or to seek knowledge outside of myself. If I allow myself to fantasy what I desire, and then I respond to this

(Parks: She allows herself to fantasy or build an image of what she desires about herself in this situation; then listening to what the other person is requesting.

In other words, "what is there about me that makes me strongly want to do this."

In other words if she wants to do something <sup>and</sup> it is too intense "watch out!"

(Cooper: She would assume it would be someone else's image?) (Parks: Yes.) "As honestly as I can see, if it is an attempt to evade looking for truth or strength in myself, then I reject the project and say 'no'. If I see taking the case, it usually means accepting a group or a patient, that it means self-aggrandisement or an attempt to please others then I refuse it and say 'no'."

Cooper: Has she seen the book, as I am reading the paragraph right here - "vanity, pride, the desire to please others."

Parks: No, she says this herself. She is always worrying about pleasing others.

With the nuns in the orphanage she would either try to please them or fight against them. So, if the motivation is to please them she refuses the case. She is weak.

She goes on to say: "If on the other hand, after examining the situation, it will be a positive experience or if I can accept the motivation as authentic" (Cooper: I

get the impression here that she is so serious....and unless you can move into a true game or something of that nature; it has got to be done lightly. She is far too

serious. Somehow, John, can you get her to loosen up a bit? The best incentive is

that which uses the ludic instinct; as Assagioli says "a sporting contest with

oneself." And this demands a certain ~~off~~ proficiency in dis-identification for in it

the self plays with its sub-personalities and drives, treating as a kind of game. Not

taking the matter too seriously, trying to win <sup>the</sup> game like a good sportsman, but to become

interested in the game itself gives the drive which being interesting and amusing

arouses no resistance or active opposition which a much more forceful imposition of

the will would call forth." (p. 137 of the Manual) I think this is tremendously im-

portant for I see over and over again in working with will, the determination factor.

This was "Fran's" whole thing. She was so determined and would write pages of what she

should do - it was "the tyranny of the should"; and it wasn't until we began to play

games that she could see it in another light that did not mobilize this part. And

(Parks: She allows herself to fantasize or build an image of what she desires about

herself in this situation; then listening to what the other person is requesting.

In other words, "what is there about me that makes me strongly want to do this."

In other words if she wants to do something it is too intense "wait a minute!"

(Cooper: She would assume it would be someone else's image?) (Parks: Yes.) "As

honestly as I can see, if it is an attempt to evade looking for truth or strength in

myself, then I reject the project and say 'no'. If I see taking the case, it usually

means accepting a group or a patient, that it means self-encouragement or an attempt

to please others then I refuse it and say 'no'."

(Cooper: Has she seen the book, as I am reading the paragraph right here - "avoiding

pride, the desire to please others."

Parks: No, she says this herself. She is always worrying about pleasing others.

With the nurse in the orphanage she would either try to please them or fight against

them. So, if the motivation is to please them she refuses the case. She is weak.

She goes on to say: "If on the other hand, after examining the situation, it will

be a positive experience or if I can accept the motivation as authentic" (Cooper: I

get the impression here that she is so serious...and unless you can move into a true

game or something of that nature; it has got to be done lightly. She is far too

serious. Somehow, John, can you get her to loosen up a bit? The best incentive is

that which uses the ludic instinct; as Maslow says "a sporting contest with

oneself." And this demands a certain proficiency in dis-identification for in it

the self plays with its sub-personalities and drives, treating as a kind of game. Not

taking the matter too seriously, trying to win game like a good sportsman, but to become

interested in the game itself gives the drive which being interesting and amusing

arouses no resistance or active opposition which a much more forceful imposition of

the will would call forth." (p. 137 of the Manual). I think this is tremendously im-

portant for I see over and over again in working with will, the determination factor.

This was "Tren's" whole thing. She was so determined and would write pages of what she

should do - it was "the tyranny of the should"; and it wasn't until we began to play

games that she could see it in another light that did not mobilize this part. And

these negative images of "unwise", "I question my motives", etc. - there is no end to them. There is no end to the conflict between the will and the imagination. Imagination is going to win, the will doesn't have a chance until you change the images.

(Hilton: She needs to build an image of the "joyful will".) Yes, make it fun, playful and pleasurable.

Parks: I think she can get into that for somehow or other I think she resented doing this exercise. With this particular task I don't think she truly entered into it... ~~It~~ I think it is linked with this orphanage thing and in giving it to her she saw me as the Mother Superior. Then there is the other mode where she is smiling and relaxed (next minute lost in cross talk)

Hilton: I think we have got to get people to see the will as a releasing, freeing thing - dropping these troubles off on one side.

Cooper: This is the crux of the whole thing about the will, to free it. The term "free will" but it is such a small minute force as we understand it that imagination and any type of image can offset it.

Rodger: Perhaps its power is small like the roots of the birch in Palisades Park, so small they go where other things cannot get in.

Cooper: But the power in it is that it is always persistent; the will is always there and it can be mobilized and used. But the images we have and project to counter the will are fantastic.

Hilton: I think we have to build a new image of the will; as Roberto says, first think about the will and its advantages and then write them down. This is building a new image of the will.

Cooper: I'd like to read here from Assagioli's book (p. 141) (on "the ways of minimizing and offsetting the dangers and drawbacks of the over-development of the dynamic aspect of the will, which can have <sup>injurious</sup> ~~injurious~~ and even destructive effects, especially on others."

"The third and highest way, which partially includes the second method, is the awakening and functioning of the spiritual will, connected with the realization of the spiritual Self. This checks and utilizes the personal will in not only

a harmless but also a constructive way, and fre<sup>2</sup>es the personal will from exploitation by a prevalent drive. In the ordinary man, the will is the slave of one or several personal drives. Here the first necessity is to achieve a dis-identification of the personal self from those drives, and then the dedication of the personal will to the spiritual will; or inversely the spiritual will, and the S<sup>2</sup>piritual Self, takes possession of and utilizes the personal will."

And this is the next stage as far as I am concerned. Once we have freed up the will so that it is joyful, free and easy we can begin to see some of the images which oppose it and begin to dispel them; and as those images are <sup>disposed</sup> ~~disappeared~~ of the will becomes freer. We use the same technique of an image of the will as now strong.

Hilton: We can take Dr. Roger's image ~~of~~ and build on it - of a small tendril that can get in anywhere but see it as being linked to an inexhaustible power supply; just as we see the personal self as being linked to the Self.

Moles: When we think of the personal will we think of it as impulsivity, doing things that you are sorry for later.

Cooper: But I think that impulse comes from another level; it comes from images. Like at the check-out counter where you have the impulse to buy something.

Moles: What would be the relation of the will to the impulse; does the will delay this?

Haronian: What about thinking of the will in relation to the impulse as the driver in relation to the car? Do I drive it or not?

Moles: Then you delay the personal will until the spiritual will takes over? (Haronian: but now you are jumping from the personal will to the spiritual will.)

Hilton: I think what Ed is saying is that the personal will says "hold on a minute! Is this impulse in line with the higher will?" (Moles: Yes.) It is that pause of deliberation before making a decision, pausing and asking is this in line with the highest good

Hilda Hilton: Then it is changing from personal will to the will to good - a transmutation, in other words.

Hilton: The personal will is just concerned with the good of oneself, the spiritual will is the good of the whole. And here comes in true impersonal relationships in



acting for the good of the whole.

Riegel: May I ask a philosophical question? There are three modes of truth in history: in Greek times truth was Sophia, to think an ideal; in Jewish times it was Javah, which was truth through experience and reflection on the experience; and Tillich sums up Christian truth as to do the truth, you find truth in the doing. As I listened I thought that much of the talk here on will was Sophia, to think the will. Is this true?

Hilton. No. In the exercises which John was speaking of this morning this is the doing side, using of the will (Riegel: But it was the writing down?) No, those were simply reports of their use and exercising of the will.

Haronian: I would like to present a picture of the relationships of these words that we have been using. Start with the functions in the Jungian sense - ~~sensation~~ sensation, intuition, feeling, thinking - and Roberto adds imagination and drive; although I don't like the word "drive" because it sounds like energy. But consider these as functions of the personality; these are like tools that we have, they are parts of the personality that we can use. We use them under the control, hopefully, of the self. Whereas if a person identifies with his thinking process, the thinking is really dominating the self; but if things are functioning properly the self is up here and it has its will - its personal will - and it chooses whether it will use one of these functions or the other for a particular job. The line of control goes this way normally, but in pathology it might go the other way or where ~~am~~ I am identified with my esthetic sensitivity or my capacity to produce or perform in some way with my beautiful feelings so that these things control me. But once I establish the control, in time these may be expressed either introversively or extroversively in a rhythmic way. But then comes the relationship of this will to the higher Self. This is the question that you, Jack, raised. Let me put it another way: in growing up I changed my identification from something down here - I am<sup>a</sup>/great bike rider or get high marks in math or what not - to identifying with myself here, but how do I move up to identify with my higher Self?

Molas: I was saying that the personal will is developed as a delaying device so that

the spiritual will could take effect.

Haronian: I see it as a stepping stone. As I see it, if at any particular time I want to know how mature I am I have to look and see what I am identifying with, at what particular level am I personally identified? If I am identified with the higher Self no matter what is happening I am identified with the good of all in some way or other; and I am oriented automatically to thinking, feeling and behaving towards what is good for the largest number. On the other hand if I am down here I am always identified with some partial function of the personality.

Cooper: Since we are wrestling with this, let me read you some more from the book (p. 142): "There is a difference, not always recognized, between the fully awakened spiritual will and the obedience of the personal will to a higher feeling. For many patients, at a particular stage of the treatment, the latter may be the line of least resistance: i.e., there is a transfer of the emotional energy motivating the will from a lower to a higher level, yet still remaining an emotional motivating force, although with more constructive aims." (Hilton: This is where the higher unconscious comes in, the higher impulses which are not necessarily the same thing as the spiritual will of the higher Self.) Yes, and this is where we get trapped sometimes. Assagioli goes on to say, "But, of course, the establishing of a direct relation to the spiritual will, to the Self is the goal of psychosynthesis. This means the developing of a constructive, strong, persevering and wise will" - in essence, a fusion of what we consider to be some of the fundamental energies in the human being, viz. the energy of will and the energy of love, so that we eventually have in operation a 'loving will'. The word 'fusion' used above could be substituted by 'organically coordinated functioning'; i.e., that is a functional fusion and not real fusion in a literal sense. Here the biological analogy is illuminating: there is no material fusion of organs or apparatus in the body - they remain anatomically and physiologically distinct - but their fusion is a functional unity, directed by what could be called a very able interlocked directorate with the summit in the central nervous system, which operates through the other nervous centers and the endocrine glands."

The theologians would say "to become a living soul"; that is what is expressed in these words here. But I think our problem is - we read these words and

talk - just what is spiritual will? I think we confuse it, as Frank has said over and over again, we get about the second stage where we have the obedience of the personal will to the higher feeling of some kind and I don't think that we are essentially in contact with the spiritual will.

Riegel: Is it a case of "many are called but few are chosen"?

Grace

Rodger: Theologically, isn't that where grace comes in? God does what you cannot do.

Cooper: I'll go along with that I buy that; Grace takes over but is that a function of the higher consciousness rather than the spiritual will?

Rodger: Isn't it a reaching up beyond the true self to the Power, the Source of all love?

Hilton: But you have to do it yourself.- warrant the "grace".

Cooper: I posit the question "Is it the spiritual will for us to be on earth?" This is the existential problem that we are faced with at the moment (Haronian: You mean is it our own will that keeps us here?) Yes, that keeps us here; if we say will-to-good on earth and then we define good as being - what? I still come back to my old story about the ~~farmer~~ farmer and a preacher came up to him and saw the beautiful field lined up in straight rows. The preacher said "how beautiful; you and God have certainly done a good job." And the farmer replied "You should have seen it when God had it on His own!" It's this kind of thing that I am asking at the present time. Is it the spiritual will that we be on earth? (Haronian: What's the alternative?) I don't have any. This question comes back to me more and more in meditation: do we have a job on earth?

Hilton: The trouble is we make a mistake of separating: saying "we" and then the spiritual Self, whereas Life is one and we cannot cut ourselves off. In this discussion we have jumped from personal will to spiritual will to some vague higher something that the theologians would call God's Will. Are we ~~really~~ a partial expression of the spiritual will - instead of trying to start from the top down let us start from the bottom up.

Rodger: ...you get a lot more energy and feel more comfortable if you make the attempt to line yourself up with the higher Will.

Cooper: But you are posing that the spiritual will is in opposition to your personal will.

Rodger: No, not necessarily in opposition but the more you get in tune with that Will - whatever it is - and reach towards it through meditation or listening or being still, the more you grow, the more comfortable you feel and the more energy you have.

(Cooper: You use the word "growth"; what do you mean?) The evolutionary growth, spiritual evolution.

Hilton: Haven't we to assume that there ~~is~~ a whole new set of laws to be discovered? We have discovered the natural laws and we are just realizing what a god awful mess we have made of the world through breaking the laws of ecology, and in speaking of the spiritual self we are assuming a higher order of being which we are just discovering. ....the laws are there; who or what made them is beside the point.

Cooper: You assume then that growing would be an increasing recognition of spiritual laws?

Hilton: Yes, Teilhard de Chardin says the next step for man is beyond manhood as we presently understand it; he speaks of the noosphere

Cooper: I don't think any of the laws can be broken. <sup>Rodger</sup> Cooper: But it is like gravity, if you ignore the law of gravity and jump off the roof no matter what you are going to fall to earth.

R: ...There are laws, laws, laws, but on the relative level people have to choose between the lesser good and the greater good...physical laws and metaphysical laws control the whole.

Cooper: They are there and we uncover them and we learn to live by acts of will within the framework of the law. (Moles: This is where we have free choice) We have choice but my quarrel is with the business of "free". I think we need a lot of thinking on this word "free." But again, it is a semantic tie-up. (Haronian: It is redundant to say free choice.) Yes, let's say choice; then we can choose. In my present bunch of inmates in group therapy at the Penitentiary, I am trying to get them to choose everything that happens to them during the day, as an exercise. When the guard tells them to get up, instead of thinking that he is making them get up, I am getting them to say

"I choose to get up". If they shave they say "I choose to shave."

Hilton: They are deciding how to respond to the order.

Rodger: They are deciding to go along with the law.

Cooper: I am only doing this with them as an exercise and I am waiting to see what will happen. If they disobey the order they would, of course, be punished or one out of a bunch who refused would be signified out for punishment, As an example to the group.

Hilton: The choice you are giving them, Jack, is more subtle - whether they will obey the order willingly.

Cooper: Right. All that I am trying to get them to do, when a guard gives them an order is to say "I choose to do it."

Parks: If he really means it.

Cooper: Well at the next session I will know - at present it is an experiment.