

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_148997

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

FOREWORD

This study is a continuation of previous researches, “The Feeling of Superiority and Anxiety-Superior, The Ottawa Pilot Study” and “The Feeling of Superiority and Anxiety-Superior, The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status.”

Like the former studies, this investigation was conducted among the people, and the writer is indebted to the many individuals who so kindly cooperated.

It is not an easy task to express in a few words my wife's share in this work. Lets hope that her help and generosity will not appear to her to have been entirely in vain.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	iii
Introduction	1
I Competition and Personality	23
II Situations of Superiority	30
III Learning and Change	52
IV Anxiety-Superior and Thinking	64
Conclusions	76
References	79
Appendices	
A Schedule	80
B Method	81

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Percentage of Responses on Competition	25
2 Percentage of Responses When Resenting Competition . .	25
3 Percentage of Responses on Learning	54
4 Percentage Indicating the Interaction of Thinking and Anxiety-Superior with Feelings of Superiority	70

INTRODUCTION

HISTORY is largely an ominous record of the consequences of the intolerant adherence to fictitious superiority. There were horrifying conditions associated with these situations, most of which exist today, and in some societies include even persecution connected with scientific acceptances. Efforts to maintain such situations failed time and again despite the mad energy, the policy of violence, masterly consistency, and dark fanaticism.

Although the contrivances of totalitarian and authoritarian personalities are easily recognizable in the desolation of their end effects, they boldly introduce themselves into any system of altruistic ideals, notions, and dogmas masked as examples of heroic sacrifice for the people or for groups of people. It is in this way alone that they can deceive and exploit feelings.

Nevertheless, throughout the centuries, individuals risked torture or death to protect their personalities and to maintain their *own* feelings of superiority. These feelings are a dynamic factor of the first rank in behaviour and in progressive evolution.

Most of the literature is significantly lacking in insight concerning the laws governing the biological origin of the inner organization of the personality.

To understand better the importance of the organization of personality, it is needful to see the illusionary secondary superstructure of the personality demolished. Examples of psychological theories which try to show the primacy of this non-existent structure are found in the teachings of psycho-analysis and of individual psychology, which have their origins from abnormal psychology, such as hysteria and obsessional neurosis, the old physiognomy, and ancient mythology. It is taught that the man who inhibits his sexual desires and/or feels himself weak in his endeavours to secure a living but who, nevertheless, strives for power or other values is but performing a juggler's feat, and that the striving for power or other human values is but a compensation for inhibited sexual desires or feelings of inferiority.

The complex character qualities which are seen normally, with all their associated sociological and other values, are really not simple basic factors of personality but artificial superstructures provided by the interaction of the surroundings.

These hypotheses go back to early childhood experiences and try to find various bodily and environmental correlates. Thus a hungry baby procures satisfaction from a kind of hallucination, the real satisfaction being derived from the 'oral' experiences. These conjectures created dangerous fashions in child psychology in terms of Oedipus Complex, castration fears, pennis envy, masturbation, sphincter control (in the final analysis, the sphincter controls itself), breast-feeding, and so on. Now it seems to be moving more into a 'mother-love' era, 'inadequate maternal care,' and 'the deprived and the privileged.' So the family and sex are divine and explain everything of personality.

If childhood experiences are of such great importance in the formation of personality, how is it that personalities of children in the same family, whether of the 'deprived, privileged, or élite,' display such great differences? Furthermore, without doubt, most of the implied good and evil is learned or acquired after childhood. Just as with the old physiognomy and that of today, psychologists, instead of concerning themselves with physical features, try to find family correlates with meanness, kindness, character, hate, love, and intelligence. This will never do.

Some of these hypotheses are called 'depth psychology.' Yes, they give the impression of depth because they are cloudy. To support this rubbish, ingenious psychologists contrived ever-new tricks with all sorts of amazing devices, some being called 'projective techniques' such as the Rorschach Ink-Blots, Finger Puppets and Masks, Cloud Pictures, Comic Strip Characters, Tautophone, and Sidewalk Drawings. To sell these fictitious ideas and to give some sort of simulating value to these tests, they form companies such as "Fellows of the Society for Projective Techniques and Finger Puppets and Masks, Inc."

In addition, they seem to believe that a *docta ignorantia* is more supportable than an *indocta ignorantia*, and therefore the frank acknowledgment of their ignorance is more shameful than a lack of knowledge which cloaks itself in such expressions as ego, phenomenal-ego, inmost-ego, mundane-ego, ego-involvement, ego-striving, ego-enhancement, ego-extension, inflated-ego, super-ego, self, phenomenal-self, physical-self, self-identity, self-concept, self-function, self-environment, nuclear-self, image, image-drive, and self-image.

But, as Woodger¹⁴ remarks, "Although your 'conscious ego'—the 'part' of you which does the knowing—is inside your brain it cannot know your own brain, but only other people's brains, and from this it infers that it is inside a brain."

Not only is the concept of personality confused with that of the living organism, but the latter has been adulterated by the introduction of queer elements and thereby has been deprived of most of its own constituents. A straw man is set up in place of an organism and the empty straw is threshed using psychological catchwords. Meanwhile the component cells of the human organism carry on the organization of behaviour manifested by the personality.

The preponderance of the so-called privileged or élite among the well-known or advertised personalities in many societies rests upon purely external favours of admission to certain professions and not upon a fair selection according to abilities. The personalities of most of the outstanding founders of the new countries such as Canada, United States, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa certainly cannot be correlated with families of the 'privileged or élite.' The restlessness manifested by personalities in migration, thereby accepting new challenges, can only be regarded as a normal demonstration of feelings of superiority.

Plant⁶ noted in "Personality and the Cultural Pattern" that the criterion of relationship of adequacy or superiority almost from the first creeps in. The parents begin to compare the child with other children, situations of being poor in school work, failing in athletics, and so on. Repeated blows at the child's adequacy or superiority could bring about a panicky feeling no matter how secure his place may be in the family and in the general scheme of things. It could be added that adequacy requires some degree of superiority.

It is clear to every intelligent and scientifically-trained individual that the fundamental core of the personality cannot consist of a series of guises by elevating sex, organic inferiority, or the family as an all-powerful factor in relation to the development of the personality of the human organism. Nobody doubts that a deranged mother or father is capable of profoundly disturbing the child. However, to use such generalizations to explain the dynamics of personality is sheer nonsense.

It is not intended to belittle the importance of Adler's and

Freud's work, but the personality and the problems of life of the human organism cannot be solved by themes of sex, libido, organic inferiority, and Oedipus Complex without misusing these theories which, in their place, may yield some results.

Adler's contention that all the neurotics and psychotics have feelings of inferiority and that they are unable to maintain 'genuine' feelings of superiority for their equilibrium and well-being is a primary datum of observation.

The Ottawa Pilot Study, The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, and this investigation show that it is never possible to ignore the *capacities* of the living organism in maintaining its specific superiority in its surroundings, and that these capacities vary extensively from one individual to another. They also show that the individual and his personality cannot be reduced to a series of camouflages in his struggle in making a living, in competitive activities, and against social, national, racial, religious, and other prejudices and injustices. These problems of personality cannot be correlated, solved, or compensated for by themes such as childhood toilet-training, family grouping, adolescent masturbation, mother-love, libido, or narcissism, no matter how much these schools of thought try to overlook the truth.

There are philosophical precepts and other hypotheses which give a general demonstration of the unconditional primacy to some instinct in the personality in action, and try to solve it by formulae such as 'will to power,' 'power instinct,' 'survival of the fittest,' 'instinct of self-preservation,' 'will to live,' 'conservation of the self,' 'unconscious drive' (blind drive), and 'unconscious ideas.'

Thousands of individuals, who have the 'will to power,' fail despite all their efforts, and power is thrust upon others who do not seek nor wish to have power as such. Real power, therefore, does not arise out of 'will to power' nor fictitious power, still less out of the so-called psychopath's mimicry of power. Moreover power alone does not mean anything as, in the final analysis, only through some degree of specific superiority can personalities thread their way through the complex battlefield of life.

So it is also with the 'fittest survive.' Woodger,¹⁴ in "Biological Principles," writes "We are told, for example, that an organism 'survives' because it is 'fit.' If we ask under what circumstances we are

entitled to say that an organism is 'fit' we are told; when its characters or properties are such that it 'survives.' But if we cannot 'explain' persistence we can compare the needs of persistence of different things, and this is of importance for biology."

How is it to be explained that thousands of living organisms sacrifice their lives for an idea or for some other reason in spite of the 'instinct of self-preservation,' 'conservation of the self' or 'will to live?'

The absurdity of such terms as 'unconscious drive' (blind drive) and 'unconscious ideas' is even more obvious.

It is beyond this study to discuss all of the philosophical and psychological theories of personality organization. Some of these hypotheses are summarily advertised through radio, television, and popular and some so-called scientific journals, with all the authority of 'ex cathedra' pronouncements. Deviation is rarely tolerated and is punished by excommunication from the institutions and journals. It will be found that adherence to such terms as 'Gestalt' or 'mechanistic,' 'Dialectic Psychology,' 'The Dignity of Man,' 'Personality Tests,' 'Adjustment,' and 'Adaptation' are recommended to the faithful and are mandatory in belief and practice.

Gestalt psychologists ignore the fact that a living organism is not just a 'Gestalt,' but a 'Gestalt of Gestalts.' Thus there is no difference between their 'sum' and the old mechanistic 'sum.'

London⁵, presenting the Theory of Emotions in Soviet Dialectic Psychology at the Mooseheart Symposium, said that according to Rubinsthein " . . . the proper education of man must inevitably involve his emotions and not by suppressing or minimizing, but by directing and enmeshing them in purposeful activity, thereby enabling, among other things, the socially and pedagogically significant to become the personally significant for man. Since in action emotions are not only made manifest, but also formed, the essential formation and alteration of emotions are accomplished not in passive contemplation or in backward-looking analysis, but in active participation of man in new ventures which change his basic orientation and the general direction of his personality."

How characteristic is the totalitarian mode of psychological expression 'the proper education,' 'enmeshing,' and 'directing.' The

⁵Ivan D. London, Op. cit., p. 91.

leading personalities of totalitarian ideas have different political bibles in their hands. Their desires are to realize the phantastic dreams of the writers of such books by trying to give 'the proper education' to man by force and butchery.

The delusion of Hitler and his followers was Nietzsche's 'superman,' 'the blonde beast' with 'will to power'—a biological absurdity. Yet they believed that, by torturing and eliminating a defenseless innocent Jewish minority, they could prove to the world the superiority of the Germanic race. The Roman Catholics or for that matter the Protestants were fortunate that they were not in the minority in Germany at the time.

Stalin and his comrades worshipped Marx and Lenin. The Communist Manifesto was their political bible. They dreamed of an abstract ideal state and believed that, by an efficient and murderous gang of secret police, they could change not only Czarist Russia but eventually the whole world to Communism.

Who knows whom these totalitarian and authoritarian personalities will use as their scapegoat, when, and where? To furnish evidence of the fictitious superiority of their notions, they must create horrors and devaluate others to make themselves gods.

This is not education, but a signal for destruction and persecution. In biology and in psychology, any form of 'enmeshing' is to be regarded as 'perversion,' however much it leads, from the Soviet Dialectic Psychological point of view, to lofty performances.

Dialectic Materialists believe that, by 'enmeshing and directing' the individual, they can transform his basic orientation and the general direction of his personality from a realistic to an abstract idea. They have no notion of the living human organism. They create states where the whips of gangsters, drug addicts, and sadists crack down on innocent, defenseless, and hard-working peoples. Is it any wonder that in such societies personalities are eliminated?

Hardly any concept has been used so much as 'the dignity of man.' In the final analysis, dignity is entirely worthless.

Weber¹² in "Essays in Sociology" writes "Only with the negatively privileged status groups does the 'sense of dignity' take a specific deviation. A sense of dignity is the precipitation in individuals of

¹²Max Weber, *Op. cit.*, p. 180-195.

social honor and of conventional demands which a positively privileged status group raises for the deparment of its members. The sense of dignity that characterizes positively privileged status groups is naturally related to their 'being' which does not transcend itself, that is, it is to their 'beauty and excellence.' Their kingdom is 'of this world.' They live for the present and by exploiting their great past. The sense of dignity of the negatively privileged strata naturally refers to a future lying beyond the present, whether it is of this life or of another."

Conspicuous examples are the Roman Republic and that of the Spanish Colonial Empire where 'dignity' and 'pride' strove to rule with aristocratic ceremonies and fanaticism. The Roman Republic bled to death by trying to protect the 'dignity' of its reactionary personalities. Neither the 'tituli' on the walls of the atrium nor the 'vigilant censorship' saved them. They believed that 'dignity' was sufficient to maintain the superiority of their personalities and of the Republic. The people were amused by them (panem at circenses). Personalities with 'superior capacities' but 'without dignity' held aloof and neither economic string-pulling nor threats could compel them to come to Rome to save the 'dignity' of these reactionary personalities. So the Roman Republic disappeared.

Democracies still have countless civilizations to hope for if they believe that 'civilization' and the 'free' development of the personalities of human organisms are things worthy of hope and expectation. As Cole³ discussing English democracy in "Essays in Social Theory" writes, "I believe in democracy because I believe that every citizen has a right to play a part in deciding how society can best be organized in the cause of human happiness, and also because it is itself one of the fundamental exercises of free creative activity. It follows that I mean by democracy not merely the right of the majority to have its way, but an arrangement of public affairs which is designed to give every man and woman that best possible chance of finding out what they really want, of persuading others to accept their point of view, and of playing an active part in the working of a system thus responsive to their needs."

It is not difficult to understand why most of the psychological tests become incredulous. The personalities of human organisms in the struggle for existence do not mean anything in the technique of a

psychometric program. They not only use generalized false-traits but all sorts of deceptive methods, with stop-watches in their hands, to discover the basic organization and capacities of personalities in a few minutes. Yet they claim that these tests are objective and are not affected by the psychologist's subjective interpretation of the responses given. The whole approach is subjective. Thus its interpretation cannot be objective; i.e., of all the various dual-type theories which have their origins in ancient mythology such as God and devil, good and bad, ascendance and submission, none has been used so elaborately as Jung's 'introverted-extroverted.' The structure of the human personality cannot be derived from these factors, even if neuroticism, whatever the term means to each user, is added to it.

These dichotomies assume that the personalities of individuals consist of different structures. The Ottawa Pilot Study, The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, and this investigation show that there is an inner harmony and an essential unity of these seemingly opposed entities, and that the seemingly qualified differences are due to differences in quantity needed from deep-lying vital feelings for the existence of the living organism; that is, some degree of superiority in its environment. Thus these dichotomies are only accompaniments or aspects.

It is a well-known fact that the usually called intelligence tests do not measure intelligence, yet they are advertised as such. Anyone can, with a few questions, find out whether an individual is an idiot. It is claimed that these tests 'fit the man to the job.' Stagner¹¹ (1933b) and others reported approximately zero-order r 's when they compared intelligence test scores and school marks. *Most of these tests attempt to measure the individual's superiority over a given stimuli.* The validity of these tests expires as soon as the demand for the response is completed. They have no predictive value as they cannot measure the future potentialities or weaknesses of a human organism. In fact, an able executive does not need psychological tests or reference cards if he is really interested in an individual with ability. Just how many individuals of capacity are eliminated is not known, and damage is done as a result of the ignorance and disregard of personalities by these tests. Besides there is the danger that these unscientific methods may assume a dictatorial proportion and contrive to predict the future for everybody. Then, instead of democratic

selection or free competition, little gods with coordinated machinery, through these tests, will decide the destinies of personalities.

No wonder society has become skeptical of these exaggerated and unwarranted acceptances of technico-mathematical, graphic, and statistical proofs, especially in psychological matters. These 'professed statisticians' simply refuse to consider arguments which do not favour their conclusions on a 'profile.' Their fallacious reasoning is based on the technique of measurement rather than what they measure. The defect of this form of measurement and reasoning is that it is capable of giving an indefinite number of interpretations that are equally convincing to their votaries but not one that can be subjected to experimental confirmation concerning the future behaviour, capacities or weaknesses of the individual. They are orientated toward techniques rather than problems. There is no scientific apparatus or technique in existence as yet through which an accurate initial forecast of human personalities is possible.

Various philosophies, theories, and hypotheses are wrestling with one another about 'evolution.' They take each other's explanations for a long time rather hostilely, not only in biology and psychology but also in society. To explain the evolution of living organisms, they use formulae or terms such as adaptation, adjustment, gene, gene complexes, mutation, selection, tropism, change in structure, oxidation of hydrocarbons, complex phosphates, saltations, macromutations, recombination, and orthogenesis.

Recently even the geologist's 'radioactive time-clock' was brought in to explain the 'evolution of organisms.'

There is neither need nor space in this work to follow the intricacies of all of these terms. In the literature, the words 'adaptation' and 'adjustment' are used to ad nauseam as catchwords about living organisms.

Russell,⁹ in "The Behaviour of Animals," notes: "It is the merest commonplace to say that animals are adapted both in structure and in behaviour to their surroundings, but this bold statement is not very illuminating. (. . .) Now the fact that every species has its own habitat, or ecological niche, raises some interesting problems of behaviour, and also gives us a key to their behaviour in laboratory conditions."

⁹E. S. Russell, *Op. cit.*, pp. 21-22.

Practically all of the needs which living organisms seek to satisfy require superiority in various degrees. Thus organisms organize to maintain not only their own superiority in their niches, but that of their progeny as well. For example, the eel and the salmon travel hundreds of miles to spawn in surroundings where their issue will have some degree of superiority.

Stagner¹¹ discussing cultural drives, in "Psychology of Personality," writes: "The main objects of adaptation or adjustment in the Darwinian argument are the successful survival of the individual and of the species. To illustrate this point, the biologists have catalogued innumerable examples of ways in which various animal mechanisms enable the animal to survive as an individual and as a species. If we compare this picture with the one we find in humans, we find, first, that the human instead of adapting himself to the environment adapts it to him, that is he changes it to suit himself, and second, we find that the human is no longer content to keep alive and bear children; he wants other things. It is only in rare moments of famine, flood or other natural disaster, that we find his main purpose to be the struggle for food for himself and his offspring. Usually his main purposes are of a cultural nature."

Without organization of the organism, adaptation, adjustment, or formulae used so far cannot be correlated with the development of personalities, nor with evolution, survival, progress or change.

The key to the personality of the living organism, evolution, survival, progress or change is organization for specific superiority in the environment. This superiority is fundamental and is part of Nature, and without it life becomes altogether incomprehensible. Adaptation or adjustment involves organization for specific superiority and depends upon the organism's level of organization. Thus adaptation, adjustment, evolution, survival, progress, and change are but accompaniments or aspects.

The fact that each species has its own specific superiority in its habitat or ecological niche further shows the key to anxiety-superior. Thus, actually, as shown by The Ottawa Pilot Study, The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, and this investigation, *most anxiety is anxiety-superior and develops or is caused by conditions which threaten or block the living organism in maintaining or manifesting*

its specific superiority either within its own ecological niche or outside, which is vital for its equilibrium and well-being.

Sherrington,¹⁰ in 'Man on His Nature,' discussing altruism writes: "Here is one of the great enigmas which vex man. Our milieu, so far as we explore it, appears a battlefield almost from end to end. Our world is in process of becoming, and that becoming is not a peaceful course. It meets on all sides obstacles and perplexities. It engages battle by methods often in man's view atrocious. One of these battles is between Man and Nature. Man is in conflict with Nature. We have not here to touch upon man's two other and still greater conflicts; man against man, and man against himself. Our theme is Nature and man as part of Nature. As part of Nature man is deeply involved in conflict with the rest."

Further on Sherrington notes: "but the course of Nature—and of the planet's whole story—reveal a law of primeval antiquity, namely, change, progressive change, a law older even than life itself. A *status quo* would be a breach of law, if Nature's laws were breachable."

These are significant observations.

Obviously the personality of the living organism, in these conflicts, cannot be reduced to a series of disguises adapted to the tune of his milieu in the battle of life. The problems and personality of the organism cannot be exhausted by a formula as it is never possible to dismiss the factor of the specific superiority of the organism, which varies extensively from one individual to another. Progressive change arises where there is genuine superiority, and this superiority is part of Nature itself. In Nature man is often deeply involved in conflict with personalities of 'fictitious' superiority who desire to maintain the *status quo* despite Nature's law. These personalities engage battle by methods often in man's view atrocious. And here are the great enigmas which vex man; man against man, and man against himself.

Woodger,¹⁴ in "Biological Principles" discussing adaptation and evolution, writes ". . . the notion of 'adaptation' does not express adequately what seems to have occurred in progressive evolution. Two organisms may be perfectly adapted to their environment and may be successful in the struggle for existence, and therefore, from the point of view of adaptiveness and survival value, they may be on an equal footing, and neither is more or less 'high' than another.

But one may have a greater degree of freedom than another. Every one knows that closeness of adaptation may prove to be a disadvantage to a race of organisms if it means loss of plasticity of response."

Woodger also notes: "Evolution, then, so far at least as the progressive lines are concerned, cannot be regarded as fundamentally a process of increasing complexity of anatomical structure—that is only an abstract aspect of it. Here as elsewhere we must think of the organism in terms of characterized events. The physiological aspect is accordingly the more concrete although it can only be studied by comparison of organisms now living. But from this point of view evolution along the progressive lines appears to have been a process of achievement of increasing freedom from contingent environmental circumstances by various modes."

These are primary data of observation.

A process of achievement of increasing freedom from contingent environmental circumstances involves superiority irrespective of the various modes. The life of an organism is based upon the organization of its constituents of specific superiority. The effect of the external environment on these potentials of organization and on the personality is incidental. The external and/or the internal environment may check or even completely crush the living organism. They cannot account for the dependence of the organism upon the organization of its constituents of specific superiority. These organizational potentials of the organism for its equilibrium or well-being are manifested in its relations. Factors in the environment may alter or influence the organism in manifesting these potentials but would not change them. *Thus, organization for superiority is the essential cause of performances and progressive evolution.*

Potentials of superiority of the living organism, even if it is a single cell, rest upon the organization of constituents with specific superiority for behaviour coordinated through the brain. Thus manifestations of the personality are actually properties of constituents with specific superiority which are organized and involve a degree of unity of action with relative cooperation through the cerebral cortex. This is an indispensable condition in maintaining the complex organization of behaviour such as differentiation, competition, learning, coordination, change, reactivity and control.

Organization for some unity of action and relative cooperation of constituents of specific superiority is prerequisite, if the organism is to survive or develop. This involves organization so that each constituent is enabled to display its specific superiority in liaison with the cerebral cortex. To attribute this organizational achievement to factors such as physico-chemical or electro-colloidal in the internal milieu of the organism would not alter the significance of the organization of constituents for specific superiority. Moreover the external milieu also consists of physico-chemical or electro-colloidal elements. Therefore, factors such as internal or external, space and time, physical or psychological, are relative to these potentials. Thus, there is an inner harmony and an essential unity of these seemingly opposed entities and the seemingly qualified differences are due to differences in quantity needed by the living organism in maintaining its organization for superiority.

It follows that there can be no differentiation between 'physical' and 'psychological' or 'inside' and 'outside.' Also without organization terms such as gene, gene complexes, gene mutations, dominant and recessive, have no meaning.

The writer's view then regarding relativity should be clear. *Relativity, in the final analysis, does not exist in Nature. The apparent unity of opposed entities is only relevant to superior entities. As the superior entities dissolve, so does the apparent unity of opposed entities. Thus Nature's unity is for progressive change, not relativity.*

Personality takes its roots from the organizational potentials of specific superiority of the cell or cells, and it is of the utmost importance to investigate the behaviour of cells regardless of their physico-chemical composition or structure.

"The human starting point," Sherrington¹⁰ writes, "even at outset, when but one single fertilized cell, is already not general but 'human.' It is as human at the beginning as at any later time, even if there comes later, in the concrete case, the wearing a stove-pipe hat."

It is not proposed to discuss the vast field of studies concerning cells. Nevertheless, a few examples may prove complementary and throw further light on the phenomena under investigation.

Butler,¹ discussing 'Life in the universe' in "Man is a microcosm," writes: "Unicellular organisms, such as free living cells which float

about in a pond, and bacteria, have to get along by performing all the necessary processes themselves. (. . .) This involves a multitude of chemical actions which are carried out with a speed, smoothness, and efficiency the laboratory chemist cannot approach."

Later, under the heading 'Muscle and brain' Butler notes: "Before we can understand the kind of work done in the brain, we must get an impression of the capacity of the messages which it receives from the senses. Sensitiveness to the environment is probably a fundamental property of living protoplasm. The most primitive kinds of life respond in some degree to heat, cold, light, and to chemical substances."

Obviously, feelings of specific superiority can be discovered and even measured in the operation of the smallest independently living cell in its environment.

Sherrington¹⁰ in "Man on His Nature," referring to the malaria plasmodium, notes: "The malaria plasmodium is a single cell. We saw reason to doubt whether any single cell, either part of an organism or a complete organism in itself, can have mind read securely into its behaviour. And here it would require for meeting its problem successfully, as it does, sensing and perceiving, cognizing and judging; reason, intention and forecast of future, not to speak of recognition and choice."

Clearly cells possess constituents of specific superiority that are organized and co-ordinated through the brain so that the organism displays certain behaviour. A behaviour not provided for in the organization of these constituents can never be effected. This applies to any single cell, whether part of an organism or a complete organism. A few examples are given which obviously support these contentions without commenting on them separately.

Butler,¹ in "Man is a Microcosm" under the sub-heading 'Chemical controllers of the body', writes: "Our organism is a society of cells, a highly organized society in which each kind of cell has a trade of its own. There are cells which manufacture special enzymes, cells which accumulate starch or fat, cells engaged in the process of breaking down and excreting unwanted products, cells which transport oxygen, etc. All these activities must be regulated and controlled. They must be performed at the right time and to the right extent."

Weiss,¹³ in "Principles of Development," discussing the 'phenomena in the service of both development and function' notes: "... white blood cells for instance, gather around foci of injured tissue but after having done their work there, they disperse again, and we may consider the whole affair a closed physiological incident."

"A macrophage (phagocytic blood cell) often sends out a pseudopodium to ingest some foreign particles, as do also the intestinal cells of certain lowly animals in order to seize food fragments; since the protruded process is withdrawn afterwards and the cell returns to its original shape, we call the change physiological." Further on, Weiss writes: "... no vital processes are in themselves either specifically developmental or specifically physiological."

Weiss, in considering regenerative processes, notes: "Mesenchyme cells, for instance, can appear as free blood cells or as fixed connective tissue cells, and, under certain conditions, they can even produce bone. A transformation of the order is known in pathology as metaplasia."

Carroll,² in "Man the Unknown," writing on 'body and physiological activities,' notes: "... cells capable of repairing organs wherever necessary. These properties are indeed strange. When carrying out such astonishing duties, the blood stream behaves like a torrent which, with the help of the mud and the trees drifting in its stream would set about repairing the homes situated on its banks."

"... Owing to these microscopic elements, the blood acts as a mobile tissue, a repairing agent, a medium both solid and fluid, capable of going wherever its presence may be necessary. It can rapidly surround microbes attacking a region of the organism with a great mass of leucocytes, which fight the infection."

Sherrington,¹⁰ in "Man on his Nature" discussing 'life in little,' writes: "Observers describe how the quick little *Colpidium* is captured by the slow amoeba. It is the chemical behaviour of the invading bacteria which brings our amoeboid cells thither to engulf and digest them. Our amoeboid cell will treat the wound and the germs of disease as chemical factors and, doing so, do just what it does. And, so doing, defend the body. So obvious and significant is the last, that the surgeon watching and studying the behaviour of the cells, though knowing it chemical, calls it 'defensive,' as if it were inspired by purpose."

The samples taken are but few of countless many. Apparently cells, no matter from what point taken, show organization of specific superiority for behaviour. In fact, undivided behaviour always correlates with a complex organization. These behavioural characteristics further reveal that a cell possesses an organization of its own; and, to organize and coordinate its innumerable constituents, the cell requires a brain. Thus any single cell, whether part of an organism or a complete organism, has a brain, not a creation *de novo* but a necessary coordinator. As shown, cells display behaviour according to their constituents and the level of their organization relative to that of higher forms of life, where these activities are recognized and credited to the cerebral cortex. It follows that any stage of development will disclose the level of organization to be in accordance with that of the constituents coordinated through the cells' brains.

This is not the place to enter into descriptions made in the literature on development. However, the following observations have a bearing on this study.

Weiss,¹³ discussing 'principles and mechanisms' in "Principles of Development," writes as follows: "The problems of development are essentially of two kinds: those pertaining to principles and those pertaining to mechanisms. This distinction needs to be explained, and specific examples will probably serve this purpose best. One speaks for instance, of the principle of "competition." One does not have to know the nature of the competitors to understand the rules of their conduct and the results of their actions. Competing for control in a common field, each expands as far as the others let him; they check one another according to their relative strengths. Strengthening one is tantamount to weakening the others. Strengthening or weakening all proportionately leaves their balance unaltered. If their common domain is widened, they again apportion the new fields in proportion to their powers, and so forth. These phenomena are invariably the same whether the competitors are nations, tradesmen, hunting animals, growing plants, cells in a common nutrient, or whirls in a common pool. The mechanisms vary: nations wage wars, tradesmen use persuasion, animals deplete stock of prey, plants exhaust the soil, cells withdraw nutrients from the medium, and one vortex diverts water from the next by centrifugal force. To know these mechanisms in no way adds to our insight into the operation of the principle of

competition. For reasons of this kind it is necessary to draw a line between the search for principles and the exploration of mechanisms. Many events become fully intelligible only in terms of the principles which they obey, regardless of the mechanisms, often obscure, through which they are effected."

Clearly development involves competition, but principles and mechanisms cannot be separated in living organisms. Events cannot become fully intelligible only in terms of the principles nor only in terms of the mechanisms. There must be some degree of unity as every need, in the final analysis, involves both. Apparently a living organism cannot be reduced to a 'machine' no matter how scientific the term may sound. *Entities with specific superiority are part of Nature. Thus, the continuous interplay and the lateral competition which develop between entities are part of Nature's law. These phenomena are invariably the same irrespective of entities and their fields.* Naturally living organisms must organize their behaviour to maintain their specific superiority if they are to develop and survive. So the principles and organization for behaviour become intelligible only in terms of both.

Sherrington,¹⁰ in "Man on His Nature," writes: "Each cell is an organized life-system centered upon itself. We cannot say more *qua* energy-system of the sum total individual of any of us. The cell is a unit-life, and our life which in its turn is a unitary life consists utterly of the cell-lives. The cell is not a polyphasic chemico-physical system merely. Many a mere drop of complex jelly could be that. The cell is a polyphasic chemico-physical system which is integratively organized. Hence there comes about that it can answer to what is described as 'life'."

"(. . .) whereas in the many-celled individual the cell's surround consists of other cells, each cell's autonomy is influenced by the cells in its proximity. That the cell is thus influenced by other cells and coordinated with and modified by them must not be mistaken for its no longer having a self-centered life. Its very specialization which results is a sign of its autonomy. To suppose it has become merely a part of some other life than its own is to forget facts. The component cells of the body assert the fact of their individual autonomy of living in many ways. They remain unit-lives."

These are primary data of observation.

Obviously a cell, whether it is part of an organism or a complete organism, has a dynamic equilibrium. Each cell is independent, is able to compete and defend itself, and is endowed with astounding properties, capacities and potentials to organize and to coordinate in building up the whole organism.

Now, to say that cells have developed and organized a complex human organism without brains is tantamount to saying that a living human organism has no brain. *Clearly, what the brain is to a cell, so are the component cells' brains to man.* Thus the manifestations of personality are actually properties of the constituent cells' brains, involved in some unity of action with relative cooperation, organization, and coordination through the cerebral cortex. Thus the cells are the subscribers using the exchange (cerebral cortex with its coordinators) through the numerous heterogeneous and independent messengers called neurons.

Carrol,² discussing the autonomous nervous system in "Man the Unknown," writes: "Organs such as the stomach, liver, heart, etc., are not subject to our will. We are incapable of decreasing or increasing the calibre of our arteries, the rhythm of our pulse or of the contractions of our intestines. The automatism of those functions is due to the presence of reflex arcs within the organs. These regional brains are made up of small clusters of nerve cells scattered in the tissues, under the skin, around the blood vessels, etc."

Evidently then, there are millions of *cells with recognizable brains* in the human organism, and at the same time these regional brains are in liaison with the cerebral cortex.

The essential features of the behaviour of cells, from a single cell to an association with other cells, are their organizational potentials of specific superiority and their unit-lives. These are vital features not only to ensure their individuality and security but, in various associations, to contribute to the organization of a fairly harmonious unity, coexistence, security, and survival, and are factors of superiority of organisms. Their specific superiority safeguards the organism against monopolistic or dictatorial manifestations of any single cell or society of cells. No individual cell or group of cells can maintain or claim, whether they manufacture enzymes, are engaged in carrying messages as neurons, or are coordinators in the cerebral cortex, superiority to other cells.

Memory of any particular event is an important factor of the personality. Recollection does not lie within the province of any single agent such as patterns of neuronal activities, fluxes of ions, and the cerebral cortex. While the cerebral cortex fulfills a highly important work with its cells as coordinators, nevertheless its success depends among other things on individual cells regardless of their position for cells are individual 'unit-lives' with brains and retain their experiences. To suppose that another agent retains their experiences for them is to overlook the truth. *Thus experience and learning become important factors in maintaining superiority.*

It is beyond the scope of this work to follow all the intricacies of the organism. Studies agree that the struggle and competition in the world of living organisms are extremely intense and a battlefield from end to end. Obviously then, what is intended in this discussion is that living organisms must organize for some degree of superiority if they are to survive. Thus the organism is not considered a 'machine' but an 'organism to organize' its behaviour and personality in maintaining its superiority, which is vital for its equilibrium and well-being. The organization of the other behaviours of the organism is of less immediate interest, as the main purpose of this inquiry is the nature of the living organism and the way it organizes in maintaining its specific superiority, which is of such transcendental importance. It can be stated that the effects of all other organizations are secondary in their direct or indirect action on this organization.

The specific superiority of the human organism over lower animals cannot be assigned to a single factor such as the nervous system, the cerebral cortex, language or symbols, for lower animals have all of these. The specific superiority of the human organism over other species must be attributed to certain component cells of specific superiority in its organism; a type of behaviour not provided for in the organism by these constituents cannot be effected. Evidently the creativeness of the human personality springs from the organism, and the degree of creativeness is determined by the creative capacity of the constituent cells. *The ability of the component cells of the organism to organize and to discover new meaning in the forces which impinge upon them, from either inside or outside, and the skill to alter their organization for behaviour in maintaining their specific*

superiority have a profound significance for the personality. This is one reason why no formula can predict the personality of a human organism.

As has been shown, to satisfy needs presents difficulties and involves overcoming obstacles. From one single fertilized cell until death, the human organism must organize to maintain its specific superiority inside and outside of its ecological niche. If it is to survive, this is the most pressing and severe task it has.

Mastery, confidence, and control are but accompaniments of specific superiority. These organizational achievements are organized by the microscopic cells. Individual cells do understand the advantages of coordination in association, nevertheless they reply to it in their own terms and individually. Thus, coordination in the organism is not unity for dictatorship but to enable each of its constituents to intervene intentionally in maintaining its own organization of specific superiority, and to allow lateral competition to develop freely in order to actualize its potentialities. This organizational feature from within has not only important implications in the study and understanding of personalities but is the key to evolution and to the progress of humanity. As history shows, the various myths, dogmas, notions or authorities of science based on cliques were either destroyed by opposition or underwent logical transformations in giving way to the more natural needs of human organisms. They will continue to do so, as in the case of conflict between ideologies and scientific truth; in the final analysis truth prevails.

It will be clear from the foregoing that the term 'personality,' as used here, has nothing to do with philosophical questions as to what personality or the various 'egos' or 'selves' are. Personality in this study includes no more than 'personality' manifested by the organism in maintaining its specific superiority. The organizational tendency to variation of these potentials in the human personality is no more concerned directly with the measuring rod of philosophical values than are the variations of lower animals or plants.

The brief sketch given here of some factors and laws which operate in building up the higher life of the organism has necessarily been confined to the constitutional dynamics of individual cells. It will emerge that the organization for behaviour of a single cell provides the basis for an explanation of that of the more complex

human organism and personality. In other words, *the organizational features 'within' or in the 'inner milieu,'* referred to in this discussion, *are exactly the same as those 'outside' or in the 'external milieu.'*

If, from the single cell, the lives, feelings, and behaviour of human personalities are observed in their milieu, the dynamics of feelings, organization of specific superiority, associations, and lateral competition are obvious. And here also, feelings and specific superiority constitute a remarkable force. The behaviours which they motivate in the daily lives of personalities are decisive. The slightest disappointment of these feelings is registered in every cell of the organism. Thus organization for specific superiority is vital and is the animating principle of the human personality.

As mentioned, researches on feelings of superiority and anxiety-superior have already been carried out. These experiments were designed for the purpose of showing how individuals maintain and manifest these feelings. For example, The Ottawa Pilot Study (1953) showed that these phenomena are a dominating motivating force in activities, while The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status (1955) indicated further their transcendental importance. These studies also reveal that anxiety-superior is a far-reaching problem. No effort can be made here to elaborate on these works. This investigation is a continuation of these studies.

Feelings of specific superiority are basic, and to them can be traced a whole series of complicated organizations of fundamental significance in differentiating between personalities and abilities. In the following discussion it is proposed to deal further with a limited portion of the vast field which the personality of the human organism presents. The experiment to be discussed was designed to demonstrate some of the relations of the organizational features of personality outlined in this introduction.

Part I. There is a perpetual state of competition in Nature between entities of specific superiority which destroy relativity and forces favoring acquiescence. Competition is Nature's law to ensure unity for the development of potentials of specific superiority for progressive change.

Part II. Nature's laws of behaviour of personalities are the laws of behaviour of the sum of the organism's constituent units. Personality variation is of complex origin, but the organizational principle

or motive is the same, that is to maintain specific superiority in situations.

Part III. Without entities of specific superiority in Nature the phenomena of learning and change could not exist. For survival, the living organism must maintain its specific superiority by means of learning and change. In the final analysis Nature's laws put an end to conditioning and canalizing.

Part IV. By reason of entities of specific superiority in Nature, phenomena such as feeling, thinking, differentiation, and anxiety-superior are important factors of personality. To satisfy needs, the living organism must organize for specific superiority. Thus all forms of thinking and feeling are of the same order and are controlled by the same motive of organization. Conditions or situations which threaten or block the organism in maintaining or manifesting its organization of specific superiority are causes of anxiety-superior.

PART I

Personality and Competition

The literature on personality and competition is full of formulae and of terms such as assertion, assertive frustration, assertive drives, assertive elements, aggressive assertion, self-assertion, natural wants, artificial wants, higher wants, lower wants, economic wants, self-seeking, self-interest, self-reliance, economic man, security, insecurity, profit, power, and prestige. For the most part, explanations of this sort cannot survive. They may have philosophical merits, but their scientific value remains obscure. After all, these formulae are supposed to give expression to aspects of the human organism, yet none of them so much as approaches competition in the nature of living organisms. There are points which justify considering competition and development of the human personality as collateral processes. These will be discussed here.

Because of entities of specific superiority in Nature, continuous competition is a law of Nature; thus the higher potentials of these entities are becoming. Man with his specific superiority is part of Nature and is deeply involved in competition all-round.

It has been shown that the transformation of a cell into the developed individual is the result of organization of constituents with potentials competing to maintain and outline their spheres of specific superiority. The capacity for competing is, therefore, provided in the organism and is not a novel and secondarily acquired adaptiveness. In consequence of this, the capacity to compete is limited by the extent to which constituents maintain their potentials of specific superiority. Thus, *the relation between the individual and his capacity to compete in his surroundings, the 'external milieu,' is the same as that between the capacity of the constituents of specific superiority to compete within the organism, the 'inner milieu.'* Consequently the capacity to compete in some forms is great while in others it is almost nil. To reiterate, the effects of the external environment on the development of personality but furnish a set of conditions under which the individual can compete in manifesting his organization of specific superiority. A change of environment may alter the manifestations of this organization. Clearly, individuals' capacities to compete cannot be

judged by their external appearances nor by their environments. Although superficially they resemble one another, human organisms obstinately preserve the distinctiveness of their specific superiority. In societies where conditions are such that they ruthlessly destroy or check the free manifestation of their potentials, individuals temporarily divest themselves of the manifold elaborate tools of organization to compete but retain their personalities. Obviously the further development of personalities is only possible through the free interplay and lateral competition of their potentials of specific superiority. That this interplay and competition are the essential causes of the highly developed and superior performances of a society can be regarded as proven beyond any doubt. Scientific investigations without factious prejudices clearly reveal that, when personalities are suppressed, society becomes stagnant. There were conspicuous examples, not only in the history of the civilization of societies, but at present where various notions such as state ownership, cults, philosophies, dogmas, class distinctions, working-class, economic string-pulling, race, and nationality, with widely conceived organizations, dark fanaticism, masterly consistency, and cruelty try to annihilate the free manifestations of personalities. Some of these societies petrified into rigidity for centuries. It is a story of attempts to maintain the fictitious superiority of various notions, at the cost of lives and sufferings, and, great tragedy as it is, torturing in proportion the personalities of living human organisms superior to them in Nature's scale. However, they failed time and again. Human personalities carry the conditions determining and controlling the development of their potentials *within themselves*. Thus, in the final analysis, the organism refuses to submit to and divorces itself from philosophical exploitation. It rejects being replaced by disembodied fictitious notions.

As indicated previously, competition and the development of the organism from a cell are collateral processes. Thus continuous competition in maintaining the specific superiority of the organism is a law of Nature. Any attempt to understand the organization of the human personality without competition would be futile.

The feelings of the subjects on competition are presented in Table 1. Eighty-nine per cent answered "yes" or "definitely" while 11 per cent also answered in the affirmative as shown in this table. No matter what the person is competing for, the motivations are

TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES ON COMPETITION

Question No.	Yes or Definitely %	Other Answers %
1 Do you feel that competition is alright?	89	11 1. It is very good. 2. It challenges you. 3. There should be. 4. Everybody has to live. 5. Not in everything. 6. Yes and no. 7. Some competition. 8. So long as it is fair. 9. It has to be so. 10. I have to. 11. Not too much of it.

100 Subjects, male and female, over 17 years of age.

invariably the same. The organization of behaviour and its manifestations vary; nevertheless, by nature of its constituents of specific superiority, the organism accepts competition, not only to survive but to maintain and to enable it to actualize its potentials.

TABLE 2
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES WHEN RESENTING COMPETITION

Question No.	Never %	When It Is Unfair %	Other Answers %
8 When do you resent competition?	23	14	63*

100 Subjects, male and female, over 17 years of age.

To ensure a greater scope and freedom for analysis, answers will not be classified and placed in tables. However tables will be used where they fully serve their purpose. The questions were constructed with the aim of eliciting the deeper personality organization rather than providing material for statistics.

*Other answers to Question No. 8—When do you resent competition?

I resent competition when money is the master.

When somebody tries to put me down when he doesn't like me personally.

Whenever I am right. When I am absolutely sure.

When he cuts the prices.

In sport.

When it is unjust.

In my spare time, or with family and friends.

The way they go about it or the way they do it sometimes.

When competition is such that I am not able to carry on.

If I feel that it is not right I go against it.

At a time you are not ready.

When it is underhanded.

When somebody is better looking than I am.

When it becomes unfair or resorts to unfair tactics.

In business.

I resent competition in cases of seniority. If they appoint someone else through advertising or pull.

Especially if I am there quite a while and a new fellow comes in and takes my place.

Sometimes when it is too much.

Mean competition. If he lies about my business.

A little man tries to build some business and the big fellow knocks him out unfairly.

When it is dirty.

When it troubles my children and is ruining the lives of my youngsters.

Only from a selfish point of view.

When it is not relevant.

I resent it sometimes, that is human nature. I may be better in other things.

I resent competition from those who do not need the work and take the work away from me.

When it is a dirty play.

Mainly when you are helpless to do anything about it, take for example Syracuse, U.S.A., advertises in Ottawa.

Lack of experience or training and I am put in a position to compete when not qualified.

I can't see how a board can decide in a few minutes that a person will not be good in a certain job.

When someone is cutting the price to a level where no one has a decent standard of living.

When bigger men tackle something they usually have more strength physically. Mentally they are poor.

If it goes a little too far or if they are wrong they are wrong.

When I was really superior and somebody was brought in and got the job.

When a personal friend abused your confidence and overbid you.

When it raises the price too high and gets beyond control.

When it is not on equal ground.

I resent having the very livelihood of people vary directly as their ability plus multiplied by their acquisitiveness.

I resent it on account of myself when I feel I can't do better.

When I know I am absolutely right.

When I have to decide to keep the best man.

If the competition is completely unfair and favoritism is put in its place.

I resent competition when a fellow is not straight.

When I see something false.

Tends to be sharp competition.

Directing competition so that individuals with real capacities are not permitted to compete.

When you may lose your job.

When it is crushed.

Resent big shots backing some one.

When competition goes over the line.

When it is stronger.

Injustice in competition, special favour or advantage.

When they buy out other people who need their places.

Not if it is competition.

I resent competition when it is underhanded.

If it is real competition, I never resent it.

Only when the competitors show an attitude of superiority.

If it is dishonest.

When it is not clean competition.

When you are not on the same level as the other competitors.

Never, as long as competition is above board.

If it wasn't fair, especially with personnel.

I resent competition when a job is rushed, as you never get a proper chance in competition.

Human organisms, by virtue of their specific superiority, compete with one another in a free society. While they understand the advantages of coordination in association, nevertheless they reply to it in their own terms and individually. Thus, coordination in a free society is understood by the personality, not as unity for dictatorship, but to enable each personality to intervene intentionally in maintaining his organization of specific superiority and to allow lateral competition to develop freely in actualizing his own potentials and those of society. Thus competition also implies the interest of the higher development of a society.

Table 2 shows that 23 per cent of the subjects never resent competition, 14 per cent when it is unfair, and 63 per cent gave various other answers when resenting competition. Among these answers it is interesting to note such statements as 'Only from a selfish point of view,' 'I resent it sometimes, that is human nature.' 'I may be better in other things,' 'Mainly when you are helpless to do anything about it, take for example Syracuse, U.S.A., advertises in Ottawa,' and 'I can't see how a board can decide in a few minutes that a person will not be good in a certain job.' These data clearly show that none of the subjects feels that competition ought not to take place; they demand competition. They resent competition only when it is conducted under conditions of various injustices and deceptions. Resentments of this sort may cause 'anxiety-superior' and be concealed for a long time before conflicts break out as has happened many times in the history of societies.

The data and discussion of this chapter could be summarized as follows:

(1) There is a perpetual state of competition in Nature between entities of specific superiority, which eliminate relativity and forces favouring acquiescence. Competition is Nature's law to ensure unity for the development of potentials for progressive change.

(2) Human personality takes its roots from a single fertilized cell, which develops into a many-celled individual, through organization of its constituents with potentials competing not only to maintain and outline their own provinces of specific superiority but that of the organism as a whole. Thus, the potentials of the total organism to compete vary inversely according to that of its component cells with potentials of specific superiority.

(3) Competition is mostly impersonal. In a free society, human personalities compete with each other, which proves that the organization of specific superiority for the development of potentials has not subsided. That the personality is influenced by other personalities or modified by them does not mean that it no longer has its own personality. The result of its own organization of specific superiority is an indication of its personality.

(4) Activities of the environment can be responsible for the reduction or even complete suppression of competition for the development of human personalities and that of society. Nevertheless organisms carry their potentials within themselves. Thus individuals' capacities to compete cannot be judged by their external appearances nor by their environments.

(5) The motivation of the organism to compete is invariably the same. The human organism competes not only to survive but to actualize his potentials of specific superiority and to develop his personality. If the nature of a society is such as to favour free competition with justice for all, orderly progress is assured.

(6) Where free competition is suppressed under conditions of various injustices and fictitious notions, personalities develop anxiety-superior and become weary of their perpetual defeat, and the excuse of inequality or of lack of capacity becomes a deception. Individuals temporarily divest themselves of the manifold elaborate tools of organization to compete and society stagnates.

Situations of superiority and their effects are important factors in the understanding of personality organization. In the next chapter some of these aspects will be considered.

PART II

Situations of Superiority

There are theories of personality which assign some sort of mysterious agent 'within the individual' and emphasize the negative and destructive effects of this 'agent' under such terms as 'repressed' and 'unconsciously active.' None the less, no such mysterious agent exists in the organization of the human personality, as Nature's laws of behaviour are the laws of behaviour of the sum of the organism's constituent units. The ability of the component unit cells of the organism to organize and to coordinate eliminate 'repressed' and 'unconsciously active' fictitious elements.

The fact that the human organism can intervene intentionally and organize in developing its potentials of specific superiority from within has important implications. The human personality not only understands himself but can discover new meaning in the forces impinging upon him, and is able to alter his organization for behaviour in the face of new situations. This organizational feature is at the same time the major constructive force in the individual and in social life, and is one of the greatest motivations for learning. In maintaining its organization for specific superiority, the organism must emphasize the essentials of the situation which are relevant. Evidence of this can be seen in the practically unlimited capacity of the human organism to reorganize for behaviour, which proves that the organization for development of these capacities does not subside. Some of these aspects will be considered here.

The degree of the development of human personalities varies according to society. As a matter of fact, the greater the distance between the knowledge of the human organism and the fictitious and deceptive ideas incorporated in social behaviour, the greater the task to be performed by the process of personality development. The educational system of some societies—according to their fictitious notions of 'non-acceptance' toward human organisms—will cause the organization of personalities to be screened. This shows that not only hypocrisy and prejudice but the dullness of a society is caused by the suppression of the human organism in manifesting its specific superiority.

To understand these fractious tendencies and the underlying inducements, it should be remembered that the anxiety to maintain and to defend the superiority of the individual is related, as has been shown, to his fundamental organization. It is through violating these most vital feelings that the personality can be wounded and temporarily subdued. Everyone knows that some individuals or groups of individuals try to maintain the superiority of their fictitious ideas by the wayward method of demolishing the achievements and the personalities of others. Evidently deranged feelings to violate and to destroy the achievements and personalities of others are deviations of the same motive. Several mild manifestations of these feelings are well-known in ordinary life, but it is worthy to note that chiefly weak and defective individuals manifest them in unreasonable ways. Some perversions of ideas may be characterized as the utmost forms of feelings to violate or attempt to destroy the autonomy of personalities. Nevertheless, in the final analysis, the human organism resists and refuses to be bullied and manouvered like a puppet.

The interaction of the social structure and the manifestations of specific superiority of the organisms play a vital role in the process of personality development, which requires that the constructive and creative elements emerging from the organism succeed in manifesting themselves freely in their environment. Each individual, by virtue of his organization of specific superiority, has some degree of creative capacity, which is necessary in solving the problems of his life. Clearly, personality development is invariably the result of the organization of the component unit cells in which their potentials of specific superiority gradually led to their manifestations in response to and in counteraction with entities of specific superiority in the internal and external milieux. While the organizational motive or principle of these entities is the same, their manifestations vary as entities continue to fluctuate independently inside and outside of the organism. The variation of the personality is, accordingly, of compound origin, and so are the excesses of variation which are called abnormal. There is no need here to elaborate on abnormalities.

The motive of the human personality to maintain his specific superiority is, therefore, internal to his own organism and determines his relations in his environment and with his kind.

The following answers to Question No. 2 show the nature of situations of superiority:

QUESTION No. 2—In dealing with a person who is superior to you in what you are doing, how do you maintain your own feelings of superiority?

Answers

Work harder to catch up.

I do whatever is to be done to the best of my ability.

Try to be like him, do the same thing.

I maintain my own and, through politeness, try to learn more from him.

Better man than I. I'm sorry but I maintain my own just the same. Sometimes I should ask, but I am too proud and I suffer sometimes on that account.

I don't feel badly about it. Try to do as well as he does.

I try to learn from him and respect him for what he is.

I wouldn't feel inferior. I would learn.

I try to feel what I am; try to know just as much as he does.

I am just my own self.

I use my own judgment in what I am doing and I listen to him.

Try to do the best I can, hoping that it meets requirements.

I still feel that I am doing a good job and can stand beside him.

I feel I'm the best.

By learning from him.

Fine. I do the best I can to maintain my own.

I try to watch his ways and catch up to him.

I tell him what I know to the best of my ability; be myself.

You can't feel superior but I maintain my own.

I recognize that I'm not the best.

I keep my own integrity.

I maintain my own by honest deal or work.

I appreciate it. I feel comfortable in the job I am doing. I feel I have reached my level.

I have to listen to him and take his words. You can't lower yourself.

Try to be the same.

I have no trouble except with some cheap people.

It depends on his attitude. If he is domineering my feeling would be the same. I would resent him.

I respect her.

I just do what he tells me.

If I am right, I am right. I don't believe in toadying. Give him his due.

I admire people who are superior.

I carry on just the same. Wouldn't concern me. Try to learn.

Respect each other.

I don't consider myself inferior.

Use your own philosophy.

I'm just as good as he is.

I do everything to the best of my ability .

I know what I can do. I know my own capacity.

I don't think I should feel inferior or frustrated. It is up to me, if conditions permit to reach his standard and if I don't have to be dishonest or crushed.

I try to do just as good as he does.

Everybody has their own responsibilities.

By having done the best job I can do. I respect him, have nothing to hide and in this way maintain my own superiority.

I don't believe it ever became a question.

By explaining what you know, but I give him no ground.

I would do what I am told. If I am told to do something in the wrong way, I do it my own way. I wouldn't accept the instruction blindly.

By showing my attention and giving full cooperation.

I just feel that I am under his jurisdiction. It takes a good man to do this.

Maybe he is superior in his own line, but I feel I have other qualities superior to his.

I respect him. I figure I am as good as he.

I am thinking what I am doing.

I didn't run to anyone.

I respect his knowledge but don't bog down to him.
I try to do a better job.
I just carry on. I use my knowledge.
I think that I am better in other things.
If it is not my specialty, in some cases I admit my own inferiority, but
I maintain my own superiority in my specialty.
At first I listen to what he tells me and do what he wants.
Try to speak in the same line they do or major in your own lines.
I face them.
I keep quiet.
I compete with him.
I'm trying to increase my own superiority.
They can do one job. I can do something else better.
I do the best I can. I go to him and ask.
I think I suffer a little and I have to fight to keep up my own.
I'm glad to go to him for anything I wouldn't know.
I would try to let him do things and try to supply every information
in my sphere of knowledge.
Nobody is superior to me.
Admit that he is superior.
Try my own in something they are not.
It is up to me to prove my abilities.
Just as much right in my own way as she is.
My faith in myself.
I'm just as good as anyone.
I agree with him, try to associate with him.
As long as he is not too bossy he is alright.
Sometimes you do things better than he does but you keep your
mouth shut.
Maintain a certain amount of politeness, don't over emphasize it.
Doing my best.
Do your best.
Relate yourself. Do your own branching. Be nicer to superiors in one's
natural skill. He has to meet the unbridled. Does not affect my
competence. Hold my own. Will enhance one's own feelings.

Just work harder.

Let him lead, you can always fill in.

I consider myself on the same level.

Be sociable and consider yourself on the same level. Invite him to your home.

By obeying, what I am supposed to do, I maintain my own.

Acknowledge his superiority.

Treat him as nicely as possible.

I respect him. Try to improve myself.

Stick to my natural self.

Try to analyse him, what makes him superior.

Best to recognize that you are not superior for some basic reason.

No two persons think alike. I maintain my own as long as I can paint.

I listen to him, try to grasp as much as possible from him and I'll be just as smart as he is.

I try to be myself.

Try to level up the best I can.

I try to think as fast as he does.

I definitely speak what is on my mind. I am not shy to bring them out. I'm not afraid.

It does not mean that he has to be the best in everything.

A brief consideration of the data discloses that it is vital to the personality to maintain its organization of specific superiority in a situation. The answers show that, while most of the subjects are cooperative and somewhat influenced by the other individual's superiority, nevertheless, the skill to alter their organization for behaviour in the light of the situation in maintaining their own specific superiority is significant. Moreover the replies indicate that these feelings safeguard them against monopolistic or dictatorial manifestations of other personalities. Also the willingness of the individuals to contribute for a fairly harmonious unity and coexistence may be noted from most of the answers. The motivation to learn in these situations is significant. Competition and some anxiety-superior are manifested. On the whole it is possible to concede that, while the organization of behaviour and its manifestations vary, it is fundamentally of the same nature and follows the same principles or motives, that is, to maintain the specific superiority of the personality.

After having ascertained the effects of such situations on the organization of personalities, situations in which the individual is superior to others were explored.

QUESTION No. 7—How do you feel in dealing with a person of whom you are superior in what you are doing?

Answers

Help him as much as possible. Show him the ropes. Make things easier for him.

Condescend to that particular person.

I feel that I have more responsibility, I am friendly with them and understand them.

It gives you a sense of superiority. Help him with the thing.

I wouldn't try to hurt him. Try to help.

I feel good with some. I like to help him but I don't feel proud.

I feel proud about it. Teach as much as I know.

Doesn't make much difference. If he likes to be taught then I help him.

Never refuse to answer questions.

I am very careful. I don't like to make them feel inferior.

I feel good and much better. Sometimes belittle him.

I never belittle the other person. I believe that he is entitled to his own. I get down to his level.

I feel superior allright. I try to help if a thing is not right.

I feel kind of sorry. I try to help him as much as possible.

I feel very friendly.

I go to his level. No use to go above his head.

At ease and try to help him if he is willing.

I feel good. I wouldn't look down on him.

I figure that he is only learning. I like to help him.

A person is a person. I treat him with respect for what he is and wouldn't make him feel inferior because of myself.

I feel better, more sure of myself.

I have no particular feeling toward him.

I try not to feel superior.

Doesn't make any difference. I would like him to know as much as I do.

Sometimes embarrassed. I don't like to use my position as a superior.

I usually consider every angle. Don't make them feel insecure.

He should get consideration; all the help I can give him.

Depends on his age.

Treat him as equal.

I treat him just like myself. I try to help him.

I wouldn't show her that I know more. I would try to help her without hurting her feelings.

I went through it myself. I treat them the same.

I wouldn't let that feeling get the uppermost.

I would try to help him if he is interested. I wouldn't force him to accept help.

It feels good, a certain sense of power.

I try to be helpful.

I like to treat them as equals.

If he can do what is necessary to be done it is fine.

I help them. I am pleased to help.

Still diplomacy. Not be too rash.

I don't feel any different. Jack is as good as his master.

If he is willing not to be bored, I am willing to teach him if he is amenable.

I feel O.K.

It depends on the person.

The greater the gap the more frustrated I am, the less the gap the better I like it.

How best I can get this man to ultimately assist and cooperate in order to get the best in him.

I have to teach him, I have no other alternative.

I am careful. I try not to show any feelings of superiority and try to treat him the best that I can. I make them feel at ease.

I would feel superior but make them feel equal.

I just tell him to do the right thing. I won't jump on his neck. I just tell him nicely.

I try to make the person feel at home and not show it too much, asking him nicely.

I help him all I can but, if I see he is not willing, I will tell him straight "Quit it and learn something else if you don't want it."

I really help him in anything.

I sort of respect a man who is willing to understand that you know more.

Not try in any way to appear so. I talk in his own terms not to give a feeling of inferiority.

I treat him the same as I would like to be treated by him if he were my superior.

I feel sort of equal even if I have the opportunity to feel superior.

Feel very happy because I have an uplift.

I generally seek, if possible, to bring him to my level of thinking.

I would teach him.

Try to get not too superior to him and understand him.

Treat them all the same.

I feel a little proud.

I only deal with people with inferiority when it is necessary.

I try to increase their superiority but explain even if it is a foolish question.

I try to teach them.

I help him out.

Actually I have had few such experiences. Don't think too much about it.

I find it very good but I feel that he has something else he knows.

After all, I am not much superior to him.

Try to do their thinking for them if it is helpful in any way.

I teach him.

Endeavour not to convey that feeling of superiority to the person.

Try to tell him what is the best and it is up to him.

He is just as good as I am. I don't show it. It is not necessary.

Try to help him out.

Inclined to be nice to the fellow.

I don't feel superior. I am glad to help if he asks questions and am glad to assist him.

Do unto them as you expect them to do unto you.

Depends on him.

Try to show him and, if he doesn't listen, give him a few chances.

Always willing to help him. One out of ten is able to do the job no matter how often you show him.

The same.

I try to teach him what I know. It depends on him.

I would want to feel cooperative and helpful. Again a common task.

Respect for each other.

Give him a chance.

Give him the impression that you respect his own opinion.

Naturally I feel superior.

Be the same.

I feel that he is lucky. He is going to get fair play.

Feel friendly. Don't discourage them. Watch myself not to become impatient.

I treat them nicely and give them equal rights.

I figure everybody is the same in business.

Doesn't change me.

Shortcomings are normal.

I feel kindly disposed toward them and try to help them.

No difference.

I don't try to show them. I try to teach them what I know.

I feel rather nice occasionally.

I don't feel better or take advantage. Teach them as much as I can.

I try to bring my thinking to his level.

I want to do more for the person. I want to help.

It depends on his ability to learn.

The data further show that fundamentally the personality is amenable to a variety of differentiating influences albeit to a different degree. The following conclusions may be drawn about the nature of personality organization manifested in situations of superiority to other individuals. By far the majority of the subjects manifested a desire to help, to teach, and to safeguard the other individual's feelings of superiority by not belittling him nor displaying their own superiority. These data further confirm the contention that 'genuine'

superiority correlates significantly with good qualities. A number of subjects frankly stated that having feelings of superiority in a situation is rather pleasing. This is in harmony with the natural organizational motive of personality. It will be noted that mastery, confidence, control, and lack of excessive anxiety are accompaniments or aspects of genuine superiority. In these circumstances, motivation to learn from the other person is obviously at a low level.

The manifestations and the feelings of the personality in situations previously examined show that development is impossible unless existing conditions are such as to enable the personality to maintain his own specific superiority so that the monopolistic use of any situation by individuals of fictitious superiority is precluded.

Boss or director must mean in a sense one in authority, and authority over someone means, in some respects, superiority. In this combination, superiority in some respects is oftentimes fictitious. The effect of such a situation on personalities was investigated.

QUESTION No. 5—When dealing with a person who is your boss or director and you feel that he doesn't know as much as you, how does it affect you?

Answers

You wouldn't feel that he is your superior; you would look down on him instead.

If you are forced economically to work for him you are forced; but it is revolting.

I tell him that he is wrong even if it would hurt me.

I don't pay attention, let it go. He notices it sometimes.

I wouldn't like that. I try to show him what to do but I wouldn't be very happy. I take a chance even if he would fire me.

I feel proud. Just the same I ask him what he thinks. I don't want to show him that I know more.

I wouldn't care much for it. Try to talk it out.

As long as the circumstances are fair. It may indicate some other qualities. I always try to get on top of him.

I don't like those people. It depends on how bad they are.

It makes me feel better and more superior.

If you know your own subject, you know how to present it to one who is your superior, not looking down on the other person.

I work against my will with him. I can't work at ease what he makes me do.

I felt that he shouldn't have the right to command men until he was proficient. It is revolting.

To be honest, I wouldn't class him as a superior.

I feel better. My conversation with him would be simpler.

I am under continuous tension.

It would irk me.

Doesn't make any difference. He was the boss, to hell with him.

You lose your respect for him. Use tact, independence, wouldn't allow his position to influence your own work.

Begin to wonder whether I shouldn't be in his spot.

I lose respect for him.

If they accept your correction or advice it is alright. I think at night what I could have said.

Doesn't affect me at all. Just go straight.

Never come up against it. Inward disrespect but you wouldn't show it. I would be suspicious as to how he got the job—through politics or drag.

I think he shouldn't be up there. Sometimes politics gets them there. He is not in his place.

Just ignore him but I am polite.

The way to get around him I try to explain my knowledge in a way that it will not hurt him. However I still respect him as my superior.

Even if she is superior to me, I tell her she has lots to learn. I wouldn't be afraid to tell her.

I wouldn't like to take his orders. I get out as soon as I can.

I had no respect for him at all.

No effect on me in any way because I look at life as it is. I can't go wrong. Makes my job easier.

I am angry about the whole thing. He is unable to accept my own decision when it is justified.

Resent it.

I feel sorry for him. I don't feel any grudge against him.

I accept it. I try to teach him. It depends on circumstances.
It depends on the individual. Consider his ability, whether he can grasp things easily, experience, and so on.
Be diplomatic.
I resent it.
It doesn't go against my grain provided he is congenial; otherwise I am indignant.
Makes me pretty mad.
It is a matter of personalities.
Makes me more confident because I feel that, if he loses his job, I can get it easier.
First a feeling of frustration and second endeavour to send the message over him.
On promotional grounds I would feel hurt and try to get out.
My feeling of superiority would go up; sometimes it would make no difference, but if he would tell me to do something I would be unwilling to do it unless in doing it I would avoid previously informing him.
I think of him as a human being and that he has feelings, overlook it. Sometimes it gets you down.
Doesn't affect me at all but sometimes you get in trouble.
Take it for granted that he had influence or pull. I have to work along with him.
I feel sorry for him. I would try to help him out and give him time.
I don't like it.
Angers me.
I don't want to offend the man's ego but I would try to be tactful. I would give him the impression that he is improving.
Provokes me. It is provoking.
I get pretty angry about it because I have no opportunity to state my attitude toward the work.
Listen to his ideas but I have my own ideas. If his idea contradicts my own I do according to my conviction. I won't say anything because he is my superior at the time.
Give in to a sense of frustration.

He should know right there I am annoyed a little bit.

Dont' try to make them feel badly. It is pretty hard. You don't like to take orders yet you can't say anything.

It makes me proud to show him what he doesn't know. I wouldn't be afraid.

I don't care as long as he is pleasant.

Try to be polite and not overrule his orders, but still try to tell him politely where he is wrong.

It was a frustrating experience. Tried my best to point out to him but he wouldn't listen. I told him politely.

You should get out, better yourself.

Will let time clear it up. In one way I am reserved and proud of myself.

Let him talk and not argue.

It is just one day to the next day. It sorts of gets me.

I would try to implement my idea in his mind and to make suggestions.

I will not work for anyone like that. I just can't do it.

Adversely I don't think he should dictate.

Feel kind of mad.

I was doubtful to show him as my better knowledge would embarrass him.

I keep everything inside.

He was so ignorant that he thought he knew everything. I felt there was no use to try against someone who knows it all.

I listen, I may grump a little and I tell him my feeling.

I am forced to assist and sometimes I have a feeling almost of pity.

If he asks you things he might be alright. He might make it.

Still he has the authority, you have to listen. You don't sleep good, you don't eat well, and finally you quit. You can't say anything. He puts you out.

Didn't get me down. Can't do anything. Just do your work.

Do my best. He is still my boss and it depends on him.

I keep it to myself, get along the best I can.

Modus vivendi. Find relationships mutually helpful. We have common job and other circumstances. So long as each respects the other. Stupid, just go ahead and do it in your own way. Get sick of it.

Feel resentful.

Gives me a little more superior feeling.

I feel I have no respect for this person. I don't regard him as I should.

The system disappoints me.

I would sheer away.

Depends on the boss.

I never had that experience. I would have sympathy for him.

You can't do a good job for one whom you don't respect.

You can't respect a person who is your superior and yet hasn't the superiority.

No one can know everything. Save what is my own.

I would probably brush him off. Resent him.

You can't talk back to him, he may fire you, but try to win him over to your understanding.

As long as he keeps his nose where it belongs it is alright, I wouldn't say a word, but, if not, I tell him what I think of him.

I don't resent it, but get annoyed.

In the army there is a discipline and I just had to bear it. Depends on the circumstances.

Never contradict him. You work him around to your way of thinking. Definitely succeed unless you run into unreasonable people in thinking.

Naturally follow instructions. I follow directions but sometimes I am not happy.

It is a very unpleasant situation.

The data show the effect of a situation on the personality when he feels that the manifestations of his specific superiority are in jeopardy on account of some fictitious superiority. Naturally, in such a situation, anxiety-superior develops, as indicated by most of the answers. Feelings from revolt, disrespect, and frustration to pity are expressed by the subjects in such relationships. Some of the subjects, in such situations, endeavour to maintain their personalities by

emphasizing relevant features and by ignoring others. Obviously, a number of the respondents held their feelings in check as they felt impelled to do something about the situation but feared to do so because of the undesirable consequences. Many expressed the feeling of quitting. On the whole, the tendency of the organism to protect its personality in such situations is obvious. Besides, an interesting comparison is afforded between this situation and that discussed under Question No. 2, where the personality was in association with an individual of 'genuine' superiority. It will be seen that, instead of feelings of disrespect, revolt, and excessive anxiety, the motivation generally was to learn and to contribute for a fairly harmonious co-existence. The individual was more capable of independent and fearless thought, and of being challenged by a wider interest.

Personality is not merely an aspect of the organism. It is natural for the cells to preserve, or at least to endeavour to preserve their specific superiority whether as an individual self-centered life or as a corporated unity in association. After having ascertained this in a few situations, how generally do they hold? Can results obtained in these situations be extended to other situations? The answer is evidently yes, without limit. An attempt was made to put this assumption on trial in yet a different situation in which the personality finds it difficult to maintain his specific superiority.

QUESTION No. 11—If you are in surroundings in which you find it difficult to maintain your own feelings of superiority, what do you do?

Answers

Try to make a show. If I do not succeed, I just leave.

Either change the environment or resort to something else.

Go to somebody who knows better than I. Try to get help. Pray to God for assistance.

If I can't stay because it is too difficult, I just go but first I would try to overcome my difficulties by any means.

I would try to explain myself, try to make chums. Then I would stay by myself.

I am very shy. I wouldn't do anything. If they won't come then I wouldn't go. I would rather leave the situation.

Try to get along as much as I can.

If I am not in the right spot and I am losing, whether right or wrong,
I change the circumstances.

I make some effort and I can always arrange to make it.

I try to bluff it out first. If I can't do that I leave.

I get down and live like the rest.

I try to get away, avoid it as much as I can. Make an excuse to get
away.

Stay quiet and try to express my own views without causing too
much hard feelings.

Say very little and get out as fast as possible.

Keep my mouth closed. I listen. If anything comes in my mind I do
it in a tactful manner.

I try to change it to a certain extent and, if I don't succeed, I am
forced to leave.

I like to get away but try to make the best of it.

I quiet right up, bide my time.

I try to find an opportunity to show my abilities or some knowledge.

I would try to find out what is going on in order to prove my own.

Stay quiet.

I get an upset stomach. Eventually I fight.

Keep my mouth shut. I get out.

I would feel rather miserable and get out of it.

Simply try to maintain my own superiority in that case.

I would try to think that it is not so hard.

I would keep my mouth shut. I do what they do and take their advice
until I am sure.

To the best of my ability I show my abilities.

I stick to my own and show them I am just as good as they are.

I fight for my own.

Hang on to them and hang on to my own feelings too.

I try to learn, to understand or grasp the situation first. If it is
impossible, I try to get out.

I sit back and find out what the others have to offer, and wait and
see what is against me. Then I enter the argument and state my
own views.

Exert myself to maintain my own superiority.

I try to do what those who are superior to me do.

When in Rome do as the Romans do.

I would learn to hide it until I get my own superiority. It is natural to become the same.

I try to meet the occasion, fall in line, fit myself in.

I just sort of swallowed, kept it to myself, and my feelings of superiority did not suffer.

I submit but I find my own diversion, find my own superiority.

I try to get out of it.

Endeavour to change the surroundings.

Firstly I would lick my wounds, take stock and take action.

Do the best possible. Try to maintain it.

Move aside if it is too hard. I back out or keep quiet and try to give my own.

Try to find out more. If I couldn't bring myself up to the standard, I move to another place.

The only thing is the truth will come out. Ask to be directed.

I hold to my own but make sure first that I am right.

There is only one thing to do, try to avoid it. Try it anyway, try to learn their ways.

I wouldn't bother.

I keep quiet and try not to feel conspicuous until I know.

I draw within myself.

I would strive to adapt myself, to change my reaction, to get current knowledge, and to win over those I know to enable getting a foothold.

I would get my strongest point. I would make myself known in the field.

I try to do the best I can, try to learn, and to grasp anything I can.

Become very self-conscious. Try to change the trend to something in which I know where I stand.

I would try to act rationally and to meet it according to my own thinking processes rather than emotionally.

I would be as diplomatic as possible. First of all I wouldn't say anything. I would try to settle things without too many contacts.

Try to be nice.

Control myself and my temper.

I try to get around. If I cannot get anywhere, I just leave it alone.

The only thing I do—I educate the people or try to get away.

I keep my mouth shut, keep my eyes wide open and learn as much as I can.

Get along in your own way first. Gradually I build up my own.

I have to prove my own by working hard.

First of all I don't talk, I listen and look. I watch the acting and, after I find out, my action follows.

I take it as it comes. I let them know what I know.

Felt uncomfortable. I would retire at first, take a look at the situation, and then come back again.

If any chance I teach. If not possible, I assess the capacities of individuals for service and move myself to a sphere which is more compatible.

Endeavour to surmount the difficulties.

I would ask somebody who knows and, after he tells me what to do, try to do it myself.

I try to blind my ways with theirs until the time arrives and I can separate myself from the position.

Just sit back and be quiet.

I retire or pull out.

Draw myself away from them. I study them first and then turn my own way.

Do the best I can, put up for a while until I see an opening and, if this does not succeed, quit it.

I was frozen. Couldn't do a thing. Jumped out afterwards.

Feel sorry for a while. Nervous. After settling down and becoming satisfied you discover good things.

I remained the same, no matter how difficult it was.

Do your best. Learn their ways.

I try to make new friends and show what I can do.

You just put to one side that feeling, become accustomed, and fall into the situation established. If you can't become a part, get out.

Find your way. I would ask help.

Try to make the best of what you already know.

Try to maintain myself to the highest level of my ability.

I just merely sat, answered shortly, and eventually left.

I kept quiet. I withdrew.

I get out. It depends on whether it is a real challenge. I was happy to learn from those with more experience or greater learning.

Make the best of it. Try to keep your own end up.

I turn around and go home. I feel that I am in the wrong place.

Try to be my own natural self. Try to rise to expectations.

I guess I would retrospect. I might sit back. I might show that I am superior in other things.

I would endeavour to find ways and means of excelling or ask for ideas or suggestions.

I would try my best to conduct myself the same as others.

I don't say much, study them, and try to get what they have. After that I explain my own point of view.

I just do my best. Try to learn something.

Try to get in with the people to show them my own. Let them give a close-up and prove their own opinions.

Carry on as a human being. If you try to change yourself you are in trouble.

I just sit and keep quiet. I grasp and try to find out what I don't know.

Either succeed or pull out.

The above account shows that the need to achieve and to maintain an effective position or orientation with respect to the organization of specific superiority is vital. The data clearly indicate that the subjects develop anxiety-superior in such surroundings in their endeavours to maintain and to manifest their own specific superiority. Most of the answers show that, under these conditions, the subjects quit or flight takes place if good relations cannot be established. The organization of behaviour and its manifestations

vary but the motivation is the same. Most of the subjects protect their personalities and keep 'quiet' or resort to 'passive resistance' at first, followed by various actions such as learning, teaching, changing, showing one's ability, and even fighting or arguing. Some of the subjects are willing to compromise with the situation and may alter the manifestations of their specific superiority. Yet, the motive is the same and there can be no major deviation of the personality from his basic organization.

Additional comparison is afforded of responses to Questions Nos. 2, 7, and 5, in reference to particular situations. Some of these are: The influence to cooperate in the situation and the willingness to contribute are not pronounced, although motivation to learn is much in evidence. Competition is not manifested to the extent that it is in the replies to Question No. 2.

Feelings of confidence, mastery, control, and other pleasant aspects of feeling of superiority indicated in the replies to Question No. 7 are barely evidenced here.

Camouflage, frustration, and anxiety-superior are features in situations where the personality is in jeopardy on account of some fictitious superiority, but here it is only temporary. Moreover, disrespect or fear to do something about the situation is not evidenced here as it is in the answers to Question No. 5.

A pause may be made to state briefly some of the ground covered in this Part.

(1) Nature's laws of behaviour of personalities are the laws of behaviour of the sum of the organism's constituent units. Thus, factors controlling the personality and its manifestations emanate from no other source than the corporeal system's cells and their organization of entities of specific superiority, in perpetual response to and in counteraction with entities in the internal and external surroundings. The personality variation is, therefore, of complex origin. Nevertheless the organizational principle or motive is the same, to maintain specific superiority in situations.

(2) Orderly development and manifestations of personality are only possible where situations coexist, each furnished with a definite intensity so that no individual can have the monopolistic use of any single situation. The importance of this in maintaining his organiza-

tion of specific superiority becomes evident when the individual's behaviour in situations at various times is contrasted.

(3) Conditions in situations can be responsible for the reduction or even complete suppression of manifestations of the personality, but they cannot reckon with the organization for behaviour of specific superiority of the individual. A change of situations may alter the manifestations of specific superiority but their organization is controlled from within.

(4) The personality is amenable to a variety of differentiating influences albeit to a different degree. Nevertheless, to achieve an effective position or orientation with respect to his organization of specific superiority is vital to the personality, and determines his relations in his environment and with other individuals in situations.

(5) A comparison of situations indicates the practically unlimited capacity of human organisms to reorganize their personalities for behaviour in meeting situations adequately. The development of personalities can take place only when their manifestations are freely expressed in situations. Thus, willingness to cooperate, to respect, to learn, and to contribute for a fairly harmonious unity and orderly progress of a society is ensured.

(6) Personality is not simply the appearance of the organism. To maintain specific superiority in situations is vital. The greater the gap between these original data of living organisms and the fictitious notions incorporated in social behaviour the greater the task to be performed by the process of personality development and manifestations. Under such conditions personalities are concealed and anxiety-superior develops, followed by feelings of revolt, disrespect, or a state of accidie, and situations finally deteriorate.

The capacity of the human organism to learn and to alter his organization for behaviour in maintaining his specific superiority has a great significance for the personality and for progressive change. This will be discussed in the following Part.

PART III

Learning and Change

The confusion of knowledge about learning comes chiefly from false ideas of conditioning or canalizing. Later these notions were turned into theories upon which articles of faith were built. These inexact formulae of learning must be discarded.

Without entities of specific superiority in Nature, the phenomena of learning and change could not exist. Thus learning and change are part of Nature. This will be discussed here briefly.

The organizational capacity of an organism provides not only for its own organization of specific superiority but for its behavioural relations with other organisms as well as the environment. Thus, learning processes are fundamentally of the same nature and follow the same motives as that of the ontogenetic processes. The capacity for learning is, therefore, not a novel and secondarily acquired adeptness of the organism in meeting later situations by adequate learning, but is provided in the organism. Hence, the capacity to learn is limited by the extent to which constituents maintain their organizational potentials for differentiation. In some situations learning is great while in others it is almost nil. On the whole, learning capacity tends to vary inversely according to the level of organization. But, when it comes to particulars, without knowing the component cells of specific superiority of a group of animals, their learning capacity cannot be safely predicted from their position on the organizational level alone.

Learning depends upon the individual's potentials, his needs, and the various conditions resulting therefrom in maintaining his specific superiority. Progressive diversified learning is a vital need in maintaining these potentials for survival. The complex organization involved in this learning may be referred to as progressive development of potentials.

Studies make it clear that the learning capacities of an individual cannot be judged by his external appearance nor by his environment. Thus, it is imperative to think of learning in terms of potentialities. Every phase of learning is the result of organization and the continuous interaction between personalities with potentials of specific superiority on the one hand and entities with specific superiority on

the other. Each individual, as the carrier of these potentials, must learn to react in situations if he is to survive or develop. The ability of the human personality to learn and to discover new meaning in the forces that impinge upon him in situations and the skill to alter his organization for behaviour *within* for the development of his potentials is the key to the progress of humanity. This implies that learning and the degree of creativeness of the personality and that of humanity, in the final analysis, are determined by the creative and organizational insight of the component cells of the organism.

It is found that, in many societies, a certain tension persists between the individual's potentials of learning, felt as an inner experience, and the social personality manifestations on account of artificial conditioning and canalizing. Past and present history of societies show that, when learning situations degenerate to conditioning or canalizing the personality to narrow beliefs and illusions, even the greatest and richest society may disappear.

There is a dangerous tendency at present in free societies to mimic totalitarian and authoritarian societies by camouflaging, conditioning, and enmeshing, under the term 'coordination.' Some of these coordinators imagine that scientific systems are produced, such as by a thousand labourers uniformly affixing some small part to skeletons of metal destined to become automobiles. They have no notion of the human organism. Oftentimes they insult and belittle the most able professors and scientists by trying to force them to accept certain axioms. In fact some of these individuals are frozen out or become ill and are forced to resign. A few would rather starve than to put up with such nonsense. By pushing out the able, the less able will not assume superiority over the more able. In reality the progress of science takes place through free individuals or the very few liberal institutions where a person has the right to exercise his freedom to search for truth, limited only to his capacity.

What would happen today to some authoritarian societies where free situations of learning are masterfully sabotaged with dark fanaticism if it were not for democratic societies?

The creative potentials of individuals are infinitely more important than any other strength. For survival, democratic societies must maintain free situations for everyone to learn at any cost.

TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES ON LEARNING.

Question No.	Yes or Definitely %	Other Answers %
4	85	<p style="text-align: center;">15</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not always, depends on circumstances. 2. Yes. Shows me how to sell. 3. In a way it does but there is always someone who does better. 4. It gives you a little booster. 5. Puts you more at ease. 6. Gives you more of these feelings. 7. In the accepted sense. 8. Yes, if you are using it. If not using it, it is bad for you. 9. At least you would have the satisfaction of knowing. 10. Education is the best thing of all. 11. I wouldn't have any superiority if I would not have studied all the time. 12. Counts a lot. 13. Yes and no. Learning sometimes produces humility. 14. Not much. Depends where you are. 15. Any form of specialty is even more valuable.

100 Subjects, male and female, over 17 years of age.

The answers in Table 3 indicate the importance of learning to maintain specific superiority.

In turning back to the data given in situations and the differential learning observed in personalities, it will be noted that no one individual could actually assume complete independence of the others without upsetting his potentials, which are vital to his personality. The organizational potentials to learn in situations, such as mutual effects and interactions, contribution, respect, competition, defence, and cooperation must interlock in a unique way, from which there

can be no major deviation if the personality is to maintain his specific superiority for survival or development. The data show that personalities learn in various situations and behave adequately, but they do this at their own pace, that is, a situation cannot make any individual learn and manifest any specific response unless his organization of specific superiority is prepared to do so. Thus, differential learning takes place through the organism, which in turn enables the personality to manifest its behaviour. Personality, therefore, cannot be bestowed upon an organism by extrinsic actions, as the abc's are taught to a child, because how could the positively same situation procure such highly differential responses from the subjects in similar situations. Human organisms learn and understand the language but reply in their own terms. The data clearly show that living organisms do not respond to most situations in a willy-nilly fashion, but that their responses are largely determined by their organization of specific superiority. The particular organization that is dominant at a given time may influence action temporarily.

Intentional propagandists are skilful in recognizing these imperative feelings and oftentimes produce action by a forceful and deceptive appeal to them. But they fail over and over again, as they forget or do not know that feelings of specific superiority are the rule throughout all forms of learning, not compensation.

The doctrine of evolution ignores the organizational potentials of living organisms. The terms adaptation, adjustment, genes, mutation, and selection disregard the most important aspect, that of the organization of the organism. *A given organism is the outcome of its capacity to organize its constituent units for specific superiority to survive. There would be no progressive evolution without organization. So, progressive evolution is only an aspect of the organization of specific superiority.*

The continuous interplay and lateral competition between entities of specific superiority are part of Nature. Thus, continuous change is invariably the result of organization in response to and in counteraction with entities of specific superiority in a varying set of situations. Both entities and situations fluctuate independently. Every change is, therefore, of compound origin. Progressive change is invariably the result of organization in which potentials of specific superiority lead to a realization in situations.

The organization of the component cells of the organism to differentiate and to prepare for anticipated change in maintaining and manifesting their specific superiority is in harmony with Nature's law. For survival, the living organism must maintain its specific superiority by means of learning and change. Consequently any precept designed for man will not succeed if it is based upon conditioning or enmeshing the human personality.

The highest development of personalities and of society is only possible where situations are favourable for learning and change, for it is precisely in societies where personalities are free to develop and manifest their specific superiority that they are perfecters rather than upsetters of traditions. The essentials in personalities are learning, creating, and progressing through orderly change for the development of their potentials and those of society.

In order to test what changes the subjects would like to make in society on account of feelings of superiority, Questions No. 3 and 12 were designed. It will be noted that these two questions are complementary.

Question No. 3—

What would you change in society (or in your surroundings) because of your own feelings of superiority?

Answers—

Abolish classes.

Give up lots of the snobbishness, looking down on people.

No taxes. More time for freedom.

Equalize it. Better understanding.

Nothing.

Everything is alright.

Nothing.

There is always a way for improvement.

There are many things that could be changed. Whether they would improve or not I don't know.

Question No. 12—

What should society or people do to enable each person to maintain his feelings of superiority?

Answers—

All creeds and classes treated alike.

Give them all the freedom possible.

Be friendly and mind their own business.

By sticking together, organizing themselves.

Be friends, not chewing the rag for nothing; all be brothers.

Everybody should be good to each other despite the differences.

Rich and poor should get along as well as they can. There is no reason for not doing so. The poor are as good as the rich.

Compare your own feelings with those of other people. Different people should be appreciated everywhere.

Up to the person.

It is difficult to say. I will leave this question.

Congenial.

I try to forget all about it. I really don't know.

Racial discrimination.

I really don't know. I cannot think of anything to change.

Our schooling should be changed.

Injustices.

Nothing.

I can't answer to this question.

I would give greater equality for everyone in their particular fields of endeavour.

I don't know enough I suppose. I don't know whether I would change anything.

Nothing because one has nothing to do with the other. I have it anyway.

Patronizing all wrong.

Maybe if I suggest something it would be bad for other persons feelings of superiority.

A lot of the laws—gambling laws, liquor laws. People who drink too much or gamble should be in institutions.

Not much to change because established. I find it hard to say what.

Its a good question. Anyone can make money, educate them. However it is not easy.

I can't see what I could change. My attitude would be the same.

It is a good question. Society is not any better than I am so I wouldn't change anything.

To avoid class distinctions as much as possible.

Let everyone live his own life.

It is difficult to say because something will affect your feelings and will not affect the feelings of others. Try and get them together to keep peace together and satisfy each with his own feelings.

For one thing stress the importance of education. Try to teach people that without education there is no advance.

Abolish those restrictions which are forced whether we want them or not.

Educate the people to a higher standard.

Give a chance to everybody according to what they are able to do.

Good economical situation. Have jobs for all people.

I am stuck with this question.

Try to make it possible for people to express their own interests, their own characters, talents, etc., and their own way. Everybody likes to be accepted. They like to be a part of what is ethically accepted for their best or highest level.

I can't think for them.

Should ensure that each individual is developed to his maximum.

Each man respects his fellowman for what he is and what he can do.

Everybody should be themselves.

Keep out organizations such as Knights of Columbus, Orangemen, etc.

To even things out in general.

To equalize things.

It is a matter for each man to find his own niche.

Respect each other's superiority.

Shouldn't be so much discrimination.

Raise the wages.

I don't think I would change anything.
Wouldn't be any use anyway.

Nothing.

Race prejudice.

I couldn't make an attempt to answer. It
is a difficult question.

I like more equality.

I wouldn't change anything on account
of this feeling.

Can't change society.

Everybody should have the same rights.

I would try to change the social way of
living.

A lot could be said about this, jurispru-
dence, education, method of education.

Nothing.

I would change any laws that tinge of
racial discrimination.

I wouldn't change anything. If you would
specify your question I would say yes
or no.

I would change the fictitious preservation
of rank.

I would change a few things but you've
got to know what; otherwise keep your
mouth shut.

I wouldn't change anything. My feeling
of superiority would be the same. It's
a big question, so many fields, you have
to think.

The people have to be changed. I myself
don't find too much wrong.

Nothing. I have my own superiority.

Hard to answer. I would have to do lots
of thinking and I wouldn't tackle it
right now.

Abolish social differences. Look at (. . .)

Raise the wages of the handyman closer
to those of the highly paid, but you
cannot equalize everybody.

Commence in your own small sphere,
treat people as they should be treated.

Being more liberal.

Accept the right of free speech to allow
each person to say what he likes to
say.

Recognize him as a leader in his own
field.

Assist with finance and education.

Bill of Rights.

I don't think I can do anything because
of each individual's feelings.

Set an example for a better life.

Have to work together to maintain a
feeling of superiority among those
lacking capacity.

Everybody should be allowed to progress
if they have the ability.

Hello them all.

Accept the teachings of Christ and try
to apply them.

No man should be allowed to feel inferior.

Society should develop the respect of the
individual.

They should give everybody a chance,
try to encourage everybody.

Could be encouraged. Recognizing credit
where credit is due.

Some form of education in that line such
as forums and talks on the situation.

Help people to do what they are willing
and interested in doing.

Treat them with equal rights.

They should give a man more opportunity
to talk and give his own opinion.

I would rather say nothing. It is a big question.

Nothing.

I wouldn't change anything because it would be political views.

That's a stickler. Because of the field in which I have superiority I would have changes made to preserve it.

Depends on what I am confronted with.

On account of my own feeling of superiority I wouldn't change anything. I want to come back to this question later.

I would change the state power from the property owners to the population on a democratic basis.

Nothing.

I wouldn't change anything on account of my own feelings.

Change for more interest.

Mostly drinking.

Change society to sociableness.

I don't believe in social segregation. Try to eliminate it.

It's a hard question to answer. So many things, it is difficult to pin down particulars. On my account, nothing.

Everybody should help the other fellow who is less fortunate.

Race segregation. That is what I would abolish first.

I don't think it ever came to my mind.

Everybody should understand each person's point of view.

It's a big question. Many changes. Better working conditions all over the world.

Fair play.

Just be friendly.

I really don't know.

Creating a condition that each man should be able to express himself according to his capacity.

Individuals should be assisted in helping themselves.

Each person should be given a field of their own, depending on what they want to do themselves.

Abolish racial and religious discrimination to equalize things.

People should have more power.

More education.

Good speeches, meetings to inform people.

Treat them all the same.

Kind words.

They should pay each man and woman to maintain a decent standard of living wherever they may live. If a man is not paid for what he knows, at least he should be paid for what he does.

Ensure everyone a reasonable place to live, slum clearing, etc.

1. Brotherly love.
2. No discrimination of colour or creed.

Different clubs, discussions and study groups.

Include this subject in the educational course.

To find out the biggest trouble people have and try to help them.

Society should pay more attention to the person obviously looking uncomfortable in his situation.

Assess the capacities of individuals for service to define what sphere is required and try to allocate the forces where they have the fullest expression.

Fair play.

Take it as it comes.

I am satisfied with my station in life.

It is a difficult question. You need more time.

Eliminate discrimination such as on account of race, religion, social and so on.

Everybody has his own feelings. As long as he is happy he is allright.

It is a difficult question. People should be better educated.

Give a larger pension.

Nothing.

Nothing.

Education.

I don't think I would change anything.

Provide more opportunity for the development of superior people.

Taxes.

It is a difficult question. What is good for one is not necessarily good for the other.

Nothing.

It is a difficult question.

Banish anything with which you could make war.

Change human nature.

A little more equality.

I am satisfied.

Change snobbishness.

People should keep their noses where they belong.

Difficult because you would take away independence if you tell them to do this or that.

It all depends.

The superior fellow could help lower ones with a good word or smile.

It's a hard question. There is a certain class, no matter what you would do, they would still be the same.

Live by the golden rule.

I would give more pension.

It's a big question—balance out things.

Health plan.

Good schooling.

Different classes of people should mix more instead of keeping to themselves.

There should be a greater sense of responsibility on the part of individuals for the use and development of the agencies or institutions.

Everybody should have more time to enjoy themselves, not to have such a struggle for food.

Education.

A change of government social standards all over the world.

Better government throughout the world.

Guarantee him his housing, clothing, food, and education for his children.

Opportunity for challenge.

Inspire a little more confidence through education.

It is hard to say. Get together and help the needy all over the world.

Every person should be more human and kind.

Generally it is beyond the realm of possibility.

Try to stretch as far as possible education and the spirit of humanity.

I would try to change appreciation of different types of people.

I wouldn't change anything on account of my own feelings.

Learn to put up with other people. Let them have their own way.

Education and knowledge to cope with situations.

Follow the golden rule.

People to be more natural. Give more than expecting from it.

Certainly I would change something.

Further education along the lines in which the individual feels superior.

There should be more education and they should teach that man is a child of God and, for that reason, should not bow the knee to earthly powers.

Practice general understanding of the general condition of the group and public in which you live.

They should teach people to be better.

Everybody should be taught that he may not be as good as someone else in a particular line of endeavour but that they have something they can do better.

Equalize the tax to the proportion of the individual's standard of living.

Follow the golden rule again.

Superiors take time to explain things instead of using big words.

Justice.

The data clearly indicate that most of the subjects desire changes that would increase their freedom from environmental circumstances in maintaining and developing their specific superiority. To achieve these various modes of action, such as creeds and classes being treated alike, freedom, friendliness, appreciation, education, Bill of Rights, and respect of the individual are suggested. A large number of the subjects emphasized the importance of learning and education. Evidently they consider them a vital need. It is interesting to note that very few subjects referred to success or security as such.

Harding,⁴ in "Social Psychology and Individual Values," referring to 'success' notes: "Emphasis on a rather abstract, theoretical notion of 'success' no doubt causes some unnecessary mental discomfort to the average person who cannot shine, but in practical reality the difficulty seems exaggerated. It seems likely that what most people want is not, as Lasswell implies, to be at the top of a pyramid of deference but to have recognition for their abilities and merits at whatever point in the pyramid they may have reached."

⁴D. W. Harding, *Op. cit.*, p. 159.

The Ottawa Pilot Study (1953) and this investigation confirm Harding's contentions.

The same could be said of 'security,' which will be discussed briefly in Part IV.

The data show that society, to which personalities look forward, is not a vision of some utopia with a population of robots conditioned or enmeshed to uphold fictitious notions.

On the whole it is possible to concede that the motivation of man to learn, to change his environment, and to alter his organization for behaviour is an important feature of the personality. It is in accordance with his organization of specific superiority not only to live but to achieve freedom from environmental restrictions by actualizing his potentials and those of society for orderly progress. Progressive evolution cannot be fully understood without the realization of the implied intrinsic organizational potentials of specific superiority of the organism.

The task ahead is to increase opportunities for creative achievement and learning for everyone, not just education for numbers, but to allow individuals to manifest their knowledge freely without being bullied, crushed, or belittled by institutions through individuals. With the consideration of this principle to the fore, the results of the preceding investigation may be briefly summarized as follows:—

(1) The organizational potentials of the component cells of the human organism to differentiate and to prepare for anticipated change in their organization for behaviour in maintaining their specific superiority is significant. For survival, the living organism must maintain its specific superiority by means of differentiation, learning, and change. Consequently, in the final analysis, the human organism refuses to submit to conditioning or canalizing.

(2) Learning and change depend upon the individual's needs and the various conditions resulting therefrom. Capacity to differentiate and to change tends to vary inversely as with the level of organization but, without knowing the constituents of specific superiority, the capacity cannot be safely predicted. Thus, it is imperative to think of learning and of change in terms of potentials.

(3) Learning and change are of compound origin. Progressive change is the result of organization in which potentials of specific

superiority led to a realization in situations. Thus progressive evolution, adaptation, and adjustment are merely aspects of organization.

(4) A situation cannot make any individual learn nor manifest any specific response unless his organization of specific superiority is prepared to do so. Personality, therefore, cannot be imparted by extrinsic action. The motivation of the human personality to learn or to change his environment is to increase his freedom in situations in actualizing his potentials and those of society for orderly progress.

(5) The organization of the personality in meeting later situations by adequate differential behaviour is a continuation of the original capacities of the organism. The development of personalities and of society is only possible where situations are free from artificial obstructions to learning and to change.

(6) Learning and change are the results of organization and continuous interactions between entities of specific superiority. Each individual, as the carrier of these potentials, must learn to react in situations if he is to survive or develop. When learning situations degenerate to conditioning or canalizing personalities to narrow beliefs, society deteriorates.

Anxiety-superior and thinking are of far-reaching importance to the personality and to society. This will be discussed in Part IV.

PART IV

Anxiety-Superior and Thinking

As has been shown, the development of the personality is not frictionless nor static but the result of the organization of the component unit cells in continuous response to and in counter-action with independently fluctuating entities of specific superiority in the internal and external environments.

The behaviour of living organisms, considering the needs which they seek to satisfy, needs for food, shelter, protection, maintaining or changing the ecological realm, responses in situations, and so on, involves organization for some degree of specific superiority for survival. As the data show, the slightest threat to this superiority causes anxiety-superior and the organism will mobilize its defenses or retreat from the menacing situation.

It is often found that, in totalitarian or authoritarian societies, individuals experience anxiety-superior but its manifestations are inhibited in the social levels. Nevertheless it persists as an inner experience. This anxiety-superior may unexpectedly break through and manifest itself by various upheavals. History has many examples of what happens when ambitions to maintain notions of fictitious superiority overlap. The violence released through these disturbances cannot be explained by a knowledge of the individual's previous conditioning or canalizing, but by the capacity of the organism *within* to organize its behaviour for specific superiority for progressive change and redirection. Nature's law prevails.

In a liberal society where it is possible for personalities to develop and manifest their potentials of specific superiority, anxiety-superior is mostly overt and can be eliminated through orderly progressive change of conditions and situations.

In a society where the methods of reducing anxiety-superior are deceptive, such as pseudo-security and economic string-pulling, personalities may retrench, as they are made afraid of freedom, and the methods used ultimately prove destructive not only to personalities but to society as well.

The literature is full of abstract notions about 'security.' It is a familiar fact that 'security' is often used as a deception to justify maintaining some sort of fictitious power.

The basic assumption of the Marxist theory and that of the Soviet Weltanschauung is that, through state ownership, they can give all sorts of security to everyone, eliminate personalities, and decide the destiny of humanity. After having executed so many personalities for their ideal state of security for everyone, why are the executioners still at their side and why are they still in such great demand? Totalitarian and authoritarian personalities are in great fear of dissent, for dissent is deciphered as defiance, and defiance violates the totalitarian and authoritarian codes.

The history of the projection of various securities into the reality of social existence to justify power has always resulted in failure. In the final analysis, when the state assumes security for its individuals, it destroys the development and manifestation of potentials of personalities and of society. That state is doomed to failure; a failure from which not even a military victory can rescue it. History has many such examples.

Each individual has an organization of specific superiority within himself which gives him the feeling that he is alive and is a personality different from others. The necessity to protect and to defend this feeling is fundamental for survival. Thousands of individuals have security yet they are in a state of anxiety-superior for various other reasons. Besides, after achieving security, oftentimes anxiety-superior develops in keeping this security. The Ottawa Pilot Study, The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, and this investigation bear out the correctness of this contention. The motive of the human organism is not security as such but to maintain his organization of specific superiority for the development of his potentials and those of society. The following answers of the subjects to Question No. 10 throw further light thereon.

QUESTION NO. 10—What do your own feelings of superiority resent most?

Answers

He is superior to me yet he is no better.

Being dictated to or told to do something which you can do as well or even better than the person in charge.

When I feel that I am not wanted.

I resent most when I try to go ahead and the other fellow bucks me.

If they say I am not a good man.

When I am not quite sure I am right or wrong and they argue about it, but they are sure by any means.

If they keep at you instead of leaving you alone. They make you nervous.

Hard to say, when you make a mistake and someone catches you.

A person tries to be more superior than he really is.

Dishonesty.

I never feel good toward a person who exhibits or acts in a superior manner.

Somebody calls me a bad name or swears at me, lying about me, etc.

Snobbishness.

Mostly when interfered with.

When he tries with big words and I know more than he does.

Injustices.

Compassion.

If they make fun of me.

I resent most unfairness and inequality.

Arguing when you know you are right.

Somebody who is inferior gets credit for being superior.

Provocation.

Insinuation.

Belittling my ability.

When an inferior tries to boss me.

When somebody interferes with my personal feelings.

Someone comes along and messes up things and I am helpless.

If somebody belittles me about something of which they have no knowledge.

Somebody hurts my character.

When they try to boss you in the wrong way, just ordering you around.

Put in the wrong when you are not in the wrong.

Derogative statements about my person.

Deception.

Rock and roll. The b . . . dancing.

Criticism. I always do my best and hate to be criticized.

Offhand I can't think. I would need more time.

When you are ordered to do a certain thing wrong when you are right.

Class distinction, racial problems, that sort of thing.

When somebody belittles my ability.

Pretense and incompetence, lying, deceit.

Dirty tricks.

Lack of aggressiveness.

Disinterest or indifference in what I am trying to do.

Any question as to my honesty.

Braggers.

When I find out that I have a false sense of superiority.

Class distinction in society like in (. . .)

When the work is not done and you've got to do it.

Bossy people, whether they have the right or not bossing around trying to boss everybody.

Anybody who turns around and gives me dirt.

Somebody belittles me.

Anyone who is insulting or anyone insulting my wife.

A man who talks to me of something of which he knows less than I.

Somebody tells me something about which I know better.

When things are lagging. I can't stand laziness.

Failure due to my own insufficiency or stupidity.

Arrogance of people in authority.

Somebody who shows his superiority too much.

Somebody says something to someone else instead of telling it to me.

Somebody speaks against me and can't face me.

Hatefulness.

When you come in contact with people who claim to be professors in whatever the field may be and they will not give the truth on their honour because they themselves are in an organized clique and have different ethics. The only thing I do is educate the people or try to set a 100% proof question.

A person who professes to know everything and has no basic knowledge of what he is talking about.

A person showing off.

Insincere person.

Race segregation.

When someone does something he shouldn't.

Resent people prying in my affairs.

Injustice.

Unfairness.

People talking behind your back.

Religious discrimination.

When my wife belittles me.

Somebody has no decency and cuts in without any regard for what happens to the other person.

I don't mind spending money but I resent someone stealing five cents from me when I employ him.

The bragger or someone wasting time.

Being pushed around.

Something you expect about which you are disappointed.

When somebody doesn't tell the truth.

Brawling.

If you feel you are doing a good job and somebody comes in and tears you apart.

I would resent unfair criticism of my general attitude to my work.

People try to tell you your own business.

Somebody who cheats or is dishonest.

I hate to be lowered.

Inference that I am helped by others.

Lack of fair play.

Non-recognition.

Ignorance.

Ignorance.

Small or cheap pettiness, petty jealousies.

Dealing with a person whom I consider unreasonable.

Domination of the (. . .) church and mixing up in politics, and exercising undue influence on a weak government morally.

I resent remarks and feelings of people who display that they know everything.

People come around and tell me what to do and they don't know anything about my business.

Criticism. I don't take it too well.

Being neglected.

Fellow who thinks he is above everybody else.

Embarrassment.

Injustices.

The data at hand indicate that the majority of the subjects' resentments are due to belittlement. Obviously, without some degree of feelings of superiority, these resentments and the resulting conflicts could not exist. It will be noted that a large number of the respondents resent fictitious superiority or anyone manifesting it beyond all proportion. Resentments are expressed when one cannot come to grips with the source of difficulties. Quite a number of the subjects resent having to live up to some abstract notions such as class, religious, and racial distinctions. Resentments against blind obedience, interference in situations, unfairness, and injustices are evident from the answers. Most of the replies indicate anxiety-superior. On the whole, the data show that the individual does not resent various insecurities as such but injustices and deceptions that interfere with his organization of specific superiority for the development of his own potentials and those of society.

Without entities of specific superiority in Nature, feeling and thinking could not exist. Living organisms are part of Nature. Thus they must feel and think to organize for differentiation in maintaining their specific superiority to survive and to develop.

Some theories of personality postulate different forms of thinking, such as logical, phantasy thinking (day-dreaming), identification and projection, which are treated as distinctive processes. They emphasize the negative and destructive effects of phantasy thinking because the study of the abnormal individual has been the starting point of these theories. The dependence of the organism on feeling and thinking does not agree with the mythical conception of these theories.

Personality takes its roots from the organism's component cells and simultaneously on them all of its activities depend. Therefore the abilities of man to feel and to think emanate from the organism's constituent units. A type of activity not provided for in the organism by its constituents cannot be effected. The specific superiority of the human organism over other animals is his ability to feel and to think new thoughts to a greater degree and to organize for behaviour and skill in executing these thoughts in his surroundings. Thus phantasy thinking, instead of having negative and destructive effects, takes a highly important place in the creative advances of human activities and places man above other animal groups. All forms of thinking and feelings emanate from the constantly operating and imperative need of the organism to maintain its specific superiority.

TABLE 4
PERCENTAGE INDICATING THE INTERACTION OF THINKING AND ANXIETY-SUPERIOR WITH FEELINGS OF SUPERIORITY.

Question No.		Sometimes %	Often %	Not at all %	Total %
9	Do you maintain your own feelings of superiority in thought alone, that is without showing it?	36	64		100
6	When these feelings are frustrated too greatly do you become anxious because you feel that you have no solid ground on which to meet particular difficulties?	74	25	1	100

100 Subjects, male and female, over 17 years of age.

Table 4 shows the percentage of answers to Question No. 9 on thinking concerning feelings of superiority. Thirty-six per cent of the subjects 'sometimes' and 64 per cent 'often' maintain their own feelings of superiority in thought alone. This is in harmony with the organizational principle or motive of the organism. Thus, all forms of thinking, feeling and anxiety-superior are of the same order and

are controlled by the same motive of organization, namely maintaining the specific superiority of the organism. Clearly each personality is the result of organization of constituents of specific superiority for behaviour such as for competition, reactivity, differentiation, learning, and change, in reaction to and in counteraction with varying situations. Potentials of specific superiority and situations fluctuate independently. The variation of anxiety-superior is therefore of compound origin and is caused by conditions or situations which threaten or block the organism in maintaining or manifesting its specific superiority for survival and the development of its personality.

Table 4 shows that 99 per cent of the subjects develop anxiety-superior 'sometimes' or 'often' when they feel that they have no solid ground on which to meet particular difficulties in maintaining their specific superiority. This is natural as difficulties or threats to the organism in maintaining its specific superiority cause anxiety-superior. In a free society where anxiety-superior is mostly overt, it is a healthy sign. It is an indication for orderly change of conditions and situations. In a totalitarian or authoritarian society where the individual is forced to blind obedience, anxiety-superior is concealed and may break through at any time on the social level and manifest itself by various destructive activities.

Descriptions of anxiety-superior were also given in the Ottawa Pilot Study (1953) and in The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status (1955). There is no necessity to recapitulate thereon except to state that they showed 64.28 per cent and 39 per cent of the subjects respectively experienced anxiety-superior.

Table 4 shows the percentage of anxiety-superior. The following answers of the respondents further reveal the nature of the state of anxiety-superior.

Obviously, without some degree of specific superiority, individuals would not feel that competition in general is allright. As may be observed, not one of the respondents objected to general competition. Clearly, then, the individual's specific superiority is involved when he resents competition, and naturally his anxiety involves his feelings of superiority, thus anxiety-superior develops. The following answers, without any comments on them will make this clear.

QUESTION No. 8—When do you resent competition?

Answers—

When somebody tries to put me down when he doesn't like me personally.

Especially if I am there quite a while and a new fellow comes in and takes my place.

When I was really superior and somebody was brought in and got the job.

I resent it on account of myself when I feel I can't do better.

Directing competition so that individuals with real capacities are not permitted to compete.

A few examples taken from situations of superiority will also clarify this subject.

QUESTION No. 2—In dealing with a person who is superior to you in what you are doing, how do you maintain your own feelings of superiority?

Answers—

Sometimes I should ask, but I am too proud and I suffer sometimes on that account.

By explaining what you know, but I give him no ground.

I keep quiet.

I think I suffer a little and I have to fight to keep up my own.

Sometimes you do things better than he does but you keep your mouth shut.

Evidently these personalities are in a state of anxiety-superior as they find it difficult to maintain their specific superiority in these situations.

QUESTION No. 7—How do you feel in dealing with a person of whom you are superior in what you are doing?

Answers

The greater the gap the more frustrated I am, the less the gap the better I like it.

I have to teach him, I have no other alternative.

I help him all I can, but if I see he is not willing I will tell him straight "Quit and learn something else," if he doesn't want it.

I only deal with people with inferiority when it is necessary.
Feel friendly. Don't discourage them. Watch myself not to become impatient.

In such situations, entities may block or threaten the further development of potentials of specific superiority of the personality. Thus a state of anxiety-superior is experienced.

QUESTION NO. 5—When dealing with a person who is your boss or director and you feel that he doesn't know as much as you, how does it affect you?

Answers

If you are forced economically to work for him you are forced, but it is revolting.

I am angry about the whole thing. He is unable to accept my decision when it is justified.

First a feeling of frustration and second I endeavour to send the message over him.

I keep everything inside.

Still he has the authority, you have to listen. You don't sleep good, you don't eat well, and finally you quit. You can't say anything.

He puts you out.

The development and manifestations of specific superiority of personalities are menaced in situations where authority is based on some sort of fictitious superiority. Therefore anxiety-superior is experienced.

Throughout history all attempts to justify the existence of authority based on fictitious superiority failed. Authority founded on justice and propriety does not need continuous justification.

QUESTION NO. 11—If you are in surroundings in which you find it difficult to maintain your own feelings of superiority, what do you do?

Answers

Exert myself to maintain my own superiority.

I submit, but I find my own diversion, find my own superiority.

First of all I don't talk, listen and look. I watch the acting and, after I find out, my action follows.

I just sort of swallowed, kept it to myself, and my feelings of superiority did not suffer.

I guess I would retrospect. I might sit back. I might show that I am superior in other things.

Any threats to the organism's maintaining or achieving an effective position or orientation with respect to his organization of specific superiority cause anxiety-superior.

The fact that each species has its own specific superiority in its own habitat or ecological niche is an important factor in the understanding, not only of the behaviour of animals in laboratory conditions, but also of the behaviour of the human organism and his personality in various surroundings and conditions and his anxiety-superior. The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status (1955) also shows the significance of this contention with reference to ethnic groups and immigrants.

In this chapter an attempt was made to give an additional description of the state of anxiety-superior and to illustrate what is considered to be the basic issue in this problem. From the discussion and the experimental evidence presented in this work, the following conclusions may be drawn about the nature of anxiety-superior.

(1) Without entities of specific superiority in Nature, phenomena such as feeling, thinking, differentiation, competition, learning, change, and anxiety-superior could not exist. Living organisms are part of Nature and must organize for some degree of superiority if they are to survive and develop.

(2) Most of the needs which living organisms seek to satisfy involve organization for specific superiority. Thus all forms of thinking and feeling are of the same order and are controlled by the same motive of organization. Conditions or situations which threaten or block the organism in maintaining or manifesting its specific superiority are causes of anxiety-superior.

(3) Potentials of specific superiority, needs, conditions, and situations fluctuate independently; the variation of anxiety-superior is, therefore, of compound origin.

(4) All forms of thinking and feeling emanate from the organism's constituent units. A type of behaviour not furnished in the organism by its constituents cannot be effected. The specific superiority of mankind over other animals is the feeling and thinking

of new thoughts to a greater degree and the capacity to organize their behaviour and dexterity to put these thoughts into effect in the surroundings.

(5) The individual's organization of specific superiority gives him a feeling that he is unique and is alive. The necessity to maintain this feeling is basic not only for survival and security, but to promote the development of his potentials and those of society. Any menace to this feeling causes anxiety-superior which is either inhibited or overt.

(6) In a free society where anxiety-superior is mostly overt, it is a normal sign for orderly change of conditions and situations for the further development of potentials of personalities and of society. In a society where personalities are enmeshed or conditioned to live up to fictitious notions, anxiety-superior is inhibited temporarily, but when manifested is destructive.

CONCLUSIONS

For the purpose of furthering the investigation on the feeling of superiority and anxiety-superior, this study was undertaken as a follow-up of The Ottawa Pilot Study and The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status. Diagnostic interviews were conducted among the population so as to obtain more detailed information on the phenomena under investigation and their manifestations in the personality. Personality in this study means personality manifested by the organism in maintaining its specific superiority. The following statements indicate some of the findings:—

(1) A living organism is part of Nature with specific superiority and its superiority rests upon the organization of its constituents for behaviour. The manifestations of the personality of a human organism are properties of its constituent unit cells with specific superiority, which are organized and involve a degree of unity of action with relative cooperation through the cerebral cortex. This is an indispensable condition in maintaining the complex organization of behaviour of specific superiority for survival.

(2) There is a perpetual motion and competition in Nature between entities of specific superiority which nullify relativity and destroy forces favouring acquiescence. Obviously relativity, in the final analysis, does not exist in Nature. The apparent unity of opposed entities is only relevant to superior entities. As the superior entities dissolve, so does the apparent unity of opposed entities. Thus Nature's law ensures unity for the higher development and manifestation of potentials for progressive change and not for relativity. Consequently the human personality competes, not only for survival, but to develop his potentialities of specific superiority and those of society.

(3) When free competition is suppressed under various injustices, the development and the manifestations of the personality are menaced and anxiety-superior is experienced. The individual temporarily divests himself of the manifold elaborate tools of organization to compete and society stagnates.

(4) Nature's laws of behaviour of personalities are the laws of behaviour of the sum of the organism's constituent units. Thus, factors controlling the personality and its manifestations are derived from the corporeal system's cells and their organization of entities of

specific superiority in continuous response to and in counteraction with entities in the internal and external surroundings. The personality variation is, therefore, of complex origin. Nevertheless, the organizational motive is the same, to maintain specific superiority in situations.

(5) The development and manifestation of the personality are only possible in free situations. Conditions in situations can be responsible for the reduction or even complete suppression of the personality but they cannot reckon with his organization of specific superiority within. Thus, to achieve an effective position or orientation is vital for the personality.

(6) Personality is not merely an aspect of the organism. The manifestation of organizational potentials of specific superiority is fundamental in situations. The greater the distance between the knowledge of the human organism and the fictitious ideals incorporated in social behaviour the more difficult is the task of the development and manifestation of the personality. Under such conditions the personality is protected and anxiety-superior develops followed by feelings of revolt, and situations deteriorate.

(7) Learning, differentiation, and change are the laws of Nature because of entities of specific superiority. Thus, for survival, the living organism must maintain its specific superiority by means of learning, differentiation, and change. Consequently, in the final analysis, the human organism rejects conditioning or canalizing.

Capacity to learn and to change tends to vary inversely according to the organizational potentials of the constituent units of the organism. It is important, therefore, to think of learning and change in terms of potentials.

(8) Progressive change is the result of organizations in which potentials of specific superiority led to a realization in situations. Thus, progressive evolution, adaptation, and adjustment are merely aspects of organization. A situation cannot make any organism manifest any response unless his organization is prepared to do so. Personality, therefore, cannot be imparted by extrinsic action. The motivation of the human personality to learn and to change his surroundings is to increase his freedom in situations in actualizing his potentials of specific superiority and those of society for orderly progress and change.

(9) Learning and change are the results of organization and of perpetual interactions between entities of specific superiority. Each personality, as the carrier of these potentials, must learn to react in situations if he is to survive and develop. When learning situations degenerate to conditioning or canalizing the personality to narrow creeds, anxiety-superior develops, and the process of deterioration begins.

(10) By reason of entities of specific superiority in Nature, phenomena such as feeling, thinking, differentiation, competition, learning, change, and anxiety-superior are vital features in maintaining the organization of specific superiority to satisfy needs for survival and development of the living organism. Thus, conditions or situations which threaten or block the organism in maintaining its specific superiority are causes of anxiety-superior. The variation of anxiety-superior is, therefore, of compound origin.

(11) All forms of thinking and feeling are of the same order and are controlled by the same motive of organization, namely maintaining the specific superiority of the organism in its environment. A type of behaviour not provided for in the organism by its constituents cannot be effected. The specific superiority of man over other animals consists of the thinking of new thoughts to a higher degree and the capacity of the organism to organize for behaviour to put these thoughts into effect in the surroundings.

(12) The individual's organization for specific superiority gives him a feeling that he is unique and is alive. To maintain this feeling is basic, not only for survival but to contribute to the growth of his potentials and those of society. Any menace to this feeling causes anxiety-superior, which is either overt or concealed. In a free society where it is mostly overt, it is a normal sign for orderly change of conditions and situations. In a society where personalities are enmeshed, anxiety-superior is inhibited but, when manifested, is destructive.

REFERENCES

1. Butler, J. A. V., *Man is a Microcosm*, London, Macmillan, 1950, pp. 21, 108, 77.
2. Carrol, Alexis, *Man the Unknown*, New York, Harper, 1935, pp. 65-69, 99.
3. Cole, C. D. H., *Essays in Social Theory*, London, MacMillan, 1950, pp. 97-98.
4. Harding, D. W., *Social Psychology and Individual Values*, London, Hutchinson's University Library, 1953, p. 159.
5. London, Ivan D., *Feelings and Emotions*, The Mooseheart Symposium, Ed. Martin L. Raymert, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1950, p. 91.
6. Plant, James S., *Personality and the Cultural Pattern*, London, Oxford University Press, 1937, pp. 97-105.
7. Remits, Ernest L., *The Feeling of Superiority and Anxiety-Superior*, The Ottawa Pilot Study, Ottawa, Runge Press, 1953, pp. 16-71.
8. ——— *The Feeling of Superiority and Anxiety-Superior*, The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, Ottawa, Runge Press, 1955, pp. 16-71.
9. Russell, E. S., *The Behaviour of Animals, An Introduction to Its Study*, London, Arnold & Sons, 1946, pp. 21-22.
10. Sherrington, Sir Charles, *Man on His Nature*, Cambridge University Press, 1951, pp. 283-288, 270, 88, 65-68.
11. Stagner, Ross, *Psychology of Personality*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1937, pp. 419-420.
12. Weber, Max, *Essays in Sociology*, Trans. H. H. Gerth, Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 180-195.
13. Weiss, Paul, *Principles of Development, A Text in Experimental Embryology*, New York, Holt, 1939, pp. 10-12, 460, 106-107.
14. Woodger, J. H., *Biological Principles, A Critical Study*, London, Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1929, pp. 94, 195-196, 416.

APPENDIX "A"

Schedule

- (1) Do you feel that competition is alright?
- (2) In dealing with a person who is superior to you in what you are doing, how do you maintain your own feelings of superiority?
- (3) What would you change in society (or in your surroundings) because of your feelings of superiority?
- (4) Do you think that learning helps you to maintain your feelings of superiority?
- (5) When you deal with a person who is your boss or director and you feel that he doesn't know as much as you do, how does it affect you?
- (6) When these feelings are frustrated too greatly, do you become anxious because you feel that you have no solid ground on which to meet particular difficulties?

Sometimes..... Often..... Not at all.....

- (7) How do you feel in dealing with a person of whom you are superior in what you are doing?
- (8) When do you resent competition?
- (9) Do you maintain your feelings of superiority in thought alone, that is without showing it?

Sometimes..... Often..... Not at all.....

- (10) What do your own feelings of superiority resent most?
- (11) If you are in surroundings in which you find it difficult to maintain your own feelings of superiority, what do you do?
- (12) What should society or people do to enable each person to maintain his own feelings of superiority?
- (13) Occupation
- (14) Age
- (15) Sex
- (16) Married Single

REMARKS

.....

.....

APPENDIX "B"

(a) Method

This investigation was conducted in the late fall of 1955 and in the spring of 1956 in the City of Ottawa, the capital of Canada, which has a population of about 220,000 people of a fairly homogeneous middle socio-economic group. Most of the employees are in the Government Service, nevertheless a large number is engaged in a variety of businesses and professions usual to a city of this size.

For a more detailed description of the population see the Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, 1955.

The data of this investigation were obtained by means of scheduled diagnostic interviews designed and administered by the writer. The Ottawa City Directory was used as a basis for sampling and a list was prepared from 'B. Names of Adult Persons—with occupations; where employed, whether householders, roomers, or boarders; Hull residents' names, addresses and occupations if such persons work in Ottawa,' from which 75 samples were selected at regular intervals. These were weighted and a supplementary list of 25 samples were added to the main sample so as to make the total 100, which, considering the degree of homogeneity of the population, fulfills the requirements of representativeness, reliability, and flexibility. No criterion was set up beyond that of age, over 17 years.

The schedule was designed so that reliable and meaningful returns would be assured, without prying into the respondents' personal lives. The questions were not formulated for test and must be memorized and asked in a conversational manner, thus creating an informal atmosphere, not a test situation. The sequence of questions in the schedule was followed. The respondents were free to ask any questions. It is necessary to have a thorough grasp of the phenomena so that the interviewer can explain the questions to the subjects if necessary. It is most important to guard against the possibility of the mode of observation exercising a modifying influence upon the phenomena under investigation. Great care was taken to obtain spontaneous answers, and the interviews were conducted in the simplest manner to ensure the minimum essential information. The time taken for the interviews varied from one individual to another, in the majority of cases lasting ten to fifteen minutes.

For further information and the history of method, see the Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status, 1955.

(b) **Reliability and Validity of the Results**

The results of this study further confirm those of The Ottawa Pilot Study and The Ottawa Test-Tube Survey on Status.

(c) **General Remarks**

Full cooperation was received in this experiment. In fact, even during pre-tests, helpful suggestions were made by the respondents. A number of the subjects stated that the questions were meaningful to them personally, and expressed the hope that their replies will be helpful.

