

#15 ✓

Comprehension

I'm going to start out with Comprehension today and then backtrack some, I hope. Again I have to repeat that Information as a subtest in the Wechsler is largely a test that an internalizer is likely to do well on, in the way that I mean when I say naturally, in that it takes effort for the Externalizer to learn the kinds of things ~~x~~ that are involved in the Information test.

The comprehension test to a very large degree is essentially a test that is essentially more or less natural for the Externalizer to do well on, because the kinds of items that are included in that test represent rather practical conventionalized kinds of activity that a person is likely if he's an E to learn to do rather naturally. If he's an I he may have to learn to ~~do~~ a certain extent to do things the practical way that is involved in it. The nature of the Comprehension test is in many ways and in many people with high IQ's, regardless of whether they are I's or E's for reasons that I will try to explain later, kind of think that the Comprehension test is a bit of a simple-minded test because in many cases the answers that are called for until you get down to one or two of the harder ones at the end are so obvious that an individual wonders why you're even bothering to ask them to do this particular type of activity. Again, the kind of thing that is involved in "Why should we stay away from bad company?" the reasons that people believe that you should stay away from bad company

00189

practically, there are many kinds of an individual who are likely to respond "Well, everyone knows why you should stay away from bad company, but now look here, that isn't necessarily true. There are some people who can learn by being around them." In other words there is a considerable amount of need to explain that you understand the reason but that you don't buy it. Well, in any event, the Externalizer taking this kind of test, the Externalizer is likely to be much more willing to give the simplest, conventionalized answer with very little antagonism or anything else, unless something has happened to make him want to be antagonistic to his literalness or his understanding in terms of this. The internalizer on the other hand, oftentimes thinks about this test in a little bit the same way as I mentioned about the F individual being cautious with the block design causing him to not do the Block Design test very effectively, not very fast. The Internalizer is oftentimes inclined to approach the Comprehension with much more of a questioning attitude. What is the reason behind why you're asking me these particular questions? Causing him to be a little slower in answering or in some instances being inclined to give a little bit of an out-of-pattern or (gap)

Now, the reason that the Comprehension fits into the R, the Block Design dimension rather than someplace else in terms of this, it is the R individuals who tends to be literal, who tends to learn to do things specifically well, it is the R individual who is most likely to give the most literal, conventionalized answer to the Comprehension type of subtest.

Whether he's I or E. Now therefore if you've got an individual who is I, that is has the high Digit Span, and he has the R, the high Block Design, and then doesn't do very well on the Low Comprehension subtest, this is an indication, to a certain extent, that the individual is remaining very much in certain kinds of ways in what is still a sort of out of contact kind of R-ness. I mean his R-ness is not related to learning procedurized things to do in terms of this. That is, he is likely to be, and to a certain extent the word that I like to use most in terms of this, the IR individual with a relatively low comprehension test, tends to be somewhat immature and inclined to be engaged in ideational kinds of activity rather than in direct kinds of procedure oriented kind. He hasn't learned to do things very precisely, he doesn't understand in terms of doing things. Therefore intellectual immaturity in an IR with a low Similarities begins to indicate a certain amount of intellectual immaturity and a person who does not tend to be particularly practical. The ER individual who begins to go down on the Comprehension, there are two things that are likely to be occurring here. The ER individual who does very badly on the Comprehension subtest the fact that he does badly on that subtest is an indication that he is an individual who is inclined to be impulsive. Now let me try to give an example of this. A sort of tricky example: the second or third item on the Comprehension subtest is "What should you do if you're the first person in a theater to discover a fire?" Now the E individual who answers that "I would yell 'fire,'" this is an indication of direct impulsivity, of what could be a relatively dangerous sign in connection with that. The IR who gives

00101

naive. He hasn't thought about this, but then after a period of time in connection with this, he is not likely to behave in quite that particular way, in an impulsive way. It's very hard to try to explain the difference of ~~of~~ orientation of how a person answers this particular question. To a certain extent I feel very strongly, if you have a forty year old IR who gives you the answer "Yell fire" I would say this response almost in itself was an indication that you're dealing with a very naive person, not necessarily immature, but naive. How do you differentiate between a person that's naive and a person that's immature? I don't know but there's a very definite difference. Naivete is the fact that a person has not really spent any particular time paying attention to something and has lost it. An I individual, for example, might more often be naive that is, a lot of things are going on around him. An IR individual could be naive because there are a lot of things going on around him that if he paid attention, he would learn from them, but because he <sup>is</sup> involved in some kind of internalized, intellectualized activity, he hasn't paid attention to them. But if he learns to pay attention to them, he can learn. Therefore, naivete has a certain amount of capacity to work on a person to get him to learn. You can make him behave properly. Immature means that in spite of anything that you've done in terms of this an individual has not learned. Therefore, an R individual who is, that is a high Block Design individual, low Similarities, indicating that he has not made any particular effort to see relationships in any particular kind of way, and a low Comprehension, the indication of that R in that particular combination is that he still is literally immature or naive in

*a relatively non-organized state of mind, low level of organization*

very often except in sick populations, because a person who is Ruu tends to be pretty much in the sick direction. Now they have to make some corrections for mild Ruu's that you get in higher intellectual levels, and I'll try to talk about that sometime later. But again, in relationship to this, I talked the other day about what the Information subtest does to the I-E dimension, that if you have an I individual, the high Digit Span, the low Arithmetic, the high C or the fact that he person does well on the information, the Iuc individual, is a person who is paying enough attention to remember those things that he needs to remember causing him to have a sort of an E orientation. The same thing now in the R, if you have R, and you have u, and you have c in terms of this, the things in terms of this, the Ruc combination indicates that the person has the high c, the Comprehension, indicates that the person has learned to do what he's supposed to do. The low Similarities indicate that there is a pretty good chance he does not understand the reasons why he does the things that he's learned to do. So therefore if you have an individual who is E and then you make him Ruc, the E means that he has learned the behaviors that he is supposed to do. He's procedurized in a way in which he looks like he knows what he's doing. The fact that he's Ruc is a pretty good sign that after you get to know this individual very well you will find out that he will have a tendency somewhere along the line to indicate that his behavior is not a good reflection of his understanding because he hasn't really understood the meaning of his behavior.

The same thing if you have Iuc. The Iuc in connection with this

00193

*indicates, the high information indicates that the person is dependent upon outside people in a sense to keep him active and relating, and that he is aware of what's going on but is also aware that he has a tendency to lose contact if he doesn't work at paying attention.*

Ruc in terms of this means that he also begins to learn the procedure that he's supposed to learn to do but he does not really understand the meaning of those procedures. Now, it's a fairly common example, an Iuc Ruc girl, we haven't talked about the final one and this enters into it but not an awful lot, an Iuc Ruc girl, the thing in terms of what it would indicate in terms of this is because she's Iuc she is very much dependent upon paying attention by the extent to which people around her are going to pay attention to her. In other words, they keep her in contact by relating to her, by pulling her out. What Ruc means in relationship to that, she not only causes people to have to relate, she is dependent upon other people to teach her how to behave. Now if you've got an Iuc Ruc girl growing up in an environment that has very specific and direct kinds of behaviors that it calls for, and I'm using a girl because traditionally in American society it might work a little bit more in terms of this in the sense that the way a girl is supposed to behave is a little bit better defined and so forth than is the way that a boy is supposed to behave. You teach an Iuc Ruc girl to always put her lipstick on right, always to sit in a certain kind of way, always to respond with certain kind of social facility with the people in the environment and show them how to do it, teach them to dance, teach them all the graces in terms of this. It is very possible to have an Iuc Ruc girl who is a stereotype of whatever the environment that she has grown

00194

in the manner to be. The thing that is going to happen over a period of time, however, is that because she is doing so many things that she is not involved in doing or doesn't understand the meaning of, that as she grows older and begins to get more mature in relationship to this, she gets into all kinds of problems because of the fact that she ... well, there's required a certain more understanding. One of the things I'm leading up to in terms of this is that an Iuc Ruc girl may react very responsively to an individual making the feeling that this person is responding to them. The individual can then begin to move and to make a closer involvement in terms of this and when they try to make too intimate an involvement in relationship to that, the individual making this involvement is going to be terribly surprised at the rejection and the hostility that is going to come out of this person because of the fact that you're going to realize suddenly that they don't recognize or at least in one of the things that's happening is that they do not recognize the meaning of what they're doing and therefore, you get pretty much in terms of this the pattern of the individual that many people call teasers. They're teasers because they can continue to behave as Ruc's to a certain extent, continue to behave in a certain way because they don't understand the meaning of their behavior and then become quite rejecting whenever an individual moves in the, thinks they mean what they say. The same thing in terms of this is that again Ru as a combination, the high Block Design, the low Similarities, one of the things is this represents a kind of selfish, self-centeredness. That is the R individual with the low Similarities is much more likely to be self-involved and to a certain extent self-centered. They've got a

00195

*very narrow vision in relationship to this.*

An E individual who is Ru, one of the primary characteristics that is likely to occur in relationship to this, is the combination of the E, the low Digit Span, with a high Block Design and a low Similarities, is that because they have a tendency to act out, and to act out with very little control in relationship to this, a characteristic of the E Ru, a fundamental basic characteristic is likely to be in terms of that if people will say they have a bad temper. That is they have a bad temper because when they don't get their way or don't get what they want, the natural tendency that ~~they~~ they respond is in the direction of demanding what they want through an emotional, overt display. Obviously then, the E individual who is Ru, one of the primary pressures that is placed upon him, 1) you must not be so overtly selfish, you must not lose your temper so easily would be the things that would be involved. You must not act out at this particular time. You must learn to control your temper. Well, one of the ways that you learn to control your temper is through the development of whatever it is that results in the high Similarities scores. And to a certain extent the majority of the people who come up as an ER, they begin to learn conscience. They begin to spend a certain period of the time trying to learn the reasons and understand the reasons that they shouldn't lose their temper. Now that's a kind of a control, a self-control. Another kind of a control that can come in relationship to this is the controls that are necessary in terms of learning the behaviors that are necessary to keep from acting out. Now this is the sort of thing that is likely to come in relationship with learning the high Comprehension type items. And what is relatively

00108

common is the E individual who will have an Ruc or Ruc+, a high Comprehension only a high Comprehension. The thing that is happening in terms of this is one of two things, and there may be more, but the two primary ones in terms of this. The high Comprehension means that the individual learns procedures on the basis of which he controls his temper. But behind it, there is still a very definite awareness, or a tendency to lose his temper. Therefore one of the things that can happen in an Ruc individual, he can learn the procedures and these procedures are likely to be compulsive procedures. He can learn the procedures on the basis of which he does not act out because he gets in trouble when he acts out, causing a tense sort of acting in. He explodes but he controls his tendency to explode out. He controls his tendency to explode out causing a kind of an ~~internal~~ internal tension. Now what this is likely in terms of what the test protocol, over a period of time indicate there are some people with an E as the low Digit Span, the high Block Desig, the low Similarities with the  $\bar{M}$  high Comprehension, there are some people in terms of this that will not be characterized as being people who lose their tempers easily but they will be characterized as very compulsive ~~and~~ individuals but they oftentimes are inclined to have very severe headaches. Some of the migraine headache groups, some of the general headache group kind of individual, that is this is an individual who is losing his temper all the time because he doesn't have the control that the high Similarities represents but is not getting any particular kind of relief and therefore it is largely a somatic beating that he is giving himself because he has not found an expressive way in terms of

*Doing that. You can also find in terms of this, an Ruc can be a person*  
tends to be an explosive person. An explosive person in relationship to an Ruc, this is an individual who controls his temper most of the time but is likely to be able to lose his temper explosively every once in a while whenever he has a rationalized reason for losing his temper. And you begin to find some E Ruc's either losing their temper or getting what they want, you will find a fairly heavy loading of E Ruc's in prison populations, and in delinquents because in a sense the Ruc individual is likely to be the kind of a person who does what he's supposed to do and does it well enough that in certain instances he will when he wants something that he is able to do it in the environment in a fairly effective way. Therefore, and of course I believe it, that what the extent that it happens will begin/fairly obvious to you if you look at tests over a period of time, if you have an individual who is Euc+, that is the very high Information, and again that Euc+ meaning that the individual is using some kind of obsessive activity to avoid being active, and you have Ruc+, meaning a very  $\times$  high Comprehension test coming in terms of this, the combination of that very high Information and that very high Comprehension is a clear indication that the individual has an obsessive, compulsive make-up. Now he has an obsessive-compulsive make-up because he has to use certain kinds of activity and certain kinds of ideational activity and certain kinds of behavioral activity to discipline his tendency to be either too Ruc, self-centered, Eu, acting out.

The Ec individual or the Rc individual has more self-sufficient capacity to discipline and doesn't need to use the same kind of intense behavior that the Euc+ or the Iuc+ or the Ruc+.

Where you get a crime of passion, the Rc and in some instances the Rc+, this means in a sense that if it's Rc+ there's extraordinarily high Similarity, means that the individual has intensely engaged in some kind of compensatory direction toward his self-centeredness, & his loss of contro, or various things in terms of this. It is likely to move somewhat in a, one of the most common ways if you've got a real R with a high Similarities, the individual is likely to be very moralistic. He's moralistic because he has learned the rules of behavior and is trying to understand the meaning of the rules, and he does it in a relatively literal way. Therefore he has many times an exaggerated idea of right or wrong and that you never lose your temper. They say it is wrong to lose your temper, except in the places where you're right. Now the things<sup>s</sup> interms of this , the danger that the Rc+ individual has is that he'll/<sup>have</sup>extraordinary control most of the time, & but when he gets into a situation in which he feels that he has really been wronged, now this is what I'm leading up to & -- the crime of passion. The Rc+ individual is likely to feel very strongly that his wife should be loyal to him, and he'll be intensely involved with the idea of her being loyal to him. He will be intensely engaged in a self-evident way of being very loyal and very moralistic in terms of it. Now if he finds outthat his wife is disloyal to him, the slap, the bang that comes with the breakdown in terms of that is likely to be the crime of passion. It's a crime of passion because you kill somebody who has done something so bad that they deserve to be killed. That's one -- that's a crime of passion. The Ruc on the other hand in terms of this, the Ruc is the person getting

ready to run a grocery store, holding the gun on the man in front of this, and the man that he's holding that gun on begins to not do exactly what he's supposed to do or move in another direction, the Ruc is the one that will pull the trigger on that gun and now that's a crime of passion in the sense that he's so angry at you at this particular point that he's going to act out but there's an impulsive acting out in terms of this and a different kind of thing than a crime of passion. So if you're going to be held up, you hope you're not held up by an Ruc.

I was thinking more in terms of the parent who loses control and beats a child, accidents, death or something like that.

Now that is more likely to be an Rc+, or an Rc, now again I have to backtrack because in English you begin as a baby. Let's talk about baby beating rather than child beating because the Ruc and particularly if they're E, one of the things that is likely to happen is that anytime the Ruc loses their temper it is likely to be explosive. Now an Ruc, an E individual who is Ruc having a crying baby, now if he's E one of the first things in terms of this, as an E, the distracting, the business of that baby bothering him it is more likely to be true in the ER or the E than it is in an I. The I individual is likely to get into trouble because he pays no attention to the need of the child, abandonment is more likely to occur in an I individual. The E individual and particularly an E Ruc, being around a baby in a period of time in which it's crying all the time, in a Ruc so he's controlling his tendency to be irritated ~~by the baby~~. He controls his tendency to be irritated, finally he cannot stand it any more and the thing that he is likely to do is be tremendously And this is one of the dangers of an Ruc individual. an

Ruc+ individual in particular. You see, they're tremendously ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ overcontrolled by whatever it is they are doing to control it. If anything breaks that control, you get a tremendous explosive outburst, so the baby beater is more likely to be an Ruc. The child beater, at this point we're talking about 9, 10, or 11 years old, this is more likely to be the Ec Rc. Because an Ec Rc combination in terms of this, the person has a great deal of need, has learned to control a tendency to be over responsive and has learned the rules of life, the things that you're supposed to do right in terms of this. Therefore when you have a child and you're trying to teach him what's right because this is what an Ec Rc is likely to be quite concerned with, not that any parent isn't, but I mean an Ec Rc has a better defined idea in relation to what he wants, what he thinks is necessary. He is less tolerant in many ways. He has much more need for a certain kind of overt discipline to be taking place purpose<sup>less</sup>~~ful~~ activity or selfish activity is likely to be much more ~~the~~ threatening to him because you see that this is the thing that he has spent his life learning to discipline. He sees his child being purposele being deceitful, doing things in a selfish, self-centered kind ~~of~~ a way. He keeps moving in a direction of trying to tell the child and teach the child that it's not likely that he should be doing better. If the child continues to perseverate the behavior, to the point that the individual feels that the child needs to be punished, there is a very definite danger that the Ec Rc individual will overpunish. I mean in other words whenever he has a reason to punish, he is likely to overpunish. Now again I've given this example many times, in fact maybe

00201

police officer is likely to be Ec Rc and particularly in the combination of the officer, the Ec Rc officer is likely to think, to be a very humanitarian person, because he's learned to be understanding. He's likely to be a very active worker in the Boy Scouts in some instances or in the Police Athletic League. He loves his mother and is very responsible to the needs of his mother. He loves his children, he loves children in general. He works very hard with them and in many cases is really a sweet guy. But as an Ec Rc one of the dangers that he has when you bring in some little dirty punk, that little bastard, he will be sadistic almost in the way he will treat this particular individual because he represents such a loss of a certain kind of a control. Therefore he has a tendency whenever, and one of the things that comes in here particularly if you have Rcc+ in a formula, the c+ has a bit of a tendency toward overliteral need to rationalize, and it's a rationalization indicator. An Rcc+ individual is going to have to rationalize that anything that he does is done for a proper reason, because he's Rc. The Ruc+ is going to work very hard to keep doing things because he knows he's likely to do improper things. But the rationalization that occurs in the Rcc+ individual is that he is likely to build up so much stress and strain that if he gets into a situation in which he rationally believes that a certain kind of a behavior is permissible, bang, it will come out in terms of that. Therefore an Ec Rcc+ executive may be a kind of an individual that seems to be very controlled in his relationship with his employees, but whenever an employee does ~~xxx~~ anything wrong, he is likely to be quite aggravatingly hostile toward that individual

00202

I talk about this it sounds like I'm wrong. These things aren't wrong; it's just a matter that if you're going to try to understand the behavior of the individual, you've got to see something of the groups, on the basis of which mainly because any EF individual has got to learn not to be emotional, any IF individual has to learn to be emotional. Now, by emotional I don't mean that the IF has to learn to have feelings. Everybody has feelings, but the manner, the way in which these feelings are transmitted or manifested on the outside. An EF is a person who in his early life everybody's going to call him an over-reactor. They call him an over-reactor because everything he feels, he's wearing his feelings on his sleeve. Now, you can't go through life wearing your feelings on your sleeve; therefore, the EF has to learn certain kinds of ways of controlling this particular kind of emotionality. The IF on the other hand, it's not a matter that he doesn't have feelings but that his feelings don't show. So he's an under-reactor. And you can't go through life as an under-reactor. So it shouldn't be unusual to see that over a period of time there will be some EF's who become over-controlled and some IF's who become over-emotional. And also, it shouldn't be too hard to follow that in relationship to the stress that an individual is going to be placed in, in his life experience, the ~~xxx~~ initial form that that stress is going to take is going to be in the compensatory direction. That is to try to put an EF under a pressure which will precipitate emotionality; they're

00203

going to become more resistant to ~~showing~~ showing any emotionality for fear that if they break down they will lose control. And that loss of control is going to be an over-reacting. The IF individual is going to over-react, under any particular kind of a stress, because their loss of control represents what in a sense is to under-react. You put an EF and IF together in a stress situation. They are likely to drive each other crazy, if you see what I mean in terms of this because one of them is going to want to act out to avoid acting in and the other is going to want to act in to keep from acting out.

Q. I think you said that he moves toward inhibition. Is he aware of this?

G. Yes, as far as I'm concerned, the Fu+ is always aware that in a sense that they are controlling, that they're inhibiting, that they're moving in. I should have mentioned this earlier. In relationship to the Similarities subtest, there probably is more sex difference, in this one particular test, than there is in any of the others. I mean in other words, it is much more common for women to have high Similarities than it is for men to have high Similarities under ordinary circumstances. And this is true as to whether an individual is either R or F; a woman is either R or F, there is a tendency for the Similarities to begin to move up. And it's a fact, the highest Similarities of all are likely to occur in a woman. Now this is not necessarily an indication of disorder. It is in a sense

00204

istic of the female personality than it is of the male personality. At least the general life style anywhere along the line, there is much more acceptance of being emotional, crying, touching, emoting. In fact, a woman who has no feelings is likely to be under tremendous stress in the American society in terms of this, as to understanding warm, all of these things. Consequently, one of the primary things that is likely to happen is that the F individual is under much more pressure, if you will, in the sense to be emotional in a controlled way rather than him being non-emotional. The F male is likely to be put under a considerable amount of pressure in a sense to move in what is much more of a non-relating or non-responsive kind of direction. He's got to be tough. And so tough, the Fu or the Fc individual, which is much more likely to occur in the male is in a sense moving in the direction of being tough because he cannot be too sensitive. The female, on the other hand, has to learn how to be sensitive in appropriate ways. Now the major way, and again one of the things that happens in the interpretation that you can make in relationship to this, is that the Fu+ woman is going to be much more likely to, there's much more likely to be sublimation taking place. And by sublimation in relationship to this, is to find rational ways to be emotional. Now I mean for example, and EF might have an area of sensuality as a characteristic in terms of this. This is much more needed in society for many reasons, or has been for a long period of time, that the proper control of

sensuality in an EF female is greater than in any other particular one group. But still they're expected to be sensual and relating. Consequently, it is quite possible in a sense, ~~of~~ for the EF female to sublimate in the relationship on the basis of which one of the most common ones that I know in terms of this, and it's almost like when I say all IFu men all play tennis, almost all EFu ~~wf~~ women love ballet. And they're likely to love ballet particularly as a non-participant observer rather than as a ballet dancer as such. Ballet because it represents a ~~high~~ highly sensual, sensitive kind of sublimation on the basis of which an individual can begin to move into the direction of getting sublimated satisfaction. The EFu housewife is much more likely to be sublimated in the sense of watching the soap operas all day long, in terms of, if that happens to be her bag or it can be any number of things on the basis of ~~finding~~ finding socially appropriate ~~sensual~~ sensual, sensitive ways of being able to relate. But with the u+ there has to be a certain amount of distance, that a person keeps in terms of this. Now again, one of the most common sublimated types of experiences that I know is the, let me put it this way, I have been surprised at the number of highly successful elementary school teachers, to take the elementary school teachers who have been elementary school teachers for twenty or thirty years are ready to retire and so forth, are essentially Efu's. And it's some form of compensation on Efu. Now ~~of~~ one of the things that happens in relationship to this, and again it sounds vicious when I'm trying to explain it, but it's a perfectly

00208

satisfactory way to make an adjustment, and it's a very good way of making an adjustment, because one of the things in terms of this is in their relationship with a child, let's make them a first grade teacher in terms of this, they can make intense, controlled, emotional involvements with the children in their first grade. And because at the end of the first grade, the children move on, something that they have no particular control over, they can immediately begin to take up an intense, emotional involvement with the new kids that are coming in, in the first grade, and they get a kind of xx revitalization which if they had to make the intense kinds of involvements that they're making to the same individual over a long period of time, the peaks and valleys that come in terms of that relationship would be much more destructive. And that to a certain extent an EF ~~xxx~~ mother is likely to have much more psychological distress over a period of time because there will be the waves back and forth of time when they are terribly involved and are terribly rejected, than the nice controlled kind of emotional and ~~xxx~~ sublimated emotional relationships that can come on the basis of the teacher who can have a new group of people in a systematic way to become involved in each year without any particular kind of guilt. Because, one characteristic of an EFu in many instances, or an IF, either an EF or an IF, is there is a tendency toward fickleness in a sense to be extremely intense. An EF individual, or an IF individual, is likely to have ~~xx~~ so many interests in so many things that they're likely to move toward that one of the things that they're going to have to

learn, that certain kind of control is a control in the sense of a sense of responsibility to be loyal, to maintain loyalty. And an EF individual in many cases is much more fickle and therefore has to work extremely hard in maintaining their loyalties over a ~~fixed~~ period of time, creating a great deal of emotional strain sometimes in this particular kind of an individual. Much more so than an ER who never doubts the fact that they're being loyal. And they don't have the same kind of insight or recognition of what's going on. ~~And~~ And they're not nearly as disturbed. An EF in many cases hates to get mad at anybody because once they get mad, they're likely never to forgive. Therefore, they will spend a lot of time to keep from getting mad but if they ever get mad, it's a pretty stressful thing. Consequently in a relationship with a child, on the basis of that you have to work awful hard not getting mad, you have a feeling of getting mad and you've got to control very much because you know you can't get mad, and it begins to be quite a difficult adjustment to maintain over a long period of time. To a certain extent an EF and an IF, in a different kind of way, is going to be proudest in any kind of a situation in which they have been able systematically to control in an organized way their feelings, their ideas or anything else in terms of this. This is why many an EF becomes highly intellectually oriented, why an IF becomes highly social. An IF can be very proud of the fact that he's become a very good minister. Because he's become a good minister he is rationally engaged in being emotional with everybody in his environment. An

*IF is an individual, an objective IF is a person whom I am likely to*  
 an EF to greatly admire because they can relate to everybody without really relating in my terms to anybody.

Q. Especially if it's an IFA?

G. Yeah. An EF who is going to have a great deal of difficulty because he is going to be pulled off anywhere along the line because he wants to relate with somebody instead of with everybody. Now again just as a simple thing in terms of this, in many instances, in one form or another, and it's rationalized in different ways -- rather an EF is likely to have a feeling that he would ~~rather~~ have a few good friends in for dinner. An IF would much rather have a party. Now I'm not saying that ~~rather~~ the IF would not want to have in a few friends, I'm talking about what represents an element of relaxation. Relaxation for the EF is likely to be in a situation in which he really -- I mean the idea and I could use my own family in relationship to this, which is essentially an EF intellectualizing family. A certain kind of an intellectual discussion in terms of this, we never had a meal in my life that my father and my sister and the rest of us, that there came up some kind of a discussion that happened to be about history or something and someone would have to go get the Encyclopedia Brittanica and look it up. And we were all interested -- acting in a highly emotional one to one relationship. And having people come to the house, it was a matter of entering into a conversation which represents a conversation which had a beginning and an end in terms of this. Now this was relaxing. And yet you move in an

an party  
leaves/tired. An IF is likely to leave the kind of intense, ~~one~~<sup>one</sup>  
to one, involvement that I'm talking about, tired and to leave a  
party refreshed.