Aanstoos, C. Serlin, I., & Greening, T. (2000). History of Division 32 (Humanistic Psychology) of the American Psychological Association. In D. Dewsbury (Ed.), Unification through Division: Histories of the divisions of the American Psychological Association, Vol. V. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

A History of Division 32 (Humanistic Psychology) of the American Psychological Association

Christopher M. Aanstoos, Ilene Serlin, Thomas Greening*

Authors' note: The authors thank Carmi Harari, Myron Arons, Gloria Gottsegen, Mark Stern, Amedeo Giorgi, Stanley Krippner and Alvin Mahrer, all early leaders in Division 32s history. Their generous willingness to give their time to be interviewed greatly assisted in the research that led to the chapter. Harari's own written correspondence and other archival materials, which he kindly shared, were also indispensable. Further thanks are owed to Eleanor Criswell, David Elkins, Kirk Schneider, and Myron Arons, without whose supportive efforts the chapter could not have been completed. We also thank Donald Dewsbury, without whose patience and perseverance this chapter would not have reached a final publishable form.

A History of Division 32 (Humanistic Psychology) of the American Psychological Association

Christopher M. Aanstoos, Ilene Serlin, Tom Greening

As with most complex human endeavors, the history of APA Division 32, Humanistic Psychology, has many facets and lends itself to many narratives and interpretations. Presented here is one version, resulting from the input of three authors and many other people. Readers may wish to read between the lines or project onto the text their own versions. In humanistic psychology, in writing the Division's history, and indeed in psychology itself, there are always texts and subtexts, and multiple "stories" and interpretations. Right and left brains play their parts in the making of history, and in the recording and interpretation of it. This chapter is one history of the Division. Other fascinating chapters could be written about the people involved, the intellectual and interpersonal currents, and the creative, socially responsible, and sometimes spontaneous and chaotic events that underlay this history.

Prior History: An Emergent Cultural Zeitgeist

Humanistic psychology is sometimes known as the Third Force in contrast to two major orientations in American psychology, behaviorism and psychoanalysis, which, along with the biomedical model, are considered by humanistic psychologists to be reductionistic, mechanistic, and dehumanizing in regard to human beings as whole persons. As one critic of behaviorism put it, "American psychology first lost its soul, then its mind, and finally its consciousness, but it still behaved" (Waters, 1958, p. 278). In

regard to psychoanalysis, Freud's own words present the challenge to which humanistic psychology responded:

> The moment a man questions the meaning and value of life he is sick, since objectively neither has any existence; by asking this question one is merely admitting to a store of unsatisfied libido to which something else must have happened, a kind of fermentation leading to sadness and depression. (Freud, 1960, p. 436)

Many psychologists were crucial in preparing the ground for what emerged as humanistic psychology's alternative, but three stand out: Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, and Rollo May. Maslow founded the psychology department at Brandeis University in 1951 with a strong humanistic orientation even before the movement was thus named. Originally working within experimental psychology, Maslow (1954), developed a research program and subsequent humanistic theory of motivation. He argued that people are motivated not only reactively by the "deficiency needs" with which psychology had hitherto been concerned, but also proactively by "being needs," ultimately including such motives as self-actualization.

Rogers (1951) sought ways to facilitate clients' yearning for self-actualization and fully-functioning living, especially via person-centered therapy and group work. He was one of the first researchers to study psychotherapy process using tape-recordings and transcripts, and he and his students also made extensive use of Q-sorts to study self-concept and change. He explored the necessary conditions for therapeutic progress and emphasized congruence, presence, and acceptance on the part of the therapist.

May, Angel, and Ellenberger (1958) built a bridge from interpersonal psychoanalysis and European existentialism and phenomenology, having been influenced by Harry Stack Sullivan, Ludwig Binswanger, and Medard Boss. May's books integrated creativity, the arts, mythology and the humanities with psychology, and encompassed the tragic view of life and the daimonic forces. Charlotte Bühler, Erich Fromm, and Viktor Frankl also contributed European perspectives to this stream, including a concern for values in psychotherapy, human development over the whole course of human life, humanistic psychoanalysis, social issues, love, transcendence of evil, and the search for meaning.

In the 1960s many isolated voices began to gather momentum and form a critique of American culture and consciousness, and to form the basis of a new approach to psychology. Massive cultural changes were sweeping through America. That larger movement was an expression of a society eager to move beyond the alienating, bland conformity, embedded presuppositions, and prejudices that had characterized the 1950s return to "normalcy" after World War II. In psychology, adjustment models were challenged by visions of growth, and the human potential movement emerged. T-groups, sensitivity training, human relations training, and encounter groups became popular. The goal was greater awareness of one's own actual experience in the moment and authentic engagement with others, goals not well-served by academic psychology, clinical psychology, or the culture in general. Growth centers sprang up across the country, offering a profusion of workshops and techniques, such as transactional analysis, sensory awareness, Gestalt encounter, body work, meditation, yoga, massage therapy, and psychosynthesis. The best known of these was Esalen Institute, founded in Big Sur, California in 1964, which continues to

this day. Begun as a site for seminars, it featured not only psychologists such as Rollo May, Abraham Maslow, and Carl Rogers, but also scholars from other disciplines such as Arnold Toynbee, Paul Tillich, Gregory Bateson and Alan Watts.

These developments in the culture and in "pop psychology" paralleled changes in clinical and academic domains. Existential and phenomenological trends in continental psychiatry affected the Anglo-American sphere through the work of R. D. Laing and his British colleagues. His trenchant critique of the prevailing medical model's reductionistic and pathological view of schizophrenic patients began a revisioning of even psychotic processes as meaningful growth-seeking experiencing. Various American psychiatrists also contributed to the elaboration of this alternative, most notably John Perry and Thomas Szasz. At the same time, Gestalt therapy was developed and popularized especially by Fritz Perls.

Meanwhile, from the academic side a rising tide of theory and research focused attention on this nonreductive, holistic view of the person. As the 1960s unfolded, new books by Rogers (1961, 1969), Maslow (1962, 1964, 1965, 1966), and May (1967, 1969) were enormously influential in this more receptive era. May pointed out that if we are to study and understand human beings, we need a human model. He advocated a science of persons, by which he meant a theory which would enable us to understand and clarify the specific, distinguishing characteristics of human beings. Many new voices also now began to be raised. Amedeo Giorgi (later Division 32 president in 1987-1988) criticized experimental psychology's reductionism, and argued for a phenomenologically based methodology that could support a more authentically <u>human</u> science of psychology (Giorgi, 1965, 1966, 1970). Giorgi argued that psychology has the responsibility to investigate

the full range of behavior and experience of people in such a way that the aims of rigorous science are fulfilled, but that these aims should not be implemented primarily in terms of the criteria of the natural sciences.

As an organized movement, humanistic psychology grew out of a series of meetings in the late 1950s initiated by Abraham Maslow and Clark Moustakas and including Carl Rogers, all APA members. They explored themes such as the nature of the self, self-actualization, health, creativity, being, becoming, individuation, and meaning. Building on these meetings, in 1961 an organizing committee including Anthony Sutich launched the Journal of Humanistic Psychology (JHP). Its early editorial board included many well-known scholars such as Andras Angyal, Erich Fromm, Kurt Goldstein, Rollo May, Clark Moustakas, and Lewis Mumford. Maslow had compiled a mailing list of colleagues to whom he sent his papers which conventional journals would not publish, and this was used to begin the promotion of JHP (deCarvalho, 1990).

The new journal's success in coalescing a responsive subscriber base quickly convinced its founders that a professional association could also meet a need. With the assistance of James Bugental, who served as its first president pro tem, and a grant arranged by Gordon Allport, the inaugural meeting of the Association for Humanistic Psychology (AHP) was held in Philadelphia in 1963. Among the 75 attendees were many who would later play prominent leadership roles in this movement. (For a summary of this meeting see deCarvahlo, 1991, pp. 10-11.)

In 1963 James Bugental published a foundational article, "Humanistic Psychology: A New Breakthrough," in the American Psychologist which was adopted by AHP as a basic statement of its own orientation. This statement was amplified in Bugental's 1964 article, "The Third Force in Psychology" in

the Journal of Humanistic Psychology and appears, in the following slightly amplified version, in each issue of JHP.

Five Basic Postulates of Humanistic Psychology

1. Human beings, as human, are more than merely the sum of their parts. They cannot be reduced to component parts or functions.
2. Human beings exist in a uniquely human context, as well as in a cosmic ecology.
3. Human beings are aware and aware of being aware—i.e., they are conscious. Human consciousness potentially includes an awareness of oneself in the context of other people and the cosmos.
4. Human beings have some choice, and with that, responsibility.
5. Human beings are intentional, aim at goals, are aware that they cause future events, and seek meaning, value and creativity.

(Bugental, 1964, pp. 19-25)

The second AHP meeting took place in Los Angeles in September 1964, with about 200 attendees. As Bugental observed, this group already included the four major subgroups that have characterized and sometimes strained the association ever since: therapists, social/political activists, academic theorists and researchers, and "touchy feely" personal growth seekers (deCarvalho, 1991, 1992).

To develop the philosophy, themes and direction of the Association for Humanistic Psychology and humanistic psychology theory, The Old Saybrook Conference was convened in 1964 at a Connecticut country inn. It was an invitational conference sponsored by AHP, financed by the Hazen Foundation, and hosted by Wesleyan University under the chairmanship of Robert Knapp. Leading figures in the psychology of personality and in the humanistic

disciplines participated: Gordon Allport, George Kelly, Clark Moustakas, Gardner Murphy, Henry Murray, and Robert White of the founding generation; Charlotte Bühler, representing a European tradition of research labeled "life-span development," Jacques Barzun and Rene Dubos as humanists from literature and biological science, and James Bugental, Abraham Maslow, Rollo May, and Carl Rogers, who became the intellectual leaders of the movement. These founders did not intend to neglect scientific aspirations; rather, they sought to influence and correct the positivistic bias of psychological science as it then stood. The titles of some of the papers indicate the focus of the conference: "Some Thoughts Regarding the Current Philosophy of the Behavioral Sciences" by Carl Rogers, "Intentionality, the Heart of Human Will" by Rollo May, "Psychology: Natural Science or Humanistic Discipline?" by Edward Joseph Shoben, and "Humanistic Science and Transcendent Experiences" by Abraham Maslow.

In addition to the Journal of Humanistic Psychology, the Association for Humanistic Psychology, and the Old Saybrook Conference, the subsequent years also saw the founding of graduate programs in humanistic psychology. Masters' programs in humanistic psychology were begun in 1966 at Sonoma State University (then Sonoma State College), and in 1969 at the State University of West Georgia (then West Georgia College). An M.A. program in existential-phenomenological psychology was created at Duquesne University in 1959, and a Ph.D. program was added in 1962. Several free-standing institutes also initiated humanistic graduate programs. John F. Kennedy University and the Union Institute, both begun in 1964, and the California Institute of Integral Studies in 1968 were among the first. In 1971 the Association for Humanistic Psychology created the Humanistic Psychology Institute (now known as Saybrook Graduate School, named after

the famous conference). These early programs, still continuing, have since been joined by many others. Thirty-seven are listed in the current Directory of Graduate Programs in Humanistic-Transpersonal Psychology in North America (Arons, 1996). Some of these have focused on synthesizing humanistic scholarship with eastern philosophies such as Hinduism and Buddhism (the best known of these are the California Institute for Integral Studies, John F. Kennedy University, the Institute for Transpersonal Psychology, and Naropa Institute). Faculty members from these graduate programs have been active in Division 32 and many, especially from State University of West Georgia and Saybrook Graduate School, have served as its president.

The Founding of Division 32: Ambivalence and Collaboration

During the 1960s the primary organizational forum for the burgeoning humanistic movement was the Association for Humanistic Psychology (AHP), which had become an organization of 6,600 ~~thousand~~ members. As a protest movement against the mainstream approaches in psychology, this alternative venue outside of APA seemed most appropriate. However, as the momentum of change during the 1960s continued, the mainstream also began to open up to much of this new thinking. Abraham Maslow was elected president of the American Psychological Association in 1968. (Rogers had been president in 1947, and later Stanley Graham and Brewster Smith, two Division 32 presidents, also served as APA presidents.) Eventually, a group of psychologists within APA decided to pursue the organization of an APA division devoted to humanistic psychology.

This effort was spearheaded by Don Gibbons, then a faculty member at West Georgia College. In order to propose a new division, the signatures

on a petition to APA of 1% of APA's existing membership were required (approximately 275 at that time). In January 1971, Gibbons wrote to John Levy, the executive director of AHP, seeking his support in soliciting these signatories from APA members who belonged to AHP. Many members of AHP were also members of APA, so it was evident that the two groups would have a significant overlapping membership. As Gibbons wrote in that January 12, 1971 letter: "We would like to see it set up in such a way as to facilitate communication between the A.P.A. and all areas of the humanistic movement. In particular, we would like to see the new division maintain the closest possible degree of collaboration with A.H.P." In the end, 374 members of APA petitioned for the proposed division. As a result, the APA Council of Representatives, after hearing receiving affirmation from the existing divisions of APA, confirmed and made official the new Division of Humanistic Psychology.

This prospect of another humanistic organization raised concern on the part of some that it would dilute the movement (Arons, personal communication, June 6, 1998). The proponents of the proposed division, however, were in any case determined to proceed, and viewed the eventual formation of a Division of Humanistic Psychology within the APA as inevitable, given the continuing rapid growth of humanistic psychology at that time. Though still wary, previously opposed members of AHP who also belonged to APA chose to help make the proposed division the best it could be, and gathered at the official organizational meeting scheduled by Gibbons during the 1971 APA convention (Harari, personal communication, June 26, 1998). For unknown reasons, Gibbons himself did not attend the meeting. Spontaneously, a group of individuals occupied the dais and took charge of the meeting.

Several people presented the case for a new division. Albert Ellis spoke eloquently for its value in giving a voice within APA to humanistic psychology. Fred Massarik indicated that he had been originally opposed to the proposed division, but now supported it. It was proposed that a steering committee of 11 be elected who would constitute an acting executive board during the coming year, to establish by-laws and a statement of purpose.

As Harari described this first meeting in his letter to the new division's members:

> On Saturday, September 4, 1971 an organizing meeting was held for the Division of Humanistic Psychology of APA during the recent APA meetings held in Washington, D.C. Fifty-seven persons attended the organizing meeting and together with original petitioners for the formation of the new Division, as well as other interested members and fellows, became the charter members of the new Division. In the absence of the originally scheduled chairperson, Don Gibbons of West Georgia College, Albert Ellis was appointed Chairman of the meeting and Carmi Harari was appointed Recording Secretary....Several signers of the original petition were present in the room and assisted in the conduct of the meeting, together with the expert consulting assistance of Jane Hildreth, representing APA Central Office....Serving as Presiding Officers for the organizing meeting were Albert Ellis, Stanley Graham, Carmi Harari, Fred Massarik, Denis O'Donovan and Everett Shostrom. (Harari, 1971)

The first meeting of the acting executive board took place immediately following the organizational meeting of the new division. Officers were elected, with Harari chosen as acting president, Graham as acting treasurer,

Ellis as acting council representative, and Shostrom and Massarik as co-chairs of the next convention's program. Three other decisions, all of which would be subsequently challenged and changed, were made: the first program would be on an invitational basis; dues were set at $3.00; and Fellows, Members, and Associates of APA would be eligible for division membership on an equal basis with no classes of membership in the division.

The Early Years: Growth and Innovation

The following year, 1972, saw the usual development and application of those processes by which a new organization becomes normalized including membership, governance, programs, and publications.. What was reflective of the spirit of Division 32, however, was the open, explorative approach to these features, which were handled in innovative ways.

Membership

A highly successful recruitment of new members, by Barton Knapp as acting membership chair, brought in about 300 new applications during the Division's first year, almost doubling the membership total. By January 1, 1973, the total was 647; in 1974 it was 784. By 1975, it topped 900, and by 1976 it was more than a thousand. In 1977 it reached 1150, the highest level where it then stabilized for the next few years.

During the 1973-74 year, the membership chair, Nora Weckler, conducted a survey of members, and itemized their major fields of involvement. Most heavily represented was counseling psychology. Clinical and educational psychologists were also strongly represented, followed by psychotherapy, experimental, social, industrial, and developmental psychologists. Smaller numbers included: engineering, environmental,

perception, rehabilitation, and philosophical psychologists. Weckler also noted that the Division's first international members came from Venezuela, Japan, and India. She also itemized reasons given for joining the Division. These included:

> to have closer contact with others of similar interests; to learn more about the humanistic approach....a desire for personal and professional growth and training....to learn how psychology can help people lead a more fulfilling life....to support the philosophy of Division 32....because of dissatisfaction with AHP's anti-intellectual and anti-scientific attitude....an appreciation of the blending of both art and science....a desire to learn more of what the Division was doing....an interest in the unresolved theoretical and philosophical problems of humanistic psychology....with the hope that the Division will further develop theory and research following an existential-phenomenological approach. (Nora Weckler, Membership Chair Report, 1971)

In the following year's membership survey (1974-75), Weckler turned up mostly continuations of these trends. Members now also came from Great Britain, Canada, Guam, and Puerto Rico. Interest areas covered almost every subfield of psychology, with clinical psychology being the most heavily represented, counseling a close second, and educational psychology third. Social psychology, developmental psychology, rehabilitation psychology, speech and communication psychology, and pastoral psychology were also prominently mentioned.

At that point in its history, Division 32 defined its mission as follows in an undated statement:

> Humanistic psychology aims to be faithful to the full range of human experience. Its foundations include philosophical humanism, existentialism, and phenomenology. In the science and profession of psychology, humanistic psychology seeks to develop systematic and rigorous methods of studying human beings, and to heal the fragmentary character of contemporary psychology through an ever more comprehensive and integrative approach. Humanistic psychologists are particularly sensitive to uniquely human dimensions, such as experiences of creativity and transcendence, and to the quality of human welfare. Accordingly, humanistic psychology aims especially at contributing to psychotherapy, education, theory, philosophy of psychology, research methodology, organization and management and social responsibility and change.

Governance

In early 1972 drafts of the new Division's by-laws were circulated to John Levy, the executive director at AHP, to Jane Hildreth at APA Central Office, and to the Division 32 members for their comments. The purpose of the Division, as stated in these first by-laws, was to apply the concepts, theories, and philosophy of humanistic psychology to research, education, and professional applications of scientific psychology.

Only two aspects of the draft by-laws were seen as problematic. Levy pointed out that requiring decisions to be approved at the annual business meeting might result in a small turnout producing unrepresentative results. Mail-in balloting was then also included as a decision-making tool. Levy also questioned the unwieldy large size of the executive board, which included nine at-large members. (This number was later reduced to six.) Hildreth, at APA, noted (in her letter to Gloria Gottsegen, March 7, 1972) that the

Division's desire to have only one class of members, while laudable, conflicted with APA by-laws that prohibit a person from holding higher member status in a division than he/she does in APA. In the case of APA's three classes of membership (Fellow, Member, and Associate), it would be no problem to consider APA Fellows to be Members of Division 32, but Associates in APA could not be promoted to Member status in the Division. This dilemma was resolved, however, by allowing APA Associates to enjoy full membership status in the Division as members who could vote and hold office on an equal basis, with the sole exception that they could not vote for the Council Representative position (as that voting eligibility is part of APA's own by-laws). Division elections would henceforth require the Division secretary to count the ballots of Division members who, as Associates in APA, were not eligible to vote in APA elections, and whose ballots would therefore not be sent to APA. This added complication was seen as well worthwhile, to be able to establish a more egalitarian collegium of members, of whom about 20% were only Associate members of APA.

As a result of the initial rapid growth in membership, along with a very positive response to Harari's first appeal of support in the APA apportionment balloting, the new Division was awarded two seats on APA's Council of Representatives. Following a call for nominations, the Division's first election was held, in 1972, to select its first actual (rather than acting) officers. Carmi Harari was elected president, Everett Shostrom president-elect, Gloria Gottsegen secretary, Barry Crown treasurer, Fred Massarik and Albert Ellis council representatives. Members-at-large of the executive board were also elected, to serve staggered terms. These included: David Bakan, Elizabeth Mintz, Joen Fagen, Robert Strom, Leonard Blank, Lawrence LeShan, James Klee, Janette Rainwater and Barton Knapp.

When Shostrom became president he presented the executive board with a silver oil can engraved with the inscription, "APA Division 32 President's Actualizing Oil Can" on which he had inscribed the names of the first two division presidents (Harari and Shostrom). He recounted the story of the Wizard of Oz. The straw man, the tin man and the cowardly lion were seeking from an outside authority qualities they already possessed within themselves. Opening to these inner qualities is a prime message of humanistic psychology. The oil can used by the tin man to lubricate his joints became a ritual reminder of this message as it passes, each name added, from outgoing to incoming presidents.

Beginning with the first elected executive board meeting, in 1972 during the APA convention in Honolulu, innovations and changes were typical. Convention programming was changed from being exclusively invitational. It was decided to allot only 50% to invited symposia and 50% to proposals solicited from members. A newsletter was inaugurated, with Alvin Manaster appointed as its first editor, and a Social Responsibility Committee was formed with James Klee as its first chair. A proposal by Robert Strom to hold a mid-year executive board meeting was also accepted. It was also decided to include a regular column about Division 32 in AHP's newsletter, so as to continue the hoped-for collaboration between the two groups.

The election of 1974 featured a problem and creative resolution. The balloting for the position of president-elect resulted in a tie vote between Myron Arons and Stanley Graham. With the concurrence of the two candidates, President Shostrom flipped a coin to determine the results. It was agreed that, since Stanley Graham won the toss, he would function as President-elect for the 1974-1975 term and that he would function as

President from September 1, 1975 until March 1, 1976, at which time he would resign that office and Mike Arons would complete the term of President from March 1, 1976 and continue as Past-President from September 1, 1976 to September 1, 1977. In effect, both men functioned as Co-Presidents and were so listed in Divisional correspondence (Division 32, 1974).

One issue that came up early for Division 32 concerned the growing split within psychology between the professional guild interests and those of academia. Division 32 sought, and has largely succeeded, in housing both within a unity drawn together by a common approach. Nevertheless, this collaborative prospect between clinicians and researchers has not been easy to maintain. The split was first evidenced when the March 1975 midwinter executive board meeting was scheduled to take place during the meeting of Division 29 on Marco Island, Florida. For clinicians, a meeting at a relatively expensive tourist resort seemed agreeable, but academic members of the executive board protested that only those in the clinical end of the profession could afford such locales for meetings (M. Arons, letter to Division 32 executive board, November 19, 1974). A committee was appointed at that meeting to examine more mutually agreeable possibilities for future executive board meetings (Gottsegen, 1976, p. 6). Compared to the tensions emerging between clinicians and academicians in APA at large, this was a minor dispute. However, it did reveal that differences recur between academicians and practitioners, even where larger visions align. A resolution of this conflict came when the next year's midwinter executive board meeting was hosted by Arons at a lodge in the woods of a state park. Despite its very minimal expense, it was fondly remembered later, even by

the more affluent clinicians, as having been one of the best (G. Gottsegen, personal communication, June 9, 1998).

Convention Programming

The 1972 program also included a collaborative effort with AHP, which at that time was still scheduling its annual meeting in the same place as APA's, during the week immediately preceding or following it. AHP and Division 32 created and co-sponsored a joint Hospitality Suite at the APA meeting. The idea was to parallel the regular program with a center and meeting place for our friends and colleagues where they can learn of the differences, similarities and uniqueness of both AHP and the Division (C. Harari, 1973b, p. 2). This arrangement was such a success that it quickly became a staple, continued to this day. Indeed, by the following year's APA meeting, in 1973 in Montreal, the suite had become an informal Division headquarters and provided a meeting place for many humanistic people, especially our members and their guests (C. Harari, 1973a, p. 2). The suite, including a perpetual coffeepot, acquired the reputation of being a good place to engage in informal conversation, meet friends, and have a home away from home during APA conventions.

Many outstanding presentations and workshops were given in the hospitality suite, with titles such as: Creative Marital Fighting; Existential Psychodrama; The Yin and Yang of Chinese Psychology; Etiology and Cure of Normality; and Humanistic Parenting. Many prominent humanistic psychologists, such as Fritz Perls, Rollo May, Albert Ellis, Stanley Krippner, William Schutz, Nathaniel Branden, and Sidney Jourard, gave presentations or workshops there, and were available for spontaneous conversation. These sessions often attracted such overflow audiences that it became necessary to move into larger nearby unoccupied meeting rooms.

The Hospitality Suite, a major expense for the new Division, sometimes left the budget quite strained, but was always supported as a worthwhile endeavor. Opportunities to simply sit and talk with leaders in the field are among the most fondly recalled events of these early years (G. Gottsegen, personal communication, June 9, 1998; S. Krippner, personal communication, June 30, 1998; A. Mahrer, personal communication, April 22, 1998; E. M. Stern, personal communication, April 24, 1998). This innovation of having a parallel program in a hotel suite during the APA convention has since been adopted by many other divisions.

Regular Division 32 programming at APA conventions also was broad-based, and emphasized collaboration with other divisions, and included informal conversation hours and workshops. First under Everett Shostrom, in 1972, then Alvin Mahrer in 1973, Division 32 co-sponsored events with the Divisions of General Psychology, Teaching, Evaluation, Developmental, Personality and Social, the Arts, Clinical, Consulting, Industrial, Educational, School, Counseling, Adult Development and Aging, Philosophical, Community, and Psychotherapy (Shostrom, 1973, p. 1). These programs fulfilled the executive board's aim, well-expressed by the 1973 program chair, that the program achieve a good integrative balance among an exciting broad spectrum of what our Division represents—humanistic psychology theory, humanistic research, humanistic educational changes, professional applications, humanistic social philosophy, and a chance to speak directly to the APA and the public at large (Mahrer, 1973, p. 3).

By the 1974 APA meeting in New Orleans, a new programmatic feature was developed: the Division sponsored all-day pre-convention workshops. One on humanistic psychology was chaired by Robert Hilton and directed by Carmi Harari, and one on actualizing therapy was conducted by Everett

Shostrom. The following year saw another all-day preconvention workshop success, this one led by Barton Knapp and Marta Vargo, titled Self-Actualization through Transactional Analysis.

Beyond convention programming, several members of the Division 32 executive board, particularly Carmi Harari, were instrumental in London, Würzburg, Amsterdam, Paris, and Tokyo, and even an around-the-world Humanistic Psychology Study Tour with stops in France, Iran, Soviet Union, India, Nepal, Thailand, Hong Kong, Japan, and Hawaii (for the APA meeting there). Harari and Krippner were particularly central to these early activities, which were also sponsored by AHP. Graham joined Harari in a number of subsequent efforts, and Arons, Jourard, Gottsegen and others also became active .

Publications

The first Division 32 Newsletter was issued from President Harari's office November 1, 1971 with news about the formation of the Division. A second issue was dated May 39, 1972 and carried news of our taking seats in the APA Council of Representatives as a result of loyal support.

Between APA conventions, communication among members was also nourished with the establishment of a Division newsletter. The Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology, the first formal Division publication appeared in 1973, edited by Alvin Manaster. It began as four pages of news items about the Division's business, then expanded (by the third issue) to eight pages, with the intention to serve also as a scholarly exchange network for members to become aware of each other's research and writing projects. One early problem, often recurring, was of getting issues out on time, given the deadlines with regard to apportionment balloting, elections, calls for

nominations, and programming. In March 1974, Zaraleya Harari was named newsletter editor. She brought to the task a personal and informal style. After a few years, however, Manaster resumed editorship and continued until 1985.

Another publication possibility was proposed in August 1973 by Fred Massarik, who suggested that the Division adopt as its official journal Interpersonal Development, a journal founded in 1970 for which he had been serving as editor. Under the proposed arrangement, all Division members would receive a subscription at a reduced rate as part of their membership benefits. To cover the cost of these subscriptions, dues would have to be increased to $10.00. Instead of adopting a journal, the Division executive board, at its September 1974 meeting, chose to begin a policy by which journals that chose to affiliate with the Division would offer subscriptions at reduced rates to Division members, and space in their pages for Division news. In November 1974 both Interpersonal Development and AHP's Journal of Humanistic Psychology became affiliated journals.

The Middle Years: Building Up and Settling Down

Identity Issues

When B. F. Skinner, nearing the end of his long career, contemplated the question of why, in his terms, psychology had not become a science of behavior, he posited three formidable obstacles on that path (Skinner, 1987). He proclaimed the number one obstacle had been humanistic psychology (the other two being cognitivism and psychotherapy). While the relative order of these three impediments is open to question, it certainly indicated a significant recognition for humanistic psychology that it should be

seen as such a decisive foe to the behaviorist paradigm that had seemed so hegemonic just before the humanistic approach emerged.

However, the popularity of humanistic psychology began to wane as the 1970s turned into the 1980s. The Reagan years brought a new socio-cultural conservatism for which the very term "humanistic" meant something sinister. Usually dubbed "secular humanism" by conservative opponents, many strange bedfellows soon arose. Perhaps the most peculiar irony was Skinner himself supporting an association of secular humanists (the American Humanist Association), while blaming humanistic psychology for the failure of his own project —at one point even comparing humanistic psychology to the creationists he and his "secular humanists" were battling (Skinner, 1987). Religious fundamentalists also condemned humanistic psychology and continue to do so. For example, religious right-wing radio broadcaster James Dobson (head of Focus on the Family) often depicts a basic struggle between fundamentalist Christianity and secular humanism. A letter from him to his supporters asserted that secular humanism, the sexual revolution, and the New Age movement "have taken a heavy toll on America" (Boston, 1998, p. 13).

This new conservatism reduced humanistic psychology's previously wide base of support among lay people. Even within humanistic organizations, it became clear that the very word "humanistic" was seen by some as a distinct handicap. The Humanistic Psychology Institute, begun in 1970 by AHP, even changed its name to Saybrook Institute, primarily to give itself and its graduates a more mainstream appearance (Saybrook, the name of the 1964 conference on humanistic psychology, was a meaningful signifier within humanistic circles, but neutral to outsiders). The Association of Humanistic Education likewise debated changing their organizational name in

the mid-1980s, and barely decided not to. The Division of Humanistic Psychology did not waver, but did experience membership declines during this time, from a peak of about 1150 down to about 700.

The question of self-identity, however, became a thematic issue for the Division during the 1980s. It had always been home to both secular and spiritual humanists (Smith, 1986), and many others whom an observer would be hard-pressed to classify. Those on the secular side often tended to see the impact of the countercultural trends in the 1960s as having given humanistic psychology a reputation of too much irrational mysticism and anti-intellectual preference for raw experience. But another wing saw within humanistic psychology a psychospiritual paradigm, able finally to restore questions of ultimate value and meaning to a discipline that had needlessly forfeited them in its misguided quest for scientific legitimacy. During the 1970s this perspective had coalesced under the banner of transpersonal psychology, with an association (Association for Transpersonal Psychology), a journal (Journal of Transpersonal Psychology), and a graduate training center (the Institute of Transpersonal Psychology). In relation to humanistic psychology's sense of itself as the third force, tranpersonalists called their movement the fourth force, after Maslow's introduction of that term.

By the early 1980s this movement had grown sufficiently to seek to have its voice become a part of the conversation within APA. It hosted its own hospitality suite at annual APA conventions and became a proposed division. The group presented a petition to APA for the establishment of a Division of Transpersonal Psychology containing the requisite number of signatures from APA members pledged to join such a Division. The leadership included several leaders of Division 32, although the principal protagonist was Mary Jo Meadow, active in Division 36, the Division of

Psychology and Religion. The question was whether or not the Division should support the proposed new Division. Significant arguments for both sides divided the Division's executive board. First, there was the question of whether or not transpersonal psychology was something other than humanistic psychology, or was a branch of a broader humanistic vision. While most humanistic psychologists were convinced of the latter, transpersonal theorists argued not only for distinct conceptual foundations, but even that the transpersonal view was the more encompassing one, within which the humanistic orientation could be seen to be a subset. Others saw humanistic and transpersonal psychology as two approaches to plowing the same field, just starting at opposite ends. In addition to strictly conceptual issues, of course, there were also concerns about the impact of splitting an already small Division into two even smaller ones. Would it be more pragmatic to support one stronger division or two weaker ones?

The Division 32 executive board voted to support the proposed Division of Transpersonal Psychology. The petition for divisional status first came before APA Council in 1984. Harari, Division 32 Council Representative, spoke for the motion to approve the Division. However, it did not receive the needed two-thirds votes in APA Council, and so was turned down there. Concern was raised that transpersonal psychology had too religious a basis. The following year, the request was renewed. Once again, it was narrowly supported by Division 32, but failed to win the requisite two-thirds of the Council of Representatives.

In 1986, the petition was brought forward for a third and final vote (such proposals having a three-year limit). Prior to the convention, Rollo May (1986) disputed the conceptual foundations of transpersonal psychology

in pieces published both in the APA Monitor and the Division 32 newsletter. May's arguments were vigorously rebutted in the following issue of the newsletter (Hendlin, 1986; Valle, 1986). This time, the vote in the Division 32 executive board meeting was a tie. As a result, the board instructed Harari, its council representative, to vote his conscience. Harari, sensing the potential defeat, withdrew the petition.

Following this final defeat, the group could no longer be identified as a Proposed Division. Instead it re-formed as the Transpersonal Psychology Interest Group (TPIG), and for a while continued to sponsor its own Hospitality Suites for a time and eventually in collaboration with Division 32. Division 32 included transpersonal themes and presenters in its programs and changed its stated purpose in its by-laws to include fostering transpersonal psychology (as well as the other recently emergent trend, human science research):

> The purpose of this organization shall be to foster, develop, and create concepts, theories, and philosophies of the humanistic and transpersonal psychologies and human science research for education, practice, and other areas of human endeavor.
>
> (Division 32 By-Laws) PAGE?

In 1998, the TPIG board voted to conclude its independent existence, and to donate its remaining funds (about $4,000) to Division 32, which it recognized as being the most harmonious platform for its goal of maintaining a presence within APA. Division 32 programming continues to include a variety of transpersonal themes. A representative of the group was given a place on the Executive Board. It is also an ongoing question as to whether to change the Division name to Humanistic and Transpersonal Psychology. (Curiously, for such a name change to gain routine approval by APA it would

have to be shown that it does not involve any extension of the scope identified by the name, Humanistic.)

New Projects

Even as the Division wrestled with identity issues, it also developed a variety of new projects to deepen its presence, and facilitate more cohesive networking. The four most significant of these were: preparing a brochure describing the Division, launching an oral history project, publishing a directory of graduate programs, and establishing a Division journal.

In order to have a short handout to offer potential new members and others interested in the Division, the executive board prepared a short brochure about Division 32. Most of all, this entailed developing a brief statement describing humanistic psychology. The board approved the following statement in 1985:

> Humanistic psychology aims to be faithful to the full richness of human experience. Its foundations include philosophical humanism, existentialism, and phenomenology. Its approach to the science and profession of psychology accepts the challenge to develop a systematic and rigorous understanding of human beings. Humanistic psychologists are particularly sensitive to uniquely human dimensions, such as experiences of actualization and transcendence, and with the quality of human welfare. Accordingly, humanistic psychology is especially concerned with contributing to psychotherapy, education, theory and philosophy of psychology, research, organization and management, and social responsibility and change. SOURCE? PAGE?

Next, the executive board appointed Arons and Harari, two of the Division's founding members and longtime leaders, as archivists for the

Division's history. They have since launched an ongoing oral history project involving videotaping interviews with prominent scholars in the field. Already concluded are interviews with Rollo May, Clark Moustakas, Paul Ricouer, James Bugental, and Stanley Krippner.

A second project was the development of a list of graduate programs in humanistic psychology, a project long advocated by one of the Division's earliest executive board members, Nora Weckler. This booklet, titled Directory: Graduate Programs in Humanistic-Transpersonal Psychology in North America (Arons, 1996), has now gone through five editions, first appearing in 1981, with revised editions in 1985, 1988, 1992 and 1996, all under the editorship of Myron Arons, and assisted by the psychology department at the State University of West Georgia. The first edition was sponsored solely by Division 32; the subsequent ones have been co-sponsored by AHP. The current edition lists 37 programs, with masters' and/or doctoral programs. These programs are centered around a humanistic orientation rather than simply including some humanistic coursework. As the Directory further reminds readers, there are many programs not listed in the directory which have on their faculties individuals who are themselves interested in questions raised by humanistic psychology or who take a humanistic approach to instruction, research, and practice.

The other major initiative undertaken by the Division in the 1980s involved the establishment of a journal, The Humanistic Psychologist. This development emerged in phases, beginning in 1985, with the appointment of Christopher Aanstoos as the Division's newsletter editor. With the support of the executive board, Aanstoos revised the format from its former layout of folded pages of news items to a 44 page bound format, containing articles

and reviews. By the second issue, it expanded to 64 pages, a productivity gain made possible by it being self-published by the Division.

With this increase, several thematic series were established. For example, one article in each issue was devoted to the humanistic foundations of allied disciplines. These came to include sociology, geography, ecology, international relations, environmental design, health care, and communicology. Another continuing series of articles was invited from psychotherapists as replies to the question: what is the essence of your contribution, as therapist, to your client's growth toward greater psychological well-being? Another series reported on various graduate programs in humanistic psychology, providing a history and orientation of each program.

In addition, a wide variety of other articles, including philosophical and literary pieces, began to appear. Clinical topics included were family therapy, depth therapy and gestalt therapy. Research themes included qualitative methodology, alongside philosophical themes such as mythology, phenomenology and constructionism. Also, social commentaries on television, the nuclear arms race, and the war on drugs expanded the range of topics covered. An editorial board was assembled, supported by the willingness of prominent humanistic psychologists to serve, including: Carl Rogers, Medard Boss, R. D. Laing, James Bugental, Rollo May, Clark Moustakas, Virginia Sexton, Thomas Szasz, Amedeo Giorgi, M. Brewster Smith, Howard Pollio, Alvin Mahrer, Eugene Gendlin, and Jean Houston.

Under this new format, the publication continued to expand, as subscriptions from nonmembers and libraries enabled it to operate on a larger budget. By 1987, the autumn issue contained 86 pages, and in 1988 it undertook a new project: a large special edition. Entitled Psychotherapy

for Freedom: The Daseinsanalytic Way in Psychology and Psychoanalysis, the Spring 1988 issue was almost 300 pages. It was guest edited by Erik Craig, who made several trips to Zurich and enlisted the support of prominent daseinsanalysts in Europe, especially Medard Boss, to provide an exceptional presentation of this tradition of existential psychotherapy which had first arisen in the 1940s as a blending of Freudian psychoanalysis with Heideggerian existential-phenomenology. A larger print run of this issue was produced, and it was sold for several years thereafter as a text for use in many university courses.

As a result of this successful expansion of scope, in 1989 Aanstoos proposed that the Division request permission from APA to upgrade the publication's status. Officially still known as the Division's newsletter (and continuing to carry newsletter items as well), it was by then identifying itself on the cover as the Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology. Aanstoos proposed it seek the status of an APA division journal, an idea approved by the executive board. APA's Publications and Communications Board supported the proposal, and it was approved by the Council of Representatives in August 1989. Its first issue as a journal was the Autumn 1989; for the sake of continuity, however, volume numbers were counted as a continuation from those while it was a newsletter (hence 1989 was volume 17).

Once the Division's newsletter had become a journal, the executive board then voted to support the creation of another regular publication in newsletter format to carry the usual news items for Division members. Published twice a year under the editorship of Mary Anne Siderits, this newsletter has developed in such a way that it is recognized not only for the quality of its writing but also for its aesthetic appearance.

As a journal, The Humanistic Psychologist continued to expand, to average 134 pages per issue (still published in three issues per annual volume). Five-year cumulative indices appeared in 1989 and again in 1994. The number of submissions also expanded rapidly, resulting in a very discriminating peer review process, with rejection rates at about 75%. Special issues were published in 1990 on Psychology and Postmodernity and on Personal Mythology (the former subsequently published as a book by Sage Publications). In 1992 a special double issue of more than 350 pages appeared, guest edited by Fred Wertz, titled The Humanistic Movement in Psychology: History, Celebration, and Prospectus. It was later published as a book by Gardner Press. More recent special issues have included: Psychotherapy (Summer 1995); Foundations of Humanistic Psychology guest edited by Arthur Lyons (Autumn 1995); Social Action as Compassionate Heartwork (Autumn 1996); and Holistic Alternatives in Psychological Healing guest edited by Gregory Kuschwara (Summer 1997). Currently in preparation is a special issue on ecopsychology guest edited by Elizabeth Roberts.

The viability of such an expanded journal has depended on its being self-published. But this arrangement has imposed daunting workloads on those involved. The impracticality of depending on such workloads being continued, or of finding successors able to do likewise, has often led to questions of turning the journal over to an outside publisher, as is more typical of APA's division journals. Almost annually for the past few years, the executive board has considered proposals by publishers who have offered their services. However, the rate that would then be charged to the Division for the copies sent to Division members has exceeded the amount budgeted for the journal by such an extent that these proposals have always

been rejected. Nevertheless, the question remains open as to the wisest course of action to take in this regard.

As this chapter goes to press, a plan by Christopher Aanstoos, editor of The Humanistic Psychologist, and Thomas Greening, editor of the Journal of Humanistic Psychology, to merge these two journals is being developed by Sage Publications. The combined journal would be published six times a year, combine the two editorial boards, and become the preeminent international journal in the field, combining the subscription bases of Division 32 and the Association for Humanistic Psychology.

Recent History: Challenges and Changes

Changing of the Guard

As the 1980s turned into the 1990s, the membership decline begun by psychology's and the culture's conservative tide continued. From its highest point in 1977 of 1150, total membership declined to 673 by 1998. A new challenge also emerged. The bulk of the Division's members had joined during the heady early 1970s. By the 1990s these supporters were aging and retiring from the field. Many others, by virtue of seniority, had become dues-exempt members. The most prominent leaders and inspirers of the movement in the 1960s and 1970s died, including Roberto Assagioli, Medard Boss, Charlotte Bühler, Aldous Huxley, Sidney Jourard, R. D. Laing, Abraham Maslow, Rollo May, Fritz Perls, Carl Rogers, and Anthony Sutich. The question of whether the humanistic presence in APA was to be a one generation phenomenon was a pressing one. Fortunately, a new generation of Division 32 members emerged whose numbers have just about replaced the older generation. The result appears as a stagnant Division membership total, but this has masked a considerable turnover and replacement rate

during the 1990s, changing the face of humanistic psychology and the Division.

It is still too early to tell precisely how this generational shift will affect the direction of the field, but some trends are already discernible. Throughout the 1990s there has been a clear shift with respect to a deeper and more sophisticated understanding of two important bases of humanistic psychology: contemporary continental philosophy, and eastern thought. The philosophical expertise contrasts with some of the early pioneers, such as Maslow and Rogers, whose home-bred versions of humanistic psychology remained somewhat detached from European sources such as existentialism and phenomenology. Such scholars as May, Laing, Giorgi, and Boss appreciated and used these sources as an important enriching influence.

The integration of Eastern sources, especially from Hinduism and Buddhism, has also become much more sophisticated. In the 1960s Zen had made a beachhead in this country, popularized for humanistic thinkers especially by Alan Watts. But now, a generation later, it is more than a mere novelty. It has become a daily practice for many, and a deep inspiration for many more. Probably it was especially the infusion of Tibetan Buddhism in the 1970s and 1980s that supported that development, so that, in this respect at least, the disaster for the Tibetans of the loss of their homeland and their subsequent Diaspora has been a gain for the rest of the world. The infusion of these sources has enriched humanistic thought with new insights into the meaning of consciousness, personal growth and freedom, and how practices of mindfulness and self-awareness can be cultivated to enhance our development.

Beyond these shifts in scholarly and experiential sources, the newer group of Division members has also changed some older governing

practices. Originally the Division was founded on the basis of a very strong commitment to a classless egalitarian organization. Only one class of members was designated—no Fellow or Associate status. Also, no awards were sponsored by the Division—no plaques, as other divisions were wont to distribute to their members. This stance flowed from the conviction that people acted best from intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation. Indeed, an early proponent of this policy, Arons, was given a tongue-in-check award from the Division executive board for his efforts: a plaque with an inscription honoring him for his undying devotion and ceaseless energy towards the creation of a plaqueless society.

But, by the 1990s, some humanistic psychologists had come to find themselves so marginalized in their employment settings that they raised an alternative argument. They pointed out the usefulness of such awards for vitas and careers, especially for humanistic psychologists branded as mavericks by employers. Of all divisions, it seemed most important that this one support its members by honoring achievements and contributions that might otherwise go unrecognized. A subcommittee, chaired by Constance Fischer, examined the question and proposed the Division award Fellow status to deserving members, as did every other division except one. A lively debate ensued, and the proposal was accepted by a narrow majority. Only one or two members each year have subsequently been nominated to APA for initial Fellow status by the Division in order to insure that its nominees be truly deserving of this honor.

In the 1990s the executive board also began to establish awards (actual plaques), presented to outstanding humanistic psychologists in recognition of a lifetime of distinguished contribution to the field. Named after famous humanistic psychologists, they are The Charlotte and Karl

Bühler Award, The Rollo May Award, The Abraham H. Maslow Award, and The Carl Rogers Award.

The Charlotte and Karl Bühler Award goes to an institution, and an individual associated with that institution, which has made an outstanding and lasting contribution to humanistic psychology.

1991. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Thomas Greening, Editor.

1992. Saybrook Graduate School, Stanley Krippner.

1993. Psychology Department at West Georgia State College, Myron Arons.

1994. Sonoma State University Psychology Department, Arthur Warmoth.

1995. Department of Psychology, Duquesne University. (No one individual was named in the award; Fr. David Smith, former Chair, accepted on behalf of the faculty as a whole.)

1997. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, Amedeo Giorgi.

1998. College of Education, University of Florida, Arthur W. Combs, Jr.

The Rollo May Award goes to a person unaffiliated with an institution who has made an inspiring contribution to a more humanistic vision of human suffering and growth.

1996. James Bugental.

1997. Carmi Harari.

1998. Thomas Szasz.

The Abraham H. Maslow Award is given to an individual for an outstanding and lasting contribution to the exploration of the farther reaches of human nature. This was first awarded in 1999, to Myron Milford Arons.

The Carl Rogers Award is given to an individual for an outstanding contribution to the profession and practice of humanistic psychology. This was first awarded in 1999, to E. Mark Stern.

In addition, the Division established the Sidney Jourard Award, which is given for the best paper submitted by a graduate student. The finalists are invited to present their work at APA's annual convention.

New Projects for New Times

Two Division projects developed during the 1990s also exemplify these changing times. The first arose as a response to the crisis in psychotherapy generated by APA's support of manualized, outcome-based, empirically validated practice. This was itself a symptom of the larger crisis brought on by the managed care industry's cost control and regulation of psychotherapy. Concerned that humanistic approaches to psychotherapy were being excluded in the preliminary versions of the APA template, the Division executive board in 1996 authorized a task force to draft guidelines for the provision of humanistic psychotherapy. Arthur Bohart chaired this committee, which also included Maureen O'Hara, Frederick Wertz, Mark Stern, Kirk Schneider, Ilene Serlin, Larry Leitner, and Tom Greening. Their preliminary report was published in the Division journal in 1997 (Task Force, 1997). Feedback was solicited from members preliminary to a vote to adopt these guidelines by the executive board. It is hoped this will allow practitioners a choice of therapies, each supported by its own set of appropriate guidelines for proper care.

A second project exemplary of this new era was the development of a Directory of Division members. Edited by Eleanor Criswell, it was produced in 1998, and given to all Division members, providing each with the list of all members, with their addresses, phone numbers and e-mail addresses

This more feasible, and more urgent, prospect of linking up is also the motif of another new project sponsored by the Division. In cooperation with the Consortium for Diversified Psychology Programs (CDPP), the Association

for Humanistic Psychology, the AHP Midwest Conference Committee. the National Psychology Advisory Association (NPAA). Saybrook Graduate School, Sonoma State University, and State University of West Georgia, the Division is currently supporting the development of a special conference, scheduled for the year 2000 and hosted by the State University of West Georgia. It will bring together the leading voices in humanistic psychology in a double forum of conversation: both to a live audience meeting in Georgia, and to an electronically connected worldwide audience meeting over the internet. Conceived as the sequel to the foundational 1963 conference at Old Saybrook, Connecticut that galvanized the humanistic movement, this one will seek to foster the next phase in the development of the field, embracing and extending its legacy as it prepares to enter the next millennium.

Conclusion: Perspectives and Forecasts

Like all of APA, Division 32 is now poised on the edge of a millennial shift. What trends from its history may give clues to its future development? Three long-standing trajectories seem relevantly indicative: the dynamic of its providing leadership of an alternative approach within psychology; its role as a bridge between psychology's clinical and research wings; and its place in elucidating new content areas for psychological exploration.

First, Division 32 has an illustrious history of providing leadership in the development of a human science approach to psychology, an approach emphasizing qualitative research focused on the actual lived experience of persons. One may say that its role has been to bring psychology to the uniquely psychological (Giorgi, personal communication, July 3, 1998). In some ways, this approach is as old as William James (Taylor, 1991). Yet it

has only rarely been evidenced in mainstream psychology since James. Instead, the field adopted a reductionistic approach by which the psychological was reduced to the physiological, the neurological, or other substrates presumed to underlie causally the psychological level. Rogers, May, Maslow, Giorgi, Moustakas, Laing, and other humanistic pioneers thus re-introduced psychology to its Jamesian roots, and in the process articulated new methodologies for its becoming a science of human experience. But this phase of its history is now drawing to a close on two accounts. First, most of its early leaders are now passing from the scene. Buoyed as they were by the larger cultural zeitgeist then in place, their stature was easily recognizable and had great currency. Now, however, there may be emerging a more critical phase in which a leadership vacuum is waiting to be filled. Until that happens, a certain kind of treading water may be evident. Additionally, the field of psychology has itself now incorporated many of these humanistic innovations.

Cognitive psychology, in spite of its original tendency to favor dehumanizing artificial intelligence perspectives, is no longer as reductionistic as it was when humanistic psychology first arose in the 1960s. In fact, in spite of the proclivity of information processing theorists to portray computer programs as simulations of human experience, cognitive psychology has helped open up the field more widely to issues of consciousness and experience.

Partly because of lack of funding, psychology has tended to abandon community psychology as a means of being relevant to society at large, and faces the disturbing prospect of future marginalization, or losing its identity by embracing the medical model and merging with psychiatry and pharmacology. Despite a generation of calls to "give psychology away,"

academic psychology remains split off from clinical and popular psychology, to which the public mostly attends. As psychology increasingly realizes this need to pursue more adequately this goal of offering a meaningful and useful understanding of human experience, humanistic psychology's historical role will position it well for contributing to this overarching project.

A second long-standing trend that may offer opportunities to Division 32 concerns the way that it has brought together the clinical and research wings of the discipline, during a period when these had become increasingly antagonistic in psychology at large, and in the APA. The Division itself had been founded largely by clinicians, who also dominated its early membership. Typically, these were therapists whose own professional practices were opening up to new techniques then being formulated by humanistic psychologists: Gestalt, body work, psychosynthesis, encounter groups, sensitivity training, person-centered counseling, marital and family therapies. Often, the legitimacy of these new practices was questioned by more mainstream approaches. Hence, an important reason for collaborating as an APA Division was to establish respectability for these less conventional innovations. Meanwhile academic rebels from the natural scientific foundations of research psychology, such as Giorgi, also saw in humanistic psychology a viable alternative: a way to develop a science of experience qua experience, non-reductively. From both the clinical and research wings, then, came a vision of psychology that could embrace each side of that divide. Because clinical practice was not reduced to a medical model it could align with a view of persons as experiencing and creating meanings. And because researchers did not cut the person apart from their meaningful involvement in their experienced world, their findings could more readily be related to the concerns of clinicians.

As the Division evolved within APA, it played an early part in the coming together of the clinical interests. Division 29 invited representatives of APA divisions related to professional psychology and APA's Board of Professional Affairs to meet on June 1-2, 1973 in New York to discuss the need for such divisions to stimulate interest and action on the part of APA concerning clinical issues. Graham and Harari attended as representatives of Division 32. The conflict between the clinical and academic areas received considerable airing at this meeting, and the participants reached a consensus regarding the need to heal the rifts. A subcommittee was appointed to meet with various divisions to work through means of resolving existing conflicts. Harari and Graham were both named to this committee, along with Logan Wright, Florence Halpern and Tamara Dembo (Krasner, 1973).

Despite this early important collaboration, the major clinical divisions did not embrace Division 32. The APA Convention Affairs Office assigned the Division meeting rooms not in the hotel with clinical divisions, but in the hotel with such non-clinical divisions as Division 10—Psychology of the Arts; Division 24—Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology; Division 26—History of Psychology; Division 36—Psychology of Religion; and Division 48—Peace Psychology. Thus, its early promise of serving as a bridge to reconcile clinical and academic interests remains a potential but not fully actualized capacity. Humanistic psychologists face the challenge of reaching out more creatively to others in APA who share similar values and goals, rather than maintaining adversarial boundaries.

The third trend that may be projected from Division 32's history to its future concerns its role in the inculcation of new sociocultural developments into psychology. Having helped bring psychology into contact with such

earlier social developments as the women's movement, the peace movement, and global dialogue, it may be wise to discern what new topic areas are now emerging. In that respect, two may already reliably be noted: the attention being given by the Division to holistic health and to ecology (Metzner, 1999). In both cases, it is the experiential dimension that is only now being understood as the crucial, previously overlooked, factor.

Holistic health has already been the focus of a special issue of the Division's journal, and ecology is the theme for a forthcoming issue. Both were featured in the Division's program theme for the 1998 convention, and the Division helped co-sponsor a mini-convention at APA related to holistic health issues. Ilene Serlin of Division 32 and Marie DiCowan of Division 22 were co-chairs. These topics, of ecology and holistic health, are not only being advanced by Division 32, but it may well be Division 32 that most ardently brings these themes into psychology. Such a development will come as no surprise to veteran humanistic psychologists, who would easily recognize the essential holism that has always been the hallmark of humanistic thought.

Martin Seligman (1998), while president of APA, began advocating the development of what he calls "positive psychology" as an alternative to much of psychology's focus on DSM categorized psychopathology, "mental illness," and what, a generation earlier, Maslow called "deficiency motivation." Although Seligman's 1998 article made no reference to humanistic psychology, the agenda presented in it is essentially the same and uses many of our concepts. He calls for studies of "self-actualization," "positive traits," "the human strengths and civic virtues," and "best exemplars" just as Maslow and others have done for decades. Seligman subsequently stated in his 1999 APA address that "positive psychology"

intends to remedy humanistic psychology's lack of validating empirical research and its emphasis on narcissistic forms of individualized self-actualization. Such critiques of humanistic psychology have long been addressed in Division 32s The Humanistic Psychologist, in the Journal of Humanistic Psychology, and in books and articles by Division 32 members, but they still sometimes appear. Often, humanistic psychology has been ahead of its time and has not connected well with mainstream psychology. We must take on the continued challenge of communicating better our theory, research and practice to the wider community of psychology. Especially now when there are many anti-humanistic forces at work in psychology and our nation, let us hope that Division 32 will continue to play an active role in the furtherance of its mission within APA and in the larger society in the next century.

References

Arons, M. (Ed.). (1996). Directory of graduate programs in humanistic and transpersonal psychology in North America. Carrollton, Georgia: Psychology Department, State University of West Georgia.

Boston, R. (1998). Family feud. Church & State, 51 (5), 9-14.

Bugental, J. (1963). Humanistic psychology : A new breakthrough. American Psychologist, 18, 563-567.

Bugental, J. (1964). The third force in psychology. Journal of Humanistic Psychology 4 (1), 19-25.

Bugental, J. (1965). First invitational conference on humanistic psychology: Introduction. Journal of Humanistic Psychology 5 (2), pp. 181-182.

deCarvalho, R. J. (1990). A history of the "Third Force" in psychology. Journal of Humanistic Psychology 30 (4), .22-44.

deCarvalho, R. J. (1991). The founders of humanistic psychology. New York: Praeger.

deCarvalho, R. J. (1992). The institutionalization of humanistic psychology. The Humanistic Psychologist, 20, 124-135.

Division 32. (1974). Executive Board Minutes.

Freud, S. (1960). Letter to Marie Bonaparte, 13 August 1937, in E. L. Freud (Ed.), Letters of Sigmund Freud, translated by Tania and James Stern. New York: Basic Books, p. 436.

Giorgi, A. (1965). Phenomenology and experimental psychology: I. Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry, 5, 228-238.

Giorgi, A. (1966). Phenomenology and experimental psychology: II. Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry, 6. 37-50.

Giorgi, A. (1970). Psychology as a human science. New York: Harper & Row.

Gottsegen, G. (1976). Executive board minutes. Newsletter: Division of Humanistic Psychology, 3 (1), 5-6.

Harari, C. (1971, November). Letter to Division 32.

Harari, C. (1973a). Past president's report. Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology, 1 (3), 1-2.

Harari, C. (1973b). President's report. Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology, 1 (1), 1-2.

Hendlin, S. J. (1986). The personal in the transpersonal: A reply to Rollo May. The Humanistic Psychologist, 14, 214-215.

Krasner, J. D. (1973). Inter-divisional committee for professional and applied psychology. Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology, 1 (3), 4-5.

Mahrer, A. (1973). Program comments. Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology, 1 (3), 3.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). Toward a psychology of being. New York: Nostrand.

Maslow, A. H. (1964). Religion, values and peak-experiences. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1965a). Eupsychian management. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Maslow, A. (1965b). Humanistic science and transcendent experiences. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 5 (2), 219-228.

Maslow, A. H. (1966). The psychology of science. New York: Harper & Row.

May, R. (1953). Man's search for himself. New York: Norton.

May, R. (1965). Intentionality, the heart of human will. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 5 (2), 202-209.

May, R. (1967). Psychology and the human dilemma. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

May, R. (1969). Love and will. New York: Norton.

May, R. (1986). Transpersonal or transcendental? The Humanistic Psychologist, 14, 87-90.

May, R., Angel, E., & Ellenberger, H. F. (Eds.). (1958). Existence. New York: Basic Books.

Metzner, R. (1999). Green psychology: Transforming our relationship to the earth. Rochester, NY: Park Street Press.

Rogers, C. (1951). Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Rogers, C. (1961). On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Rogers, C. (1965). Some thoughts regarding the current philosophy of the behavioral sciences. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 5 (2), 182-194.

Rogers, C. (1969). Freedom to learn. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Seligman, M. (1998). President's Column: What is the "good life"? Monitor. American Psychological Association. October.

Shoben, E. J. (1965). Psychology: Natural science of humanistic discipline? Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 5 (2), 210-218.

Shostrom, E. (1973). President's report. Bulletin: Division of Humanistic Psychology, 1 (3), 1-2.

Skinner, B. F. (1987). Whatever happened to psychology as the science of behavior? American Psychologist, 42, 780-786.

Smith, M. B. (1986). Toward a secular humanistic psychology. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 26 (1), 7-26.

Taylor, E. (1991). William James and the humanistic tradition. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 31 (1), 56-74.

Task Force. (1997). Guidelines for the provision of humanistic psychosocial services. The Humanistic Psychologist, 25, 64-107.

Valle, R. S. (1986). Transpersonal psychology: A reply to Rollo May. The Humanistic Psychologist, 14, 210-213.

Waters, R. H. (1958). Behavior: Datum or abstraction? American Psychologist 13, 278-282.

TABLE 1: Presidents of Division 32

1971-1972 Carmi Harari (Acting)

1972-1973 Carmi Harari

1973-1974 Everett Shostrom

1974-1975 David Bakan

1975-1976 Stanley Graham and Myron Arons

1976-1977 Gloria Gottsegen

1977-1978 Barton Knapp

1978-1979 Nora Weckler

1979-1980 Virginia Sexton

1980-1981 Stanley Krippner

1981-1982 David Morgenstern

1982-1983 John Tisdale

1983-1984 Robert Harper

1984-1985 M. Brewster Smith

1985-1986 Alvin Mahrer

1986-1987 Harold Greenwald

1987-1988 Amedeo Giorgi

1988-1989 Mary Jo Meadow

1989-1990 Frank X. Barron

1990-1991 E. Mark Stern

1991-1992 Fred Massarik

1992-1993 P. Erik Craig

1993-1994 Ruth Heber

1994-1995 Frederick J. Wertz

1995-1996 George Howard

1996-1997 Ilene Serlin

1997-1998 Christopher Aanstoos

1998-1999 David Elkins

1999-2000 Eleanor Criswell