

# Addictive Constrictions

*Walter O'Connell*

The heroic ideal of the theory of the natural high (*NH*) is the self-creation of constant puzzlement and involvement-without-attachment (O'Connell 1979a). Such authentic persons would be guided in personal conduct by the behaviors implicit in the three levels of self-actualization, yet be ever-ready to question even the natural high premises through basic involvement in the scientific attitude. The latter goes far beyond projecting an aura of magic manipulation with numbers. The scientific attitude in practice is a reflection of the truly actualized (or hominized) being: one truly aware of the "how's" and "why's" of self-generated feelings of worth and belonging and the full necessity of the humorous attitude as a way of detached involvement. However, in actuality what often passes for this scientific ideal is a variation of the ancient ego-game of hidden addictions: "I create an image to seek power (interpersonal influence) outside of myself, simply because I lack the inner strength (or actualization) of inherent self-esteem (SE) and social interest (SI) or universal belonging. Moreover, I will seldom admit this purpose even to myself."

In like manner, we are faced with institutionalized addictions (or constrictions), a kind of collective ego-addiction. Such unexamined ego-addictions (or ego-constrictions) turn professions into guilds. All addictions, whether individualized or shared, function tenaciously and unwittingly. Perpetrators of such diseases are not aware of the presence or importance of this defensive crippling. Addictions are a tragicomic waste: their presence is a tragedy because the catalytic powers of expressing one's real love for self and other (SE and SI) is lost to the world. Such ideas are what Teilhard de Chardin (1969) was trying to express when he saw all the dissipated energy of mankind, forever being lost at each sunset. On the other hand, addictions are comic from an objective, God's-eye view. Ego addictions, in addition to being a heinous waste of time, energy, and potential, would be totally unnecessary if each human would consistently practice, ideally with the encouragement of a similarly-minded support group, contemplating the inherent self-worth and innate universal belonging of each person.

Ego constrictions (or addictions) are part of each personal identity, subtly incorporated from parental figures and peers: who one was defined, miscast, and validated as being, and what one should never think, feel, say, or do. For most persons, life is the process of slavishly obeying or slavishly resisting

---

*Walter O'Connell is a Clinical Psychologist at the Veterans Administration Medical Center, 2002 Holcombe Blvd., Houston, Texas 77211.*

such inner dictates. Ego-addictions continue every moment through our internalized sentences containing invidious comparisons, demandments, and negative nonsense. Life is thereby that process in which one diminishes self, others, and life itself, then reactively becomes greedy and grasping for power or influence. But as Adler noted almost 70 years ago (O'Connell, 1975), any power earned is never enough to compensate for the loss of inner strength (SE and SI). The grasping, controlling efforts at power throw one off center; hyperdependency and passive or active compensation ensue. By this inner process, one becomes addicted to certain strokes from other folks as proof of one's worth and power.

## **Therapeutic Manipulations**

Part of the therapeutic stance is gently-but-firmly "manipulating" the client to see the humor involved in the role of the psychic yo-yo: actively putting the self down, then madly striving reactively for interpersonal, external power.

"How funny! How do you interpret approval? You remind me of my dogs who nudge my hand for strokes. How do you know for certain that the other *really* means the special message you decide is there? And will you have any pampering tomorrow? And from how many others, what proportion of the time?"

All of this interaction in *NH* practice is done with mutuality; the client can practice looking for addictions and constrictions in the teacher (therapist). There is no blame or punishment intended for anyone. However, part of the therapist's goal is to openly inquire about such demandments and negative nonsense, anticipating the client's reactive negativity.

"When I'm pointing out stupid acts, I'm not saying you're a stupid person. In fact, you're highly creative in keeping (or resisting) your idea of who you learned to think you were."

The *NH* therapist is ever alert at anticipating possible untoward ego-reactions, Adler's tactic of "spitting in the soup" (O'Connell, 1975).

"I'd like to give you some feedback on important mistakes, but I'm concerned that you might use my feedback to diminish yourself (or me, or life)."

Psychotherapy in the *NH* tradition extends far beyond the mutual transactions of the treatment hour. *NH* has anticipated the emergence of holistic medicine (Pelletier, 1979). The patient is regarded as an active agent: In *NH* therapy, all students learn from the therapist's interpretations that they have *never* been the passive victims they (and outmoded therapy models)

assume that they are. Natural resources of the environment could be conserved if our ego addictions (clinging to material goods and services) became outmoded. Most illnesses are stress-related: patients can learn, especially through practicing humor, that disabling stress can often be converted to eustress. What was once a dis-ease can become a play-full challenge to be shared with others. "Let me share my phobia-skills with you and see if you can help me to increase or decrease them. Perhaps we can put the lyrics to music."

*NH* does not compartmentalize, dualize, dichotomize. Any actualization aids the universe: If such a view increases SE and SI, it is true. Good psychiatry and psychology are good religion; both must remain instrumental ("how to"), not institutional ("who is licensed"), to help create a growth society.

### **Giving Psychology Away**

George Miller, in Adlerian spirit, wants to give psychology away. "I would tell them to stop looking at individual responsibility and start looking at social institutions. I'd ask them to examine the conditions that take responsibility away from people, that let them regard others as a species apart" (Miller, 1980, p. 45). For over 20 years (O'Connell, 1975), my pen and feed have been attuned to Miller's suggestion. As in the case of the unidentified wee-lad in the tale of *The Emperor's New Clothes*, such feedback has never been welcomed and honored by institutions. Miller's give-away seems to imply that institutions are awaiting critical feedback with open arms. As long as power and worth is dependent upon success in external images, open sharing is unlikely. In reality, psychology training programs would have to take quite seriously the task of creating self-actualizing students who could, with humor and without discouragement, be "as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves," in reaction to wily entrapments and rebuffs (O'Connell, 1981). In the Miller message, there is gross neglect of the constant operation of ego-and institutional-constrictions (or addictions) mentioned earlier.

An acute awareness of these debilitating processes, can be a danger for the unactualizing "reformer". One must be wary of the most subtle trap, the discouragenesis involved in incorporating a paranoid-patterning of inequality of persons. When the world is separated into the "us" and "them," the encapsulated good-guys and bad-guys, dyadic responsibility for actions and reactions disappears (O'Connell, 1975, 1979a). In accepting this dichotomy of the isolated other, two cardinal points are ignored. The first is the errors of behavioral mission and commission that *contribute* to autocratic discouragement of others. *NH* theory, especially level II, stipulated actual (and actualizing) behaviors for which each person is responsible. The second error in arrogating characterological qualities to persons is that people might project shadow and archetypal qualities on others. After such projections, they can

then, free of guilt, do unto the other as they would not want done unto them. The sobering thought is that we all have either currently operating constrictions or a potential for diminishment of life from our early identity. As no one grew up identity-less, so one is free from at least the potential for "being the bad guy."

In effect what all this means is that people are responsible for the state of their own esteem and belonging no matter how rejecting the environment. This state of control is constantly reflected in acts toward others. By allowing openness for feedback and self-disclosure (or lack of it), humans are responsible for contributing, positively or negatively, to the lifestyles of others. And so you and I can behave like that very institution we often rail against. We can use that institution as an excuse not to risk teaching actualization to others ("What good would it do, if important others *never* listen").

Perhaps what George Miller really means is that we are responsible for making the *effort* to give non-blaming feedback, regardless of the reactions of others. "We should say, it is my opinion, based on my intuition and on my training as a psychologist" (p. 49).

### **Humor, Holy Humor!**

For 30 years this has been one of my messages. Humor can be learned, but who is actualized enough to teach? And what do I mean by humor? To me it's now rather clear, still most psychologists have not been so involved at all with this concept over time. For self-training in humor, novices must learn their own skills (not sickness) in diminishment, gladly accepting the presence of their mistaken certainties. The same search for ego-diminishments must be accomplished with social interest and courage (level II). Some students keep a log of their mistakes (level I) and their practice of the steps of encouragement (level II). After meditation is fairly-well mastered, focus on imagery of worth and belonging becomes possible (level III). Again, a continuous log or diary is in order to be shared with others, but not "analyzed" for impersonal psychopathology. The third prerequisite for the sense of humor is a robust appreciation of the paradoxes of life in the spirit of Adler, Jung, and Moreno.

Ernest Becker (1973) described the existential paradox at length. Unfortunately he regarded the split in preceptions between our God-like symbolic nature and that of our bodily decay as a fixed gulf. Yet in *NH*, all paradoxes are temporally-re-solved through the humorous swing, that sudden enlivening switch in perception between the poles of a paradox. Taking Becker's existential paradox as an example, we can see how those with SE and SI diminishments cannot make sudden affective swings between the poles of a paradox. As an example of inflexibility with the existential paradox, paranoid thinking starts with fixations on the death-decay pole, that of basic unworth and temporality. Isolation is an absolute characteristic for

mental disturbances: "I alone have this secret unpardonable sin." The paranoid secret-of-failure is to hide the presence of this basic unworth and switch to a compensatory grandiose, God-likeness, again unshared with others. When others react against the paranoid violation of time, place, and person mores, society intervenes with hospitalization. Now there follows more interpersonal grounds for unworth, yet for tremendous power in the negative sense. We move against and institutionalize our paranoids, unless, of course, we become followers of their hatreds and implicit promises.

In Adler's writings there is the constant theme that "anything can be anything else" (O'Connell, 1979a). Translated into *NH* terminology, affective perceptions to life are governed by internally-generated feelings of worth and belonging. Depressed patients find proof for what they already believe—and so do we all. An actualizer can find in an apparent rebuff an opportunity to practice the steps of encouragement (level II). On the other hand, the mentally-ill catastrophize such interpersonally happenings. Perhaps with humor, we can actually build up even our biochemical morphine-like pain-resistors. For with adequate SE and SI, surely less pain is felt, both physically and psychologically.

Moreno gives an example of one bipolar, re-solvable puzzle. "To conceive of what is most universal and most distant as being so near that it can be felt and touched is the paradox of the Christian God" (1941, p. 154). There are scores of paradoxes in human existence: religious-secular, male-female, past-now, self-other, inner-outer. To be fixated on either pole for proof of esteem and worth only invites future diminishment and despair. It may be that humorists were, in early life, so addicted or constricted. As humorists, they note their mistakes and errors in the present, and suddenly swing to the other pole. Carl Jung (1963) gives a perfect example with his divergent feelings about his mother's death. Death brings *both* sadness and gladness. For the humorist, both affects are experienced in sequence. From the point of the ego, all death is a horrible complete cutting-off of relationships. From the stance of the self (level III), death is a re-union of the timeless eternal self with its universal self, the ultimate in transcendent social interest. Cults capitalize on charismatic leaders to obliterate the sadness of death, with the promise of only future gladness (O'Connell, 1980a). Both poles are not experienced in the here-and-now moment, in cultish repressions.

Jung's whole approach was toward the reconciliation of opposites: ego-shadow, ego-self, ego-collective unconscious archetypes, archetypes (such as animus-anima, reconciling with each other). Unfortunately, like Becker, he did not concentrate on the actualizing strength of the humorist. Yet Jung's underlying message was always: life is not either-or but *both*. Such priceless wisdom is lost in times of ego-and institutional-addiction. For then, the emphasis is on the image of perfection in circumscribed roles, goals, and controls. Flow is seldom experienced, hence fun is very rare. True humor is still very rare because it is so unstudied and untaught. Humor is the kingpin of

all actualization. Its use in self-humor, type B (O'Connell, 1976), is predicated upon a constantly practiced sense of worth and belonging. An affinity for loving mysteries or paradoxes is utmost. Humans are a strange combination of Gods and decay, male and female, unique and similar, operating in the sacred and secular, the now and the then. But, above all, within the forces of our "thrownness" and "fates," we have the potential inner strength to actualize symbols of worth and universal belonging. This mystery of self (SE) and other (SI) orientation, when regarded as a re-solvable paradox—not a dualism—is our greatest gift to ourselves and our evolving universe.

I recall the humor of Mark Twain who was so skilled at seeing the ridiculousness of others in a gentle loving way (type B humor) and was almost overwhelmed in later life by the pettiness of man. He could have profited from an existential knowledge of natural high premises. A great tragedy is awareness of the mechanisms of humor without a solid optimistic transpersonal theory to understand its operation.

Most of Twain's humor shines a light on the human paradox. He had a tale, herein paraphrased, of a skipper of a small leaky coast-bound ship who struggled for recognition. Whenever another ship came near, he made his presence known with a blasting stentorian questioning of the other's name. One foggy day, he shouted at an unrecognizable hulk, "Who are you?"

"I am the King of Ceylon, 143 days out of Hong Kong, laden with precious spices for Boston" was the reply.

Then out of the fog came this huge, svelte, sailing ship, cutting a graceful course, seemingly with miles of canvas to the wind and a hundred eager hands nimbly at work.

"And what be you?" came to cry from the King of Ceylon.

"The Beggar of Bangor, five hours out of Boston, bound for Kennebunkport, with nothing special."

We are all Beggars of Bangor, nothing unique and special from the rest of mankind. Yet we are all Kings of Ceylon, capable of plying our seemingly arbitrary fates into rich inner treasures. Scientific proof? You'll find it after you practice this art of humor (O'Connell, 1976, 1979a, 1979b, 1980b, O'Connell & Bright, 1977).

### **The Missing Link: Self-Training in Competence on Three Dimensions**

While on vacation I became attuned to the rhythms of the television schedule, that unworthy substitute for the pulsations of deep and broad

transactions of life. One of the continuing talks shows has captured my fancy in its efforts to project the image of a dialogue between opposing forces on basic issues of society. Early on, I was struck by glaring problems which no one else seemed to recognize. Proponents of any of these TV issues aired appeared quite plausible because the missing intellectual keystone made any semblance of sense impossible. Whether the debate concerned working mothers, abortions, homes for the aged, lack of educational programs on TV, or easy divorces, all argumentation was interminable because of a complete absence of a dynamic theory of human growth with specific, palpable concepts. All questions of sampling and measurement are relatively minor in contrast to the colossal question of what behaviors do we evaluate, according to what criteria. This question of valuing has been adroitly devalued since long before Freud. But his name comes most easily to the modern mind (Becker, 1973, 1975). In orthodox psychiatry, all variables were to be reduced to mere epiphenomena of the physiological flow of molecules, in the eventual control of professionals. The crusade to create images, packaged flawlessly and simplified, has given us the *CWAMA* (count-weight-and-measure-addict): one who suffers withdrawal symptoms when the quantification addiction is not quickly satisfied (O'Connell, 1979a). But the *CWAMA* is simply one example of Becker's (1975) "fetishization," the grasping for the easy, facile, and isolated. We are now faced with the ultimate in profanation: a world which labels, drugs, and shocks rather than try to unravel the pattern on human responsibilities, contributions, and like complexities. Am I my brother's keeper or contributor? The answer: everyone is both!—at all times.

Our world has become one in which economics is supposed to bring happiness in work and consumption. Yet this consumption has been instrumental in creating scarcity and a host of environmental problems. Satiated with consumption-ideation, I am cancelling my subscription to an economic newsletter because it predicts only chaos and catastrophe. Here as elsewhere, the missing element is a theory and practice, such as the natural high, which looks at life as a complex human transaction, of more than economic forces. Natural high is a matter of asking the right questions, a most pressing project in our daze of discouragement. Nothing is more important than a good theory which can provide an optimistic anchor, and suggest viable questions while generating robust research.

In the words of Rudolf Dreikurs, psychiatry's prophet for this century (O'Connell, 1975), professions are bankrupt but will not face the fact. One sign of this awe-full bankruptcy of teaching tactics, strategies, and goals is in the multiplicity (and duplicity) of "pop" psychologies which promise, in pleasant packaging, all the answers in easy array, making existential questions irrelevant. For example, the *EST* movement (O'Connell & Bright, 1977) answers the koan "What is the sound of one hand clapping?" with "It's the sound of one hand clapping." *EST* leaves out "others" (level II) seen as simply "desiring" whatever they are suffering. The trans-personal-intuitive (level III) is

ignored by isolating and flattening life into a single egocentric dimension. Even the unidimensional diminishment-pride cycle is not offered in systematic detail for *EST* pilgrims to make their own trips, as in *NH* level I.

### **Rote Encouragement?**

Colleagues in Adlerian psychology have managed to overlook my work on encouragement (O'Connell, 1975) and so trivialize, yet market well a sort of instant, isolated encouragement. Encouragement can be simplified, well-packaged and marketed and seldom used. The movement reminds one of the declining days of pilgrimages. Personal responsibility for the constant transactions with others could be avoided by substituting mechanical, meaningless movements, a choice of religiosity over religiously-purposive acts. At the same time, the pilgrim could enjoy the pleasures of travel while feeling superior to those who stayed at home. Likewise, encouragement can be marketed as simple sets of instructions; in fact, the steps could be institutionalized and never practiced, moment-by-moment. To clear the muddle, a distinction must be made between *techniques* and motivation. And beyond that point, an awareness of a distinction between isolated techniques and dyadic (units-of-two) techniques is essential. The effects of these distinctions go beyond the encouragement issue; they are necessary for a viable psychology and psychiatry as well. Unless adequate self-training on the importance of self-worth and social interest is available on both levels I and III, few persons will ever consistently practice the dyadic steps of level II, courage or encouragement.

Natural high theory originally high-lighted encouragement as a deep dialogue between two persons, cooperating-as-equals. In fact, the steps of encouragement were seen as operational definitions of Adler's courage (*active* social interest). In a wider sense, all three levels of *NH* are *self-encouragement* because the *NH* emphasis is on self-training in expansion of worth and belong. This inner accretion of SE and SI does not diminish anyone else. In actuality, the opposite is true: from a God's-eye view, the here-and-now moment is peopled with fellow creatures, constantly expanding, contracting, and stabilizing SE and SI. Other psychological variables—love, anger, sexuality, mental illness, substance abuse, etc.—are by-products of states of SE and SI actualization.

Nevertheless, encouragement in the orthodox Adlerian meaning is interpersonal, level II. Stock phrases are useless in themselves for encouragement. One needs to know where the other is in relation to actualization or diminishment of SE and SI to know how a message sent will be perceived and recalled. Constant feedback given and asked for is an inherent part of all level II steps (O'Connell, 1975). It is the other's perception of my intended or unintended message which decides whether or not the relationship is one of encouragement or discouragement. Encouragenesis (or



vice versa) is only so in the eyes of the dyadic beholder. Thankfully or otherwise, no numbers can be reliably fixed on SE and SI movement as yet. So empathic intuition, based upon the other's behaviors, must still be used. But until the day arrives when states of actualization can be put into numbers with a reliable validity, the Adlerian question must continue to be asked: "what can we do about it, cooperating-as-equals?" Hopefully more can be attempted than numb the other with labels, drugs, scalpels, electricity—and discouragement.

The inter-personal process of encouragement touches every discipline. This observation is very striking with religious communities who believe in name-magic. If they call it "community," then it must be so. Institutionalized religion is devoted to theocentric, abstract end-states. Process thinking is anathema, because creation is wrongly perceived to have stopped forever at "the seventh day." *NH* theory maintains, on the other hand, that the communities can no longer wait for God to "infuse" SE and SI. *We* are creation every moment. Every act of faith, good or bad, is the creation of an active agent. The "victim," non-consciously "deciding" whether others are encouraging or discouraging, does not really exist. Everything can be seen as anything else, depending upon each person's creative efforts at expansion and constriction. In *NH* world, there are no passive victims, no isolated persons, no solid external proof of one's worth or unworth. If Lincoln did not really free slaves, *NH* therapy does.

### **Therapeutic Communities: A Quarter-Century Later**

And in the world of mental hospitals, what interesting has happened from my first venture with early therapeutic communities, in the 50's (O'Connell, 1961), to my latest contact, at the end of the 70's? Nothing much, except discouragement, from what I see. In earlier days, therapeutic communities, which arrived with the advent of the tranquilizer, offered much hope to a more hopeful world. Shortly before the unwise national commitment to intervene in Asian politics, the early 60's appeared to be an apt occasion for mental hospital movement into the community, buoyed with optimistic energy and ready cash. But the money flowed elsewhere, tranquilizers did not live up to the advanced noticed as anti-psychotic panaceas, and, of course, no one in authority pushed for the creation of a dynamic developmental theory of both pathology and actualization.

Now at the beginning of the 80's, the therapeutic community to which I have been assigned, like the rest of the world seems fixated on mainly useless power ploys (O'Connell, 1979a). Destructive dyads are so easy to spot against a backdrop of the ideal steps of encouragement. Staff functions often become gossip: one only hears about the drinking and the delusional patient. What behaviors will be acceptable as symptoms of a disease and what is purposeful, subject to operant conditioning? A well-functioning therapeutic

community must decide on these issues, but staff time is spent on descriptive diagnoses: institutional issues (past behavior, abstract concepts, power ploys) are foremost. Dyadic responsibilities are moot: some professionals want law and order and view therapy as permissive. Yet the same people will give up the idea of consequences when well-liked patients cross the nebulous line of the diseased behaviors. Another professional pushes for the discovery of "thought disorders" so "chemistry can be used." As it turns out, such candidates for intensive chemotherapy are "those that frighten me." As luck would have it those who frighten her are seen as "frightened creampuffs" by others. Some patients want the right to censure personnel. The psychiatrist, a wonderfully emphatic person, likes the idea, but those who have their esteem riding on hyperdependency (subservient patients) object. I say it would be great to censure both patients and personnel, then mutually decide, with Adlerian cooperation-as-equals, how to apply the three levels of *NH* to all.

In groups, patients have only vague dysfunctional notions of what to do, because of the babel of theory-less premises. Do patients wait for doctors and tranquilizers to cure them or are they responsible for the condition of their psyches and the psyches of their ward-mates? If the latter is true, patients must be taught interpersonal skills. I draw my line on dis-eased behavior such as wandering out of groups (and hence, rejecting, without responsibility, the relational potential for "cure"). I institute a weekly "community therapy" session of teaching and action therapy (O'Connell, 1975). So now I am back on the issue of the 50's, on how to encourage dyadic responsibility with staff. Some patients are angry at the increase in their responsibility; but their anger is a workable dyadic response, if not followed by reactive anger, revenge, and hopelessness of staff. Those involved patients are now interested, motivated to re-learn. They will, in the absence of discouragement, become students. They have all day to study, like monks, if they can experience the need to change and know what to do about it.

The patients are now staying within the group, now meeting in a close knit circle. Consequences are worked out for unacceptable behaviors now reframed as discouragement, in which everyone plays a part. Most of the patients have had multiple hospitalizations, dating back to World War II. How pathetically they handle anger, so inappropriately swallowing or acting it out, with grave consequences for SE and SI.

### **"Wilbur Walk-out"**

Wilbur has been of interest to students through the years because of his physiological skin reactions. Now he notices that the physiological reactions erupted after he stopped acting out anger. His idea of the group is to detail for new members his life-long anger, openly expressed in earlier years but more subtly, albeit just as inappropriately, now. For 30 years he has walked out on

any situation in which “some smart-ass tells me what to do . . . acts like he’s better than I am.” Half the group admits, under the therapist’s curious puzzlement, that they do the same. I tell Wilbur I think I’m about to anger him and he can do with it what he wants. I never tell patients what they should do only what I will do. Wilbur promises he’ll try to stick to feeling-talk and not blame. Wilbur is told that he is very creative in maintaining his power base, and at ignoring similarities with others. (He later begins to see, as it happens, how he is seen as acting superior by new members.) We examine how he automatically diminishes his own worth and that of others through his litany of demandments and negative nonsense. He is told that others (in the group, now) give him too much power by focusing on his past apparent victimizations by traumata, both psychological and physiological. He is told (oh, for video-playback equipment!) that he looks so happy reciting the details of his suffering and might never change until he can cry about his ego-imposed misery—and perceive similar sufferings of others. Wilbur claims he has never cried (“it’s unmanly”). He always operated in group as if the purpose was a blame-oriented “catharsis”: tell of your anger but sleep when others talk about “inconsequential things” in groups. Wilbur was told that I believed the group would help him initially by trying to anger him, then guess at how he created anger by hidden demandments and negative nonsense, never shared with others. Wilbur is ready for action therapy in which he will try out many alternative behaviors, after catharsis or sharing of feelings (but not blame).

Wilbur will probably not advance toward actualization by keeping a log of all his movements (inner and outer) and sharing and celebrating his reactions with a positive support group. Above all, humor is perhaps beyond him. He will not be hospitalized for long. His chance of encountering *NH* therapist outside of his present setting is almost nil. He will probably always be extraverted, yet even a working knowledge of level I would help bring some competency. With some form of humor, he could appreciate the ridiculous paradoxes of life, as he over-reacted with anger to persons he perceived as so basically different from him.

### **Actualization for the 90’s**

In the long run, *NH* practice becomes a psychospiritual ritual, with the emphasis on non-institutional practice. Deep inner symbols which when experienced add to faith (or certainty) of everyone’s basic worth and belonging are not the domain of any institutionalized force (Smith, 1980). Institutionalization makes for Moreno’s “cultural conserve,” a focus upon ideal end-states rather than dyadic transactions in the moment. Institutionalization emphasizes the power of the uniquely special person and the “less-than” essence of all others.

We’ve had our fill of interpersonal techniques which de-emphasize the dyadic (or other-oriented) interactions and skills and totally ignore the self-

generated motivation (high SE and wide SI) so necessary to operate encouragingly in a discouraged world. So, George, perhaps what psychology can give away in the 90's is an effort to train and re-train ourselves in actualizing psychospiritual humor.

### References

- Becker, E. *Denial of death*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Becker, E. *Angel in armor: A post-Freudian perspective on the nature of man*. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- Jung, C. *Memories, dreams, and reflections*. New York: Vintage, 1963.
- Miller, G. Giving away psychology in the 80's. *Psychology Today*, 1980, 13 (8), 38-50+.
- Moreno, J. *The words of father*. New York: Beacon House, 1941.
- O'Connell, W. Ward psychotherapy with schizophrenics through concerted encouragement. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 1961, 17, 193-204.
- O'Connell, W. *Action therapy and Adlerian theory*. Chicago: Alfred Adler Institute, 1975.
- O'Connell, W. Freudian humour: The eupsychia of everyday life. In Chapman, A. and Foot, H. (Eds.) *Humour and laughter: Theory, research and applications*. London: Wiley, 1976, 313-329.
- O'Connell, W. *Super-natural highs*. Chicago: North American Graphics, 1979a.
- O'Connell, W. The sense of humor: Our untapped energy source. *The Individual Psychologist*, 1979, 16 (3), 28-34.
- O'Connell, W. Spirits in thanatology: Entities and archetypes. *Death Education*, 1980a, In press.
- O'Connell, W. Natural high therapy. In Corsini, R. (Ed.) *Handbook of innovative psychotherapies*. New York: John Wiley, 1980b, In press.
- O'Connell, W. The impossible dream: The institutional actualization of worth and belonging. In Steffenhagen, R. (Ed.) *Self-esteem and addiction*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1981, In press.
- O'Connell, W., & Bright, M. *Natural high primer*. Houston: Natural High Associates, 1977.
- Pelletier, K. *Holistic medicine: From pathology to optimum health*. New York: Delacorte, 1979.
- Smith, H. The sacred consciousness. In Walsh, R. (Ed.) *Beyond health and normality: The exploration of extreme psychological well-being*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1980.
- Teilhard de Chardin, P. *Building the earth*. New York: Avon, 1969.