

Cleo: A great problem when we get these handwritings is that the person usually appears to be ~~w~~ terribly withdrawn. At the same time, either he or she seems to be able to communicate with people very well, the person is basically very warm, and I'm always perplexed by it. I don't know quite how to look at it, and I've asked John to elaborate on that. How can you at the same time be withdrawn from the environment and also very relating? And I'd like to know how that works.

John: Well, I guess may be I'd like to know how it works, too. I can sort of go over again the whole process of what I consider the dynamics of a person's adjustment. And bear down again on the fact that <sup>any</sup> ~~my~~ individual when he goes through a period of extreme stress or is in a period of stress, the direction of his adjustment is essentially determined hypothetically by the PAS. The direction of how he responds to that stress is whether or not he's an I and an E, in the kind of way that I've talked about before. Now the really complicated thing is that any time an individual begins to be placed under stress, the first direction that an individual is likely to go in terms of making some adaptation to this stress is in a sense to compensate against or control what is in a sense the direction that he considers the guilt producing or area of least effectiveness. Now again theoretically what I say in relationship to this is that an I individual, the direction of any kind of emotional distress is going to be ~~xxx~~ turned inward. That is, the individual is going to be in a

state on the basis of which he withdraws in and unto himself. And now this withdrawal that the I individual does is quite a different <sup>00437</sup> kind of a thing than the withdrawal of the E individual. Because the E individual, the direction that he is likely to go in terms of this is that he will move in a direction of acting out, and that therefore the primary problem that the E individual has is that when he gets into an emotional state, that emotional state is going to be manifested by what is in effective some kind of behavioral state. Again the characteristic of the uncontrolled E is that he is in a manic state, because he has no control of his ability to over-relate and ~~EXXX~~ over-react. The psychotic or the ultimate state of the Internalizer when he withdraws and withdraws to a certain extent, he becomes schizophrenic which in effect means that he has lost all awareness and all contact with his environment. Now the adjustment process or the type of thing that an individual whether he is E or I has got to do is to move a little bit in the direction of trying to organize his ability to stay in contact with what is going on around him in the most effective kind of way. That is, the E individual has to work pretty much at not being too reactive in order to be appropriately reactive. Therefore the normal state of the E individual is in a sense to be relatively passive because if he remains relatively passive and at the same time is alert, he is able to control his tendency to be over-responsive. Now if you place him in a situation and certainly this is as far as I'm concerned, I think this is something that is likely to be particularly picked up in the handwriting

is that the E individual<sup>as</sup> as he is moving in the direction of needing  
to over-relate or over-respond or to be over-reactive, that is, if he  
moves in the direction to be passive in order to avoid too much  
overactivity, the passivity is going to carry with it a great deal of  
characteristic of tension. The person is very tense because he is  
very aware of what there is to respond to and the more he has a need  
to act out, the more tense and controlled he is likely to become.  
Therefore, an extreme tension in an E person's handwriting is an indica-  
tion that the person is controlling his tendency to over-react.  
Now when you talk about the I individual in terms of this, you've got  
almost exactly the opposite thing taking place. To a certain extent,  
the I individual when he begins to withdraw and to move into what is  
in a sense the schizophrenic state, he is losing awareness of what is  
going on around him, therefore he has to work in a very active & way  
to try to keep in contact. Therefore the I individual when he is  
healthier is likely to be the kind of an individual who will have a  
~~great~~ great deal of tension in his handwriting because the tension is a  
indication that the person is working hard not to withdraw . There-  
fore the I individual when you begin to get indications in his hand-  
writing that the handwriting is getting less tense, there is a very  
definite possibility the individual is moving out of contact. When  
you get an indication in terms of the E individual of not too much  
tension involved in it, this is an indication that the person is  
rather comfortably engaged in relating. And you can get in terms of  
this, the kind of a healthy E, a person who learns over a period of  
time how to be a demonstrative person in a controlled way. Now  
therefore you can get the kind of an individual that you are talking

about who is cautious. This is what essentially is the life adjustment that the individual is likely to make. He is cautious because he's 00439 trying to avoid over-relating but he still can be pretty much of a warm and relating person. Because he has to stay in contact. And if he begins to be put under stress, the handwriting begins to get extremely tense, indicating that the individual is controlling. I wish I knew enough physiology to be able to say exactly what I mean in terms of this because to a certain extent the smooth muscles are more likely to be the tense muscles in the I individual, the striated muscles are more likely to be the tense muscles in the E individual. Consequently, when you begin to move in the direction of control in handwriting, the I individual as he gets tense becomes more relaxed in terms of his handwriting, whereas the E individual as he becomes tense, it is very definitely reflected in the muscles of the hand. The tension state of the E individual is likely over a long period of time to be more manifested with things like high blood pressure because in a sense the way that he is holding on in terms of this is likely to be reflected by a rise in blood pressure, whereas the I individual who is in a sense internalizing is likely either to have severe headaches than he is to have high blood pressure, or some kind of visceral reaction. In passing, something that I think I know I can't demonstrate it. A thing like on the lie detector, the polygraph. One of the things that happens in terms of a polygraph, is that the E individual responding to the polygraph, when he first begins to sit down and gets into the situation of having everything placed on him, he is placed in a situation in which he is not allowed

44

to react and respond in what is essentially the normal way that he is likely to respond. The E individual acting out is oftentimes going to have to have a certain amount of activity. Consequently, the process of the individual sitting down causes him to become very tense. That tension is picked up very rapidly by the polygraph. Because the polygraph is primarily getting these things that are in connection with the physiological measures that they're getting are largely E type measures. Consequently, when you begin to deal with the E individual, when you begin to move in a direction of where something is distressing, disturbing, or that he has something that he wants to hide in terms of that the individual becomes immediately more tense because he is trying to keep from reacting. Therefore the machine will pick that up. Now the I individual beginning to go into the polygraph, the first thing that he does when he sits down in terms of this is in a sense to move into the direction of being very aware. The process of being very aware in the I individual gives initial indications of tension in the individual because he is reacting in this particular way, but as you begin to move along with the test, then you begin to get in an area of threatening or an area where the individual does not want to respond to what is being told to him, the individual is likely to become inwardly tense causing in effect the polygraph indicators to begin to disappear because the individual is withdrawing and it is not getting the kind of a response. Theoretically what I'm saying is that sometimes an I individual can beat the polygraph because he is likely to be the most non-responsive when he is being dealt with the most

threatening thing. You're likely to get false positives on the E individual because the E individual is likely to over-react in polygraph terms to practically anything that creates any particular kind of distress or disturbance for them. And you can get, and I've seen Iu individuals who oftentimes brought in what we talk about as non-reactors. There are people that when they bring them into the polygraph situation they get almost no reactivity at all, because the individual in a sense, with his schizoid adjustment, is not likely to show up on the surface kind of tension.

Cleo: When does an E withdraw completely from contact with others?

John: Well, essentially there are two ways that an E can completely, or in a sense, completely withdraw. In one case the individual can become in PAS terms the Ec+ that is the kind of an individual who has repressed and totally repressed his E particular type of activity. I used to call them, for want of a better term, I called them pseudo-schizophrenics. They are not pseudo really, because they are not false. They really are schizophrenics, but they are very tense schizophrenics because they are individuals who have so repressed their responsiveness that they are not aware that they still continue to respond. Let me give a kind of an example of this, an analogy maybe more than an example. In the relatively early days, maybe 25 or 30 years ago, when they begin to come in with natural childbirth and in natural childbirth began to move a little bit in the direction of using hypnosis in connection with childbirth, something which they have in one form or another sort of gone away from, because one of the things that would happen in a person with a hypnotic childbirth

experience, the individual ~~is~~ physiologically had all of the effects  
00442  
of the childbirth experience without the psychological effects. This  
is an example of what I would call Ec+, the individual has lost the  
psychological awareness, but still has a tendency to react to everything  
that is going on around him, just the same but it is more likely to  
be highly physiological rather than the awareness, the cautiousness,  
the kind of thing like you get sometimes in hypnosis. Again one of  
the things is that there were some people who could cure ~~headaches~~  
headaches with hypnosis, but what would happen, the person would be  
talked into that he didn't have a headache when in <sup>reality</sup> ~~reality~~ the  
headache was still beginning to have some particular effect ~~of~~ on  
him that he was no longer aware of. That's one way that the E indi-  
vidual can withdraw. The other way, and this is the way that involve  
a great deal more of tension, this is essentially the Euc+ in-  
dividual. The Euc\_ individual is very aware that he is still a very  
responsive person, he doesn't <sup>have</sup> ~~have~~ the repression. He has very  
definite awareness and the only thing that he can do is to move into  
the direction of developing some kind of obsessive mechanism which  
in a sense prevents him from reacting. Now he's not like the Ec\_  
in terms of his withdrawal, is really convinced that he no longer is  
~~responding~~.responding. The Euc+ individual is a person who is  
very aware of all of the things that he should respond to and displa  
it by developing some kind of an obsessive or compulsive type of  
activity on the basis of which he prevents himself from reacting. .  
Euc+ individual is much more likely, though not the only one, is mu  
more likely to develop a somatic rationalization for non-responsive

ness, will develop headaches to avoid responding. Now this is a ~~different~~ different kind of a headache than the headache of the I <sup>00443</sup> individual. He is also likely to develop malaise or do any particular kind of a thing to avoid any kind of a stimulating situation. There's many an individual who will move in the direction for example a very active E housewife can actually become non-~~re~~ productive as a housewife by using the television soap operas or the radio soap operas as a means on the basis of which she can obsessively identify with in ~~an~~ such a way that it keeps her from being responsive, reactive, that kind of an individual. Also the E individual in an attempt to withdraw in one form or another, drinking is likely to be one of the things that he'll move into the direction of as he needs some kind of support. The Ec<sub>+</sub> individual usually doesn't need the same kind of artificial support that comes with what is ordinarily obsessive. But the Euc<sub>+</sub> individual is a much more, this person is distressed because he's very aware of his tendency to over-react, and he's physically avoiding any kind of a situation that is likely to precipitate over-reaction. The Ec individual who maybe in a sense more appropriately adjusted will at least move into the direction on the ~~hand~~ basis of which he feels he can control his tendency to over-react. Therefore he doesn't have to go to the same lengths to avoid interaction, that the Eu individual is likely to do.

Cleo: Therefore the Euc<sub>-</sub> would be more tension-producing.

John: Yes, it would be much more tension producing and again to put it in handwriting terms, the Euc individual is likely to show more

changes in his handwriting in any particular given period of time. The Eu handwriting sample is likely to reflect rather definitely the various moods that the individual is in while he's writing the letter. The Ec individual is going to be much more consistent. Therefore the Ec individual, if he has a consistent handwriting which begins to deteriorate, the Ec whose writing begins to deteriorate if you have a sample over a period of time showing a certain amount of consistency, and control, then a beginning of a collapse in the handwriting, this is an indication that the Ec individual is moving into some kind of an uncontrollable state, and is a much more pathological sign in the handwriting than is the variation in the handwriting of the ordinary Euc.

Olga: There's an article in a recent issue of Psychology Today that that brings to mind. Did you see the article on giving up -- hopelessness? You can train animals to believe that a good result will ensue if they keep struggling but if you train them to believe that it won't, they will give up and they will die. And he was telling about this one man who was a prisoner of war in the Korean War. And he was convinced that at the end of a certain period he'd be let go if he'd do certain things and he cooperated. So he was a very spunky little guy and he encouraged all the others and he maintained his ego strength and he kept on going. And then after he did all these things that he was supposed to do, the deadline passed and it began to dawn on him that he was not going to be let go regarding that he was stuck there. At this point he stopped all his activity and just completely let, completely regressed, just completely withdrew from contact and eventually died.

42.

John: This is a relatively common reaction, a reaction which you get based on our own experience with following prisoner of war behavior over a period of time. Again one of the things anytime you talk about solitary confinement, this is one of the best ways I know to explain something of this giving up and what happens in this giving up in relationship to this. In many instances an Ec individual or even an Eu individual in a stressful situation will actually look forward to a solitary confinement because solitary confinement gives him a situation on the basis of which he no longer has to respond. Consequently, in the initial phases of a solitary confinement experience for an E individual he is likely to gain a considerable amount of comfort. Now the longer he stays in that isolation, the more the problem begins to develop because he is a reactive and interactive person. He has a need to respond. He's placed in a situation in which there is ~~nothing~~ nothing to respond to. He may move into the direction of which he uses all kinds of mechanisms to try to keep himself a responsive person. But you keep him in there long enough, until he gives up, his giving up is manifested by being literally an individual who goes berserk and wants to climb the walls, and to holler and to go into what is in effect a manic state. So you have in an E individual in solitary confinement over a period of time, initially very comfortable. The longer he's in it, the more he's likely to move to the direction and giving up in this case is in a sense going berserk. And going berserk in a sense in the E individual is overactivity. He begs to be let out and all the other things. Now the I individual on the other

hand placed in the same situation, the initial shock of solitary confinement is likely to be very threatening to him, mainly because the direction of his tension, the thing that he needs to do, he needs to have people to relate to in order to keep him going. And here he's placed in a situation which is driving him into a direction of inactivity. Therefore he is likely to be highly nervous, highly over-reactive to the initial isolation experience, but as the isolation experience begins to continue over a period of time on the basis of which he finds that he's not going to get out or other things in terms of this, the direction that he moves is in the direction of complete withdrawal. And he has what is in effect after a long period of time where he starts out quite overactive then makes an adaptation which is in a sense pulling the ~~ix~~ blind and moving into what is in effect a schizophrenic state on the basis of which if somebody doesn't feed him, he will die.

Olga: This guy wasn't in solitary. He was in a situation where in order to maintain his hopes he had to keep interacting and behaving in certain ways, that his captors insisted upon or that were appropriate to the situation. His fellow prisoners were there and he was a source of encouragement to them. He'd say "Don't worry, if you do this and that and you play it right, you're going to get out at such and such a time." And he was always in that situation where he was forced to actively behave in certain ways. When he found out that it wasn't even going to work, then he ceased behaving ~~xxx~~ at all. So ~~x~~ wouldn't he be very likely then an Ic?

John: Right. Now, I think I can use another example of the same

thing in terms of this. It is also a very hard one to explain <sup>010447</sup> relationship to this. The Ic placed in a prison environment is likely to get a considerable amount of support by the fact that there are other prisoners there. And the fact that there are other prisoners there on the basis of which they can develop a certain amount of non-relating kind of relating, what I've tried to call in the past gregariousness. Gregariousness has a tendency to keep an I individual healthier. He needs that. But the thing that is happening is that he is really not interacting with anyone because he is acting to reacting rather superficially with everyone. Therefore in a prison camp even though that there are strangers or other things in terms of this, the fact that he's living in that group of people, keeps him in contact over a long period of time, in a relatively effective way. The problem with the E individual on the other hand, is that E individual has much more need to move in what are in a sense one-to-one relationships. He needs somebody who will reciprocate whatever his feelings are. Or he will reciprocate feelings as they come. You put him in with a group of people and if there are some of them that are hostile toward him and he's hostile toward them, there's a great deal of emotional interaction on the basis of which the E individual is placed with a large number of people, many of whom he doesn't like or who don't like him. That can be a very disasterous experience to the E individual as opposed to it being an enabling experience to the I individual.

In PAS terms the E individual is a person who starts out in a sense as an active person. This is part of his make-up. The I

20.

individual starts out essentially as a passive person because he does not have the same kind of motor need to respond. Therefore one of the things that is happening in relationship to this when you begin to talk about something like hand movements, it's going to be the E individual who's going to have to move into the direction to avoid hand movements. The I individual is going to be in the direction in a sense of having to develop hand movements. And again I use the example of public speaking courses in terms of this. A ~~new~~ public speaking course or the old elocution lessons that little boys and girls used to take in my day was in a sense designed to teach people behaviors. The behaviors were in two directions: the over-acting E's who didn't know what to do with their hands had to be taught certain kinds of positions on the basis of controlling their hands. The bland, non-responsive little I's had to show some kind of expressiveness. They were taught to be expressive. To a certain extent, the best elocution students oftentimes were the I individuals who in a sense could learn to be expressive the way the teacher wanted them to be expressive, because they didn't put anything of themselves in the E sense in terms of this. Therefore in hand movements and in relationship to hand movements the Ec individual or the Euc+ individual is oftentimes when you watch his behavior in connection with this the behavior is likely to be manifested in a direction on the basis of which the individual is actually engaged in controlling movement. To a certain extent if you watch an individual over a period of time in this business of control, the control will move into the direction of where he holds on to the chair and I'm getting into an argument

24.

with you and I want to begin to come back in terms of it. I begin to get tensed up and I get tensed up because I am controlling my tendency <sup>00449</sup> to over-react, I'm moving in the direction in terms of this and finally when I get my say "Now you look here/." Now the minute that I come out of that, I'm using my hands in a sense as part of whatever it is that I'm doing. Therefore an E individual's hand movements are usually going to carry with them a certain amount of relevance to what the individual is talking about. The I individual on the other hand in terms of this isn't going to have to move nearly as much in terms of this and the I individual ~~x~~ in relationship to his hand movements, his hand movements are always going to move to the place on where there is a point he has to make. And he is likely to persevere his hand response. The kind of person who, and you've seen them in relationship to this, ~~x~~ who will talk to somebody and will ~~x~~ sit right there and move like this, this is much more likely an I than it is an E. Because an I is going to continue to make some kind of a movement because it doesn't represent the same kind of threat to him. Therefore stylized hand movements done relatively easily are more likely to be associated with an I individual than with an E individual.

Cleo: Wouldn't that depend on whether he's an A or a U? Whether it's more free or more stilted?

John: When you get to the point of stilted, A or U is going to enter in terms of this. An EA individual can learn grace in movement than an EU can. Therefore an EA is likely to be graceful in movement and not be nearly as disturbed in connection or disturbing or as stereotyped or what is much more likely, the EU is the one most likely to

engage in certain kinds of overcontrol of movement. The EA is likely  
to be much more appropriate in the manner and terms of which they do  
it. The IU is going to be the most stereotyped in the sense that he is  
going to learn his movements or be a president, I still put in  
terms of this as being a prime example of an IU hand movement which is  
in a sense this perseverated type of thing in that it has very little  
relevance to anything other than to show I am relating. An IA on  
the other hand, can oftentimes move in the direction of which these  
movements have a certain amount of appropriateness. An example of IA  
movement is if you can remember and watched the debates between Nixon  
and Kennedy in the old debate period of time, this was an example of  
an IA against an IU. And that much of the IA behavior that Kennedy  
was manifesting, came across better. It still had kind of a learned  
quality. The IA child learning elocution is going to be many times  
somewhat one of the best. The IU is going to have to work on it a  
little harder, in terms of getting anything out of it. Johnson is  
EU in terms of the body posture, the behavior. There's a considerable  
amount when you're watching him in terms of this. He's not working  
to relate the way I think Nixon is working to relate. He's working  
to relate in the right way and therefore there is a kind of a tension  
in his public appearance in relation to this that is more character-  
of the EU individual. Eisenhower, also an EU individual. Now, I  
can't think of an EA. The nearest one possibly as an EA is Muskie.  
I think it's possible that Muskie in the relationship in the kind of  
responsiveness in the sense that he has, that there is some kind of  
an EA characteristic in the manner in which his presentations are made

Can you see Muskie as an E? The period of time when he was most ~~relaxed~~ relaxed was the period of time when he was running for Vice 00451 President and that was the period of time in which the kind and to a certain extent Humphrey as an EU and Muskie as an EA, they had a little bit of a ~~mix~~ balance.

Cleo: How about the poor country lawyer, you know, the one at the head of the Watergate?

Ed: Sam Ervin?

Cleo: Yes, wouldn't he be an EA?

John: Well I don't know that he's an EA. I suspect very much that he's an IA. Mainly because his social role is very definitely contrived. I think he's very definitely an A because in a sense he has been perfectly willing to persevere the role of the area that he comes from in spite of the fact that he's had an awful lot of exposure to other kinds of roles. He has no particular need to modify. And as a Harvard lawyer, he certainly is as unlike the stereotype of a Harvard lawyer but there's a sense of contrivance, which I think is more likely to be I than it is to be E. Mainly because if you watch Ervin long enough over a period of time, he is much more likely to respond to a group than he is to individuals. I certainly would not call him an EA.

Roger: How about some other body movements, like sitting forward or backward, pacing vs. standstill?

John: Again the bedrock of practically any movement is in what I've already said. An I individual is more likely to pace in a situation

22.

in which there is a considerable amount of need for him to think about 00432  
certain kinds of relating. I have known I actors for example and I  
actors are likely to go through a kind of calisthenics. In more ways  
than not calisthenics are of much more interest to I's than they are  
to ~~E~~ E's, mainly because they give you a controlled manner in terms  
of learning to be x expressive. And that I actors oftentimes will  
pace up and down before they get ready to go onto the stage, because  
in a sense they are readying to relate. The E actor is much more  
likely to be inclined to want to sit in a room very quietly, doing  
nothing so that he can put everything into his relating when he goes  
out. In terms of social behavior, the I individual is likely to become  
the most active when he is the most interested. This is likely to man-  
ifest itself in a m number of ways. The I individual, if he really is  
interested, one of the things he begins to do is he begins to move  
in the direction of getting closer to the individual that he's talking  
to, indicating that he's paying attention, that he's looking at them.  
He is also likely to move in the direction of where he wants to go  
over and sit right next to somebody. In other words, all of  
his muscular activity is in a sense to keep him alert. The E in-  
dividual on the other hand is much more likely to be inclined to be  
in a situation on the basis of where he is attempting to listen to  
someone rather than responding to someone. He is likely as he gets m  
interested to move into the direction on the basis of which he become  
less active. An interested E is likely to be very passive because of  
the fact he has actually been so interested in something that somebo

is saying that he does not need to respond. As a matter of fact he is likely to destroy a certain amount of his ability to be able to listen to what the individual is talking about, or to be able to relate to the individual if he moves too close to the individual. What happens to the E individual is that he begins to be distracted by the reciprocal interaction, moving in the other kind of a direction. The same thing with eye contact. Eye contact to me is one of the best indications of I and E. An I individual is likely to move into the direction as they become interested, that they want someone to look them right in the eyes when they're talking to them. There are very few E's who can maintain eye contact for a long period of time without having to break it because that eye contact is likely to distract them in a different kind of way than it does in terms of the I individual. The other example that I'll give in terms of behavior in I's and E's, except in certain areas where the sun is very bright all the time, is when you watch a person wearing sunglasses come in from the street, to a drugstore. The E individual, the minute that he walks in that drugstore, he takes off his sunglasses because he is immediately aware of the change and the fact that he can't see. The I individual is likely to be much less aware of it and in a sense be the kind of a person who will be able to continue to operate quite effectively in the drugstore even though he can't see. This is the reason why, on the tunnels on the Tennessee Turnpike, they have to put up big signs that say "Take off your sunglasses" because there are plenty of I's who would go right through the tunnel with their glasses on. Th

44

E's would desperately tear off their glasses, the minute they hit that tunnel because their perception was very definitely ~~distorted~~ distorted by it. The same thing with the business of, like I'm doing here of taking off my glasses in relationship to this. The E individual, taking off his glasses in a sense is likely to mean "Now there's something I want to think about." He's x cutting out his tendency to be too aware of what's going on. The I individual is oftentimes likely to be sitting in a group and he'll ~~have~~ have his glasses like this, and will do something like this, when somebody begins -- "Now that's interesting" and he puts his glasses on because what he wants to do is in a sense to bring it into focus. The same thing is true in relation to body movement. The E individual is likely to close his eyes "Let me think about that." Now obviously the thing he's doing is to cut out distraction, by closing his eyes so that he can think. It's much more threatening to the I individual if he really wants to think about what's being said in terms of this, to do this. Therefore the I individual is likely "Now let me think" and he moves and begins to in a sense interact in a very intense kind of a way, which can be very distracting sometimes to the E individual.

Roger: Yes, so when an individual looks out the window to try to organize his thoughts, while he's putting together a complex concept. If you're looking out the window, this is like the E individual taking off his glasses, avoiding the eye contact?

John: Yes. And as a matter of fact the I individual is much more likely to look out the <sup>window</sup>~~window~~ to think than is the E individual,

As.

because the E individual looking out the window is likely to get dis-  
tracted by what he sees out the window. The I individual oftentimes,  
if he wants to think, sometimes he can look right at a spot on the  
wall. But rarely does he close his eyes. He looks out the window,  
he looks at a spot on the wall, he keeps alert. This is the I indivi-  
dual. The E individual looking out the window is likely an indication  
that the person is bored. Boredom in the E individual is ultimately  
going to manifest itself by a tendency toward body movement, or a  
tendency toward squirming. Therefore the E individual in a process  
of being bored is going to have to work out some kind of a mechanism  
on the basis of which he controls his tendency to be too responsive.  
One of the ways he can do that, he can doodle. And he doodles when  
he is bored. And he is likely to doodle when he wants to be overactive  
and he's using it to control his tendency to be over-reactive. The  
I individual doodles when he is paying attention. If you look and  
see Kennedy's doodles for example, Kennedy is likely to have in a  
period of time, in some of the ones that I saw were in his notes about  
the Cuban crisis, which there were some people that talked quite a bit  
because he drew ships and all kinds of things when he was making notes  
on the Cuban crisis. This is an I individual being very aware of the  
need to be alert and to be responsive. And the doodling in this case  
is an indication to keep an individual alert. And consequently if you  
see doodles which have a tendency to be stylized, that is an individ-  
ual who draws a star, and the same star over and over again, this is an  
I individual keeping alert. If you see different, more ~~xx~~ original  
kinds of things, this is an E individual trying to remain passive.

Ar.

my case, because I am an Euc I've always had great difficulty in keeping my body movement under control, particularly when I was younger. I used to get in a lot of trouble in school, because being a U as well as an E, the squirming and the various things in terms of this, indicating that I didn't regulate this, that I developed and I still do it every once in a while, and it's not something that you can observe because I had to move in the direction of getting non-observant. I drew a triangle with my big toe in my shoe. And when I have to be still, if you would watch you'd see my foot beginning to move a little bit because I'm drawing a triangle with my toe which is in a sense an obsessive way to keep from being too over-reactive, too over-responsive.

Dave: Is an I more likely to come up with what might be called an internal behavior in that kind of an instance, when he wants to do something to keep himself alert? Is he more likely to say have a song run through his mind or keep a mental activity going rather than a physical activity?

John: Yes, except there are some I's who really become finger ~~drum~~ drummers and when people talk about that's a very nervous individual a very nervous individual is more likely an I than he is an E. I think you've seen professors in the past who are very nervous, but they're more likely IF's and they're IF's who in a sense have to move in the direction of being very over-active to keep alert.

Dave: Does this remind you of Monsieur Houdeau, of Monsieur Hondeau's Holiday?

John: Yes.

00457

Dave: Always doing something that was a quick nervous reaction that was always inappropriate and putting something down. The I is very unobservant.

John: The individual is going to have to move into the direction of keeping a certain kind of passivity. The theoretical thing and it doesn't work exactly this way but the theoretical thing in terms of this is as the I individual becomes more passive, he is losing contact therefore he has to be active to maintain contact. Another example in relationship to this, leg crossing behavior. I swear I've seen this and it's rather eerie and awesome, in a Chinese audience that I used to have to give some lectures in once upon a time. It was largely an I audience. They would sit there with their legs crossed making no movement of any kind and almost as though on cue everybody would jiggle and they would jiggle into the other ~~xxx~~ direction. And it was just a wave. This is related to the ~~xxx~~ thing that I have said before about E and I behavior in connection with women. One of the ways you can tell an E woman from an I woman sometimes in terms of this is that if I look at her legs and she sees me and will be very aware that I am looking at her legs, and she will immediately take a correction, because she is responding to the movement that I made and the various things in terms of this. The I individual who is likely in the period of time of growing up, has to be taught to be careful in

relationship to this. And you watch an I girl, particularly with some  
of these short dresses now, when they're sitting down and they're <sup>00458</sup>  
exposed all the way up to here, and if you look at them and they make  
no move of any kind, but every once in a while they'll go through the  
motion of pulling their skirt down.

Cleo: Don't you think this case is a question of U or A, because I  
know many an E who will not do it because they're U's?

John: What do you mean will not do it?

Cleo: Will not pull their skirts down if you look at their legs.

John: Well, it depends on where they are and what it is. But  
the major thing that I'm saying is that the E individual is very aware  
of the fact that this is taking place. The I individual is aware that  
it's taking place. In many instances an I individual is sometimes in  
danger that somebody who's not even looking at somebody's legs may be  
accused. Because it's just in the way and particularly EU's who are  
likely to get accused anywhere along the line in terms of this, when  
they are really trying awfully hard not to look at somebody's legs,  
and many times the thing in terms of this is again, you see the body  
movement that begins to come in terms of this is an avoidance ~~reaction~~  
reaction. . Therefore in any instance when you begin to see E individu  
move in what is in a sense an avoidance reaction, that is they are  
aware of something on the basis of which they are avoiding it. An  
E individual talking to somebody he's getting too involved with is  
going to have a tendency to walk or pull away from them because the  
situation in a social situation doesn't call for as much involvement

In terms of leg crossing behavior is that to a certain extent if I'm sitting here talking to you in this way, I am more in contact with you and this is in the I much more likely to be comfortable 00459 talking to you this way. You'll always see that I am talking to you this way which is in a sense, giving some distance. I'm moving and I'm actually uncomfortable. If I'm trying to talk to somebody and if I can't get some kind of distance. One of the other things is the business of legs going to sleep. I tried to think about this in many kinds of ways. I think in general certain I's are likely to have the tendency for their legs to go to sleep if they're in a situation that doesn't call for very much activity. They are not nearly as sensitive and as aware of some of the changes that they undergo in this. An I individual if he remains passive and it's a passivity that is appropriate, that is, sitting in a classroom paying attention, an I individual can keep their legs crossed almost forever. I know very few E's that there doesn't have to be a jiggle or change somewhere along the line because of the awareness in relationship to this. Therefore long, continued, relaxed types of things -- I'm not talking about the tension of the E who crosses his legs tightly and grays onto this in order to make sure that he's paying attention. There's a tension involved in that as opposed to the difference of you sitting over there. You haven't crossed your legs or made a bodily movement since we've been talking ~~about~~ about it.

Dave: How about the person who switches his legs when somebody else does? Or on going into a store, takes off his sunglasses because somebody else next to him does? Or folds his arms because somebody

248  
CP460

else does? Is this more likely to be an A rather than a U or is that more likely to be a U?

John: That's more likely to be a U. It can be either I or E depending upon the circumstances. But in most instances, it is an individual who is quite dependent upon someone else to give them some kind of aid and assistance, a prop. In a sense if I'm an uncontrolled E and I have to move around, you put your arms together, I'm likely to do that because it makes me more comfortable. That's the U.