

The major topic that I want to spend a little time on now is something about Y's; I talked about X, Y, and Z's somewhere along the line in relationship to the test, in terms of the formulas. I think I have to start out this way. There is a test X, and a test Y and a Test Z. And it is probable that there is a theoretical X, a theoretical Y, and a theoretical Z. Now, I'll try to explain what I mean by this, this way. As I've gone through the tests, in each one of the primitives, I have spent some time in talking about, because of the fault of the test, there are certain people who will have low digit span scores who because they're high arithmetic, for example, their high arithmetic ability causes them to do a little better on the Digit Span. Now that's an example of what I mean by a test X. That is, there are certain combinations that begin to occur that by the way the test operates, you can correct that X and make it either an E or an I according to the sort of the rules that have been set out in terms of this. That is, you can make a definite statement that this person is more likely an E or more likely an I because of the relationship to the Arithmetic score and so forth. On the other hand, it seems highly unlikely that people are divided very neatly into people who are all E and all I. You can look at it in one way, in the sense that E and I and the distribution of E's and I's, in the population, take what is in effect, a normal bell shaped curve with the most pure I being at one end of the curve and the pure E being at the other end of the curve and as ~~you~~ you come into the middle, in terms of this,

you reach a κ point somewhere in between them, in which an individual is ambivalent ~~E&E~~ E-I. That is, he is neither clearly one nor the ⁰⁰³⁶⁵ other. That is, one of the examples of what I am calling the theoretical X. And I'll come back and talk about each one of these a little bit later in terms of what I think the meaning in terms of this is. But this X in this case would indicate an individual who is neither E nor I, neither clearly E nor I. I don't know any way to determine this kind of an X per se from the test. In other words, unless you put it on the basis that every once in a while you will get individuals who have neither a very low Digit, nor a very high Digit Span and his Arithmetic is neither very high nor very low and that this might be an indication that you're dealing with what I'm calling the theoretical X or the ambivalent E-I individual rather than resolving it in E and I. Because the other way to describe it and the way that in many ways is more comfortable to me, is that whatever it is that is E and whatever it is I, an individual is not either E or I, he's both. In other words, an individual is made up in such a way that he has both E components in his personality and I components in his personality. And that the thing which makes an individual in the PAS κ terms an E or an I, is a matter of dominance in terms of pure E-ness or I-ness. What is more comfortable to me is the idea that everyone has possibilities of doing I things, everyone has the possibility of doing E κ things, but that there is a tendency in an individual for them to be more dominant in one than they are in the other. What the X theoretical position would be in this particular way of trying to describe what is going on, is the individual who is in a state in

which both E and I are equal causing him to not be able to ~~---~~ there
00363
is no dominance. And again because of this there would be certain
kinds of descriptive things that you would have to say about this
kind of individual. Remember now I'm talking about theoretical X.
I'm not sure that I've told you how to tell this from the test. I do
have a good deal of theoretical ideas in terms of X. Because one of
the things that is very important in terms of that if it is in this
first state a bell shaped curve on the basis of which a person is
neither E nor I, that is in this X position, this places and also
whether it's true is whether we're talking about dominance, and if
both are equally dominant that the major thing that is likely to happen
to an individual when he's in this particular state is conflict. In
any event, because if you stop and think about it, the whole ~~dynamic~~
dynamics of the PAS are related to the fact that an individual is,
in order to be E he has to repress I. Therefore there is some kind
of conflict inherent in E activity and I activity. And it is relatively
difficult to be able to do both kinds of activities at the same time.
Or at least in doing ~~xx~~ it at the same time, one depending on how
you are, one is likely to take over and when I talk about the E
individual who is alert, aware and responsive to external kinds of
activities and is distracted by what's going on out there, if he has
a process on the basis of which he has to engage in an internalized
activity, that is he has to be ideational or begin to think in terms
of that, one of the things that he must do is to work and to work in
some way on the basis of blocking out what is his tendency toward
dominance in relationship to that. If you have a situation in which

both are relatively equal, then there is a bit of a conflict in terms
of that. ~~It~~ It is going to take much more effort and much more energy
in a sense to move either in the E or the I direction if there is no
clear-cut dominance there. A person is clearly Edominant, is going
to have to be rather active in terms of working out some kind of
defense against being too E in order to be I. But there is a psycho-
logical capacity of an individual to be able to handle this kind of
a dominance much better than he would if he gets inot this conflict
state on the basis of which both are equally powerful, in whatever is
forcing an individual to ~~px~~ operate. Therefore the X position carries
with it more strain and much more stress to an individual than there
is when an individual is clearly either E or I/ That would be ~~xxxx~~
theoretical position that I would take. This represents a conflict
area, an anxiety area, because the individual can never really be
successfully one or the other. Now, the same thing if you think in
terms of R and F. R and F in relationshpp to this, there's going to
be a position in the middle in which a characteristic of an R in-
dividual is a tendency to be bewildered, a characteristic of an F
individual is to have a tendency to be confused. You move close
together and you have no R or F dominance in terms of this, you have
a Y position which would ~~xxx~~ be the position and the term in which
there is no dominance in connection with this would also be a highly
conflicting type of an adjustment because the person would be a little
bit bewildered and a little bit confused in what is a way that would
be somewhat difficult for the individual to be able to operate some-
times, rather effectively; the same thing with the Picture Arrangement

22

or the A-U dimension in terms of this. The Z position which is what I call it in terms of the A and U, when it comes in this place where a person is neither clearly A nor clearly U, that ambivalent position begins to put in terms of that, a series of experiences that the individual is going to have which is going to cause him to be much more conflicted or much more confused, in connection with this. So, in an extreme sense, if you had an individual who was really X, Y, Z in a theoretical sense, this would likely be a very confused, conflicted individual who has a great deal of difficulty making any particular kind of an adjustment. It's probably unlikely that they ~~exist~~ exist, this pure X, Y Z, I don't know. There may be. But it's much more likely that there will be differences along the line, that is, an individual might be ERZ, or he might be XRA. In one of the three variables that are used, the individual is in the ambivalent state. Now, theoretically or in terms of trying to describe this kind of an individual dynamically, it is my contention that an individual when he is in this particular state, that is, if you have an individual who is X and who is R and A, the ambivalence and the conflict in the X area, the way in which the individual is going to resolve whatever his conflict is in relationship to this, is more likely to show up in the way in which he is R and the way in which he is A, rather than a resolving of the X state itself. The fundamental point that I am trying to make is that the X, Y, Z positions if they ~~exist~~ exist, that they represent a dynamic adjustment that is very difficult to explain and also likely to be highly significant in interpreting a person's PAS

profile. We don't really pick this up very well with the test 00369

Ed: When you're interpreting the results of a test profile and in one of the dimensions you have an X, Y or Z, say, you have an X, would that be the focal point then for your interpretation of the rest of the formula, or would you use that more or less as a pivot for the rest of the interpretation?

John: Yes, Yes. It begins to be a pivotal point in the sense, now what are the things that are likely? Let's talk a minute about X. Now what are the things that are likely to happen in terms of an X individual? What is likely to happen is that he is in somewhat of a conflict state because he is unable to really be as aware as he feels that he should be, nor as unaware as he feels that he should be. There's a confusion state in terms of this. Therefore the fact that that individual is X, means that that kind of an individual who is X is going to be much more dependent on some kind of external direction in terms of maintaining their adjustment. So you've got in an X individual a different kind of dependence, than you have in an individual who is Eu or an individual who is Iu. The Eu individual is dependent because he needs to be appreciated, loved, related to. The Iu is dependent because they need to be taken care of, supported and given succor. The dependence of the X individual is in a sense that because he neither gets any particular kind of dependence satisfaction in either direction, you are likely to get the ambivalent swing in an X individual on the basis of part of the time he's going to need to be loved and appreciated and part of the time he's going to need ~~xxxxxxx~~ a great deal of succor and support, but all of the time is he going to need some kind of strong support. Now I

said a while ago that there probably doesn't exist the X, Y Z person. I'm going to withdraw that a little bit. It strikes me that the ⁰⁰³²⁰ ~~mani~~ feation in an individual, the pathological manifestation of the XYZ state is very clearly indicated by the so-called ~~xxxxxx~~ catatonic state. Because what it represents~~xx~~ in terms of the catatonic state, the individual is in effect frozen. A person becoming catatonic absolutely freezes because they move in a direction in which they cannot go in any direction. They can't withdraw completely in a schizophrenic sense. They can't over relate in a manic sense, therefore, they do nothing. That to me is the example of the XYZ state in the extreme. Therefore when you go back to this business of the pivotal bit, the presence of that X, and you know or are relatively certain that an individual is an X rather than an E or an I, you know ~~xx~~ that the thing in terms of that particular individual's problem or life problem in relationship to this is that he needs a considerable amount of support in one way or another because he cannot react. I think it is probably a state that doesn't exist all that often. But the major thing in terms of this that if you think about E-I, R-E as being co-existent in an individual and one being dominant in each individual, the one thing that you can see dynamically, it seems to me is that as one of them becomes more dominant than the other, the individual is likely to be under less conflict. There is less conflict because if he is very dominant E he can be E in a relatively dominant kind of a way. Now he might have to compensate for being too much E by moving back in the I direction, but it's not a conflict

A:

state. As you move this coexistent E-I, as you move it closer and closer together, the strength or the necessity or whatever, it is going to take much more tension for an individual who is only moderately dominant E to control that E because... 00371

Sadie: That would be an Xu when they are closer together?

John: Yes.

Sadie: So you put the compensations in your E, I mean u and c.

John: Yes. You would get the compensations anywhere along the line in terms of this, for example, an Xc individual in terms of what I'm talking about is likely to be a much more tense individual than is an Ec individual. Although an Ec individual is tense, an Xc is going to be much tenser.

Ed: I was going to ask if you couldn't resolve some of the XYZ thing by the strength of the Activity Level.

John: Yes. One of the ways you can resolve Xc in relationship to this, and one of the things that you'll note is that Xc is an individual who is making this theoretical Xc position, has he compensated by becoming E or has he compensated by becoming I? Because the fact that he is X there's a possibility that he can go either way. The Xc only means that the individual is working to control something, but unlike when you've got the Ec, you know the individual is controlling E. If he's Ic, you know he is an individual controlling I. Xc, you don't know whether he's controlling by being E or controlling by being I. The activity level might be one of the ways to resolve this

in the sense that the ^{As} Xc individual with a high Digit Symbol or a high Activity Level in terms of this it is probably an indication ⁰⁰³⁷² that the individual is more I ~~x~~ than he is E. If you have a low activity level or a low Digit Symbol in relationship to this, the individual is more likely E than he is I. Now also because it is existing so close together, the tension in terms of this... if I am strongly E and stronger I and I make an E adjustment, because of the strength of the I that I have in terms of that and the thing that is so close in terms to it, it is going to take a lot more intense energy, it is going to take me much more tension to produce that E adjustment, because the I ~~x~~ is so close to the surface. The real Ic who moves in terms of this in a sense has much more of a capacity somewhere along the line to be able to control their tendency to be I. There is less ability to control it when it's close together. I keep saying that over and over. The point is that it is certainly a dynamic law in terms of this, that if you have two equal forces in terms of this, you get immobility if they're identical two equal forces and you can move into a direction on the basis of which you can get compensations.

Olga: I don't understand why you talk about a normal distribution. I can understand having two opposing lines or forces and being in the middle between them. It is certainly not normally distributed in the population is it? Because these would be at the extreme and there would be very few of them, instead of having a majority, which you would get in a normal distribution, would be sitting at X. Right? I'm saying that in these particular individuals that are X, that there is a normal distribution of E and I tendencies.

John: This may be true. If this is true, it may be much more normal for an individual to be neither clearly E nor I. That may be the way people are distributed in which case we need to explain or think a little bit more about not whether a person is an E or I, but what is the characteristic of the E-I if it's a normal distribution.

Olga: Yes, but if you start with a case, then what you really get would be, I guess, two completely bimodal, with here in the middle just a very few people that were X, and then the two on each side. And the other thing that worries me a little, that I have trouble understanding, is that I would think that a child who's started out I+ and a child who started out E+ would both receive more pressure from the environment to move in the opposite direction than would a kid who is sitting on the fence.

John: Exactly.

Olga. He would be subjected to more stresses from the environment to change.

John: Well, that's the key to what I'm talking about, in relationship to this. And that's why for example when an E individual who is clearly E and E+ is much more likely to be put under pressure to change.

An I+ individual because he's so obviously I is going to be put under pressure to change. Maybe most people really are in the middle range, on the basis of which they are not clearly E or I if you see what I mean in terms of this. And they're not put under the same kind of a

pressure. ~~It~~ They haven't got a lot of what I am talking about, as occurring in the extremes, does not really occur as much in this middle group. That is, maybe ambivalence, maybe the majority of people are comfortably both E and I without having to meet any particular pressure one way or the other. 00374

Dr. H. Would you say that in that X Y Z position you will find a more unpredictable type of other group. Because it might be in one situation I, in another situation, E.

John: Yes. This is the major thing, that their unpredictability anywhere along the line, mainly because to a certain extent they really can be either. And theoretically, if you have an individual who is Xu, what I would say is that an Xu individual has a capacity to be both E and I. And an individual who is Xc has made some kind of an adjustment or movement on the direction of which he has been making moves into an E direction, it also could be in an I direction. And, as a matter of fact, he actually could make a relatively satisfactory Ic adjustment or a relatively satisfactory Ec adjustment, either way because he's close enough in terms of this. And rather than it being a conflict state, it might be a ^{relatively} ~~relatively~~ healthy kind of state on the basis of which you don't get the bizarre kinds of things that happens to the E individual who strongly if he can tries to be I, and becomes a delusional I. It would be very hard ^{for} ~~an~~ example for an X individual to become delusional. But certainly there would be a considerable amount of unpredictability in terms of finding out something about him.

Olga: Wouldn't it be likely to happen to him early on so if he were raised in a family where there were very, very strong pressures

to be I, now it would be relatively easy for him to come over and
make this kind of adjustment; won't it be the same, that the opposite
would be true. And it seems to me, he'd end up probably a lot less
likely to be in deep water than an E+ who is born into this kind of
family, where you have a strong pressure. 00375

John: Exactly.

Ed: But ~~it~~ isn't the key word there, that there is some kind of
support for the X individual in that case that you mentioned as opposed
to a case where he wasn't getting support one way or ~~the other~~ the other.
Then he would be in more trouble.

John: Well, I would say in a sense that the one who is in the most
trouble of all in relationship to this is someone who is XA, because
the XA individual is likely to be so much beholden to the direction
of the environment, that literally the XA individual can be all
things to all people, without ever having to make any particular kind
of an adjustment. They really would be willy-nilly. And it's very
possible that some kinds of psychopathic states might come out as XA,
because a ~~key~~ characteristic of a psychopathic state is in a sense,
the individual's total inability to feel guilt. Feeling guilt in a
sense in terms of this, an individual in order to be productive in
any way in the PAS terms, an individual to be productive is going to
have to feel some kind of guilt. That is, if I'm too much E and be-
cause there are I tasks that I have to perform, I have to feel guilty
about being too E, and try to do something about being too E, in order
to develop the I skills that are necessary for me to have to ~~fix~~ exist
in the world. Because this is what maturation, that is what adaptation.

is. Adaptation, the process of growing up, is the process of an individual beginning to learn to use these balances that the PAS⁶⁰³⁷⁸ talks about as E-I, R-F, U-A, and to use them effectively and efficiently. And part of the way that you do it, you've got to recognize in a way, I am too R. I don't know that I mean that one recognizes it as a child in terms of this, but the experience in terms of this, the things that happen to him because he is R, he has to make and recognize some kind of an adaptation. He has to feel a certain amount of guilt and a certain amount of shame because he is one way. Therefore he tries to be another way. Now if you're in an ambivalent state in terms of this, you are likely to end up being guilty either way. I mean you don't know what you are supposed to do, in a sense. That's the conflict, the ambivalence, there's another word -- complacent. I would say, for example, a characteristic of any of an XYZ there is likely to be some kind of complacency present, either complacency, confusion, conflict, all of these things can happen.

Olga: One of the things to do if you have an X child or a child that doesn't manifest strong tendencies one way or the other is to really structure his role so that he's pushed in one direction and there's no two ways about it.

John: That's right. That's again why an XYZ or any combination of XYZ in terms of this, the individual having any of these particular positions, if he's going to make any particularly satisfactory adjustment has to be under some kind of contrived, direct instruction.

Because the need for making a person's own decision is not there. Therefore, an XYZ kind of an individual growing up in a highly structured

environment may be the best product of that highly structured society. And that in any particular society that calls for a large number of people to make an adjustment which is imposed upon them very definitely by the society which they live in, it is much more likely to be an XYZ who is going to be the most productive member of that society.

Olga: In a primitive, permissive society he's lost. He'll never make it anyway.

John: Yes.

Dr. H: So would you say most Chinese on mainland China are XYZ?

John: Yes. Very definitely and that they're XYZ which essentially has an IR cast to it. The major Chinese cultural role is an IR role. The IR's in the society are likely to be able to do a pretty good job in terms of learning that role, the EF's in that society are going to have the hardest time making the adjustment. The XY's are likely to be what in a sense is the cadre, the major kind, they would talk about this in terms of indifference, even in pre-Communist days if you talk about a coolie population. The balance of the coolies were probably XY's and were characterized by what many people, I mean if you were a strong IR you wouldn't be a coolie, if you were a strong/you couldn't be a coolie, and essentially the indifference that is characteristic of the coolie is part of this XY dependence. This begins to give a little bit of substance to the idea that may be it is a normal curve distribution in terms of E-I kind of thing. Because the balance of people may be the kind that are neither IR enough to be IR, or EF enough to be EF, they are I-E, R-F's, or XY's. In terms of whatever

it takes for an individual to break out in any particular kind of a standardized society, probably takes something different than the 00278 conformity, because conformity would be the primary characteristic of the XY type of thing, because placed in any kind of situation that's not structured, being too permissive, they go to pieces. The slave population in the South was probably largely XY also.

Olga: The trouble is you didn't have to take an aptitude test to decide whether you're going to be a slave or a coolie. I mean there you are.

John: The only thing in either one of these types of things whether a slave or a coolie, and I don't know any other way to say this than in a brutal way in terms of it, is survival of the fittest. An EF in a Chinese society, or an EF in a potential slave society, are the casualties of that system. They don't survive. And therefore in a sense just in the process of the combination of breeding and opportunity ... I've always felt very strongly that for example in an IR culture, like the Chinese culture, that the people who have the most problem adjusting to that culture are the EF's. In an ER culture, like the U.S., the people who have the primary problem in making an adjustment to that culture are the IF's. The EF in the IR culture, and again a characteristic of an IR culture is that for the purposes of the cultural description, it's formalized, it's structurized, it's defined, it depends a great deal upon people learning patterns and they have to learn patterns. It is also particularly in the Chinese culture, or the Chinese type of IR culture, body contact is tradi-

tionally something that is very much frowned upon. For example, in an IR Chinese past culture, I assume that it hasn't changed this much, in the past a Chinese child would never think of running and throwing his arms around Daddy, because you didn't touch Daddy. Isn't that true, Dr. Ho?

Dr. Ho: You don't even approach him.

John: You don't even approach him or have the idea of touching him. Now you think in the ER American society, any Daddy who comes home at night and his little boy or girl doesn't come running up and throw his arms around to welcome Daddy home, Daddy feels rejected. In the ER, you teach an IR child in an ER society, you teach him to throw his arms around Daddy. You don't have to teach the IR/child not to touch Daddy, but you do have to teach the EF child not to touch Daddy. The same thing in terms of movement and of survival of the fittest. In any society and particularly in Chinese society or for Southeast Asian society in general has this characteristic, at least in terms of the peasant, the period of time, because of the fact that the mother has to work, and you put the baby on your back and you keep that baby bound on your back and certainly in some cultures in terms of this, this can last as long as 9 or 10 months before that child is allowed to get off of his back. Now you think of I and E in relationship to this, an I child is under relatively little threat in relationship to this. Whatever their body movement in terms of this, can be internalized in such a way that it is not a particularly stressful

experience. For the behaviorally responsive E child to be placed in terms of this particular kind of bondage is likely to result in, one kind of child under this could be very frustrated and another one could be not frustrated at all. In the American society in relationship to this, any mother who has a feeling that their child at 10 months is not showing enough activity, gets all kinds of help. They say "What's wrong with my child?" In the American society, the business of being active begins to be an extremely important thing and to a certain extent there may be many an E child who during the early 10 months of his life has relatively little frustration because he's encouraged to be active. An I child will have a considerable amount of frustration because it also is encouraged to be active.

Dr. Ho: Touching your father, this is a difference in values. You touch your parents or your father to show love. We don't get close to the father to show respect. You don't respect anyone that touches you. You stay at a distance, pay homage and look at him.

John: And the same thing in terms of the Western cultural idea is the first thing that you do when you meet someone is to put your hand out, on the basis of which you make some kind of contact. Culturally, this business of sticking your hand out can be very offensive to an IR cultural oriented individual. The Japanese when they meet, they bow and in a sense, they keep their distance. And you never see a Japanese really shaking hands with other Japanese. And to a certain extent if you ever see a Japanese who shakes hands, ~~then~~ then from an American standpoint it is likely to be relatively ludicrous because once that he has learned to do this which is against whatever else that he does, it begins to be a very peculiar activity. He is forcing

himself to do something and in the same way that I as a non-Japanese, if I start trying to learn to bow to people, it ~~eg~~ begins to be very ⁰⁰²⁸¹ ludicrous also, because I am having a great deal of difficulty in keeping away from what is my normal way of making contact, that is, you shake hands.

Dr. Ho: There's a funny idea in the China countryside that if two ~~boys~~ boys start holding hands or shaking hands, people interpret it as a homosexual tendency.

Olga: Boys hold hands here and they get the same reaction.

John: Yet, you can go to the Philippine Islands, which is an F culture rather than an R culture. And you walk into what is essentially their Pentagon, with their officers in uniform and all the young officers will be wandering around the halls in the Pentagon, holding hands. Because holding hands is in a sense in terms of that particular cultural setting, and holding hands the way we hold hands when we are ~~walk~~ walking with our girl or our boyfriend, this is much more a sense of friendship. Philippines would drive you crazy, if you watched them in terms of this. The same thing in terms of the Russian. The Russian who moves very much in terms of body contact, this is an E society, and a body contact on the basis of which it still is more common, it's not as common as it once was, it is still more common than not, that Russian ~~men~~ men when they meet kiss on the lips. Not the French brushing, going through the ritualized business of touching

cheeks which again is a different manifestation of this business of touching, but the Soviet is still in terms of the men traditionally⁰⁰³⁸² when they meet, they don't just shake hands, they kiss on the lips. This is a very hard thing in American society, still in terms of this is the idea of men kissing -- women can kiss each other.

Walter: But isn't that an ER culture, too?

John: Yes.

Walter: Like ours?

John: Yes.

Walter: How do you account for it? In fact, you haven't been able to reconcile the ERUness of the Communist Soviet new man and the brooding, sentimental Tolstoyian-Dostoevskian overly warm, overly involving Russian of the old Tsarist days. It almost seems that today's Russia is almost an overlay on something that is really very F-ish.

Olga: Maybe those have always existed side by side in the Russian nature, these two types. Because if you look into your Tolstoy or your Dostoevski you find very clearly that both kinds of people are always there and always described and always just played off against each other in the story, like the Brothers Karamazov, in the same family you have both of them.

John: This is very hard for me to explain in terms of some of the other things that are there. In cultural terms I call the Soviet

culture ERU. I call the American culture ERA. I call the Japanese culture IRA. I call the Chinese culture IRU. What are the things that are making a difference between whether you're calling it A or U? A U characteristic, or one of the things in terms of what an E and U begin to put in terms of this, that there is a tendency for role uniformity to begin to occur based upon whatever the basic cultural needs are in relationship to it. Now a characteristic of a U individual is in a sense a U is xenophobic, that is, whatever the way that they do something is the only way to do it and that if you exist in that society, if you're going to exist successfully you learn to be whatever it is that the society calls upon you to be, causing you to be xenophobic. Now the thing in terms of this, one is the pattern in the Russian set in terms of this, open out, moving into the direction of kissing, touching, feeling, shouting, singing, making close ties and relationships among their group and again you have the characteristic of the Soviet installation overseas. The Soviet installation overseas is characterized by the fact they bring their culture with them in even a different way than the Americans bring their culture with them. They're very self-contained and very dependent upon being able to maintain themselves exactly the way that they're used to being maintained. They don't go out of their way, for example, to try to get other people to join in with their, I'll use the word drunken brawls, or the other things that they do in their installations overseas that are part of their ERU-ish world. The same thing in terms of the Chinese installations overseas, and it's not just a characteristic of the Communist influence per se. It's certainly been exaggerated by the Communist influence, but traditionally a Chinese embassy or a

Chinese ~~xxxxxx~~ installation overseas or a Chinese moving into any
00384
other environment whether you're talking about the dandy dancers building
the railroad in the West, in every instance they bring in a sense
their role uniformity with them. A characteristic of the difference
between a Chinese and a Japanese in terms of the A and U, is that
there can ~~ix~~ exist this A quality in the Japanese culture on the
basis of which it can have all the appearance of a Western community
and co-existing with it is the traditional debt in terms of this, on
the basis of which the Chinese will wear his business suit to his
office and look like any Western businessman and the minute that he
walks into his house, he takes his suit off and puts on his robe and
begins to move in an entirely different kind of a way. In the Ameri-
can society there is much more of a capacity in the A sense for a lot
of various kinds of things to happen, being outgoing, being regulated,
and being affable. It's an affability and affability means in a
sense that you go out of your way to get other people to join in with
you. Now the difference between the Soviet and the American is that
the Soviet is inclined to be much more insular, while the American
is inclined to be much more involving. Now that's the U and the A
difference. The Japanese is much more likely, it's only in very recent
times and over a period of time that there begin to be Japanese restau-
rants outside of Japan. I never knew a Chinese community that developed
anywhere that one of the first things that didn't come into it was a
Chinese restaurant. Therefore the A characteristic of the Japanese is
that they move in and they can adapt in a different way than can the
IRU. I'm not saying one is better than the other.

Olga: Becky was telling us that one ~~of~~ of the ~~men~~ men that is interested in her unmarried sister is a Northern Chinese. ⁰⁰³⁸⁵ Well, he just might as well not be Chinese at all, because the whole cultural pattern is so different. Well, what are the Northern Chinese like? They're completely different from us because they're cold and they're unscrupled and the whole IRU thing. And the Southern Chinese, it's true if you ever go to Stanley Lee's laundry on Wisconsin Avenue or any similar place, and there's something going on all the time; people are talking all the time, kids are running around, people yelling at each other, very emotional, very volatile, but the Northern Chinese are supposed to be completely different, cold, austere, inscrutable.

John: I've had a great deal of trouble in the past, in that after I've talked about I-ness and E-ness and then say that the Chinese culture is I, a lot of Chinese will get very angry and say, you don't understand the Chinese culture at all. It certainly is an E, the way you're describing E. Well, it is E in a way, but it is the way I'm describing Ic. I maintain that the Chinese culture is a gregarious culture, not an involving culture. Now there is a lot of difference in being gregarious, it includes the fact that when you've got so many people living together you've got to work out some kind of an adaptation. As a matter of fact, I think it would be very difficult, with the number and the way in any particular group that has to live close together and be productive, for them to be really an E culture, in the real meaning of E. They've got to make an adaptation which makes them active, gregarious, responsible, people. But neither must

they be too involved in what is going on. The E child, growing up and
to me this is true in any culture, the E child who is easily distracted,
having to sleep in the room with five other people is going to grow
up with more pressure because he had to sleep in a room with five
other people, than is an I individual growing up in the same kind of
environment, because it is not likely to represent the same kind of
distraction or there's not the same kind of adjustment one has to
make. An E child growing up as an only child may have many more diffi-
culties than an I child growing up as an only child.

Walter: I think when you have crowding:

- 1) each person gets less space.
- 2) and I think you need more formal relationships, and things
have to be spelled out and limits set. And I think this is a function
of density of population.

John: A difference between the Russian and the Chinese, they never
exist in a mass....(end of tape)

.....which a person really has to modify, and to what extent the effort or the energy on the basis of which a person must learn to modify. And consequently you would put in terms of this that the IFU primitive personality constellation is going to be the one who in their initial stages of maturation are going to be the least suitable in the American cultural stereotype. Therefore you could expect that an IFU growing up in an American culture is going to be much more under pressure to make some kind of modification or some kind of change because so much of his natural response state is inappropriate or ineffective in the American society. Now he would look like you could almost say in terms of this that the ERA primitive personality type, the ERA would be the one who is most suitable. And in a sense in the earliest point in an individual's development, ERA is a very good, mainly because an ERA child growing up in a stereotypic cultural setting is going to be the most responsive to those things which are deemed appropriate. He's going to be relating, he's going to be responsive, he's going to be socially suggestible and conforming and getting along very well. But obviously in terms of the American stereotype, because of the fact in many instances he's not put under as much pressure as he should be to make some modification. He doesn't learn to control his E, quite the way that the society demands. In many instances, he doesn't learn to control his R in quite the way that society demands. So, being an ERA in an ERA culture is not in and of itself an indication of certainty that a person is going to make

it his adjustment as an adult. So there will be a lot of ERA's who, because in one way in the early period of their life have conformed in one way too well and have not modified in another way on the basis of which it's obvious to the people around them that they need to make some kind of pressure or some kind of change on them, there are likely to be a considerable number of maladjusted adult ERA's because of the failures of society to make the right kind of pressures upon them.

A Chinese society, which I characterize in a cultural stereotype is in a sense an IRU society, and the difference that I'm trying to say in terms of this, that it is more Ic for example than it is Ec in terms of what the cultural requirements are, the cultural stereotype is.

A person has to have a considerable amount of, much more in the culture stereotype in the Chinese society, an individual has to be much more self-sufficient, than the responsiveness, the reactivity, the controlled reactivity that is in a sense the characteristic of the Ec individual. Therefore self-sufficiency, sense of responsibility, a relative amount of control of the emotionality of a different kind is much more characteristic of a Chinese society than it is of an American society. R again in terms of this, R in the sense that regulated and regulated begins to move much more in terms of this in a Chinese society in a sense of ritualization. Ritualization is a much more important aspect of the stereotype Chinese cultural environment than ritualization is a characteristic of an American society. I'm trying to make the difference between an ER society which is regulated but still rather dynamic, but that sounds like I'm being rather

negative when I talk about the Chinese society as being non-dynamic. 00389
 But it is dynamic but it's dynamic in a much more ritualized way.
 The other thing in terms of that, rather ~~xxx~~ than the A characteristic of human relationships being on an emotional, socially effective way which is much more a characteristic of what I think of as A, the reason that I call the Chinese society U, is that there is much more of the U tendency in terms of an individual to very definitely limit the kinds of people to which they socially relate and respond ~~to~~. And that in a sense one of the reasons an American looking at a Chinese society is likely to call it xenophobic, in the sense that most of the social interpersonal relationships are set up in a ritualized way to deal with each other and they do not call for very much warmth, outgoing adaptability to respond to people who are not part of the defined cultural group of which they've grown up. Now a difference in the American society is that you're supposed to be nice to everybody. A Chinese is supposed to be proper to everybody. This is the thing that makes a difference between being an A culture and a U culture. Oppose for example the Chinese culture which I call IRU, the Japanese culture which I call IRA, because although they're still IR like the Chinese culture, ritualized, self-sufficiency -- this I kind of self-sufficiency, the sense of responsibility but there is an element in the Japanese ~~xx~~ culture that is different ~~xxxx~~ ^{from} that in the Chinese culture in the sense that although again people are supposed to relate to other people in a proper way, that proper way has much more social adaptability in terms of this, in that the Japanese in a sense can move a little bit more in terms of being nice to everyone. But the

00390

process of being nice to everyone, at least to an American-looking at it on the outside, the Japanese being nice is not being nice with the same sense of responsibility that the American is being nice, that is, in the cultural sense. The cultural stereotype of the United States is when you're nice to somebody, you're supposed to mean it. I'm not saying that every American means it when he's being nice, but in terms of the value of American cultural stereotype, being nice is the way to be because you really like people. To the Japanese, being nice is that this is the proper way. You are being polite, but you do not have, and you have a little bit of the A deceptiveness in the Japanese society. And that one of the things is the difference between the Japanese and the Chinese in rather a broad sense is that you can be fooled oftentimes by a Japanese because he will be nice to you when he hates your guts, something that he's able to do relatively well because it is an A stereotypic culture. A Chinese in a U culture is proper and is never nice to you just for the peace in the being nice to you. And to a certain extent there is much more of a tendency to be suspicious of anyone who begins to be too outgoing or invade the kind of intimacy. So you don't run into a Chinese, for example, who is nice to you in the same way that you run into a Japanese who is nice to you.

culture

In both the Chinese culture and the Japanese ~~culture~~ as I cultures, IR means in a sense self-sufficient, sense of responsibility, organized, ritualized, procedurized, properly developed and I'm certain to someone looking at it from the outside, either the Japanese or the Chinese culture in its global mass, think of it as everything being

in its place in a sense. Next you begin to move into ~~Southeast~~ Southeast Asia and you begin to see the Philipinos, the Thais to a certain extent, the Vietnamese to a very great extent. You now begin to talk about what is essentially an IF kind of culture. And as IF there still is the self-sufficiency, there's still the need of moving much more in a direction of a kind of responsibility. But the sense of responsibility and the thing that differentiates an IR culture from an IF culture, an IR culture because it's procedurized, there is a rather marked cultural emphasis upon an individual having responsibility in the whole group. It's group responsibility. You get in the IF, there begins to be much more of a self-centered, self-sufficient, narcissistic quality when you get in this area. And the difference ~~between~~ between a Vietnamese and a Chinese is that he may have a strong sense of responsibility, he may have a strong amount of self-sufficiency, but along with it he has much more of a tendency to move into the direction ~~where~~ on the basis of which his sense of responsibility is totally to meet his own kind of needs. So therefore you don't have the group cohesion that you get in an IR society. And therefore the characteristic of the IFA society to which the Philippines, the Vietnamese are to me the best examples of this, was characterized in terms of what I would call deceptiveness in the sense that they will be very nice to you in order to get what they want. In terms of this, they will work very hard to be nice and pleasant because they can get you to give them something. And when you give it to them, they take it entirely for their own particular use. They don't have the same sense of sharing. Again,

I'm overstating this but a characteristic of the society is that it's fragmented much more into less cohesive groups because it is ⁰⁰³⁹² really an individualized, narcissistic and uncultured self-centered one.

There is a difference between a society being self-centered and being xenophobic. Self-centered has a highly personalized characteristic and xenophobic has much more in terms of a racial connotation to it. That's the IFA society. Now what would be the IFU society?

Cleo: You said the Phillipinos and the Vietnamese are the best representatives of that...

John: to me.

Cleo: What about the Cambodian, Laos and all that.

John: I would put all of them in this group. Again each one of them have characteristics beginning to move them into a little different category. For example, I said that the Thais, it is an IF society organized in an IR way. There is a kind of control in the Thai society, in the cultural stereotype. A cultural stereotype on the basis of which the people tend to have IF values, but are run in an IR manner. Therefore if you compare Thailand with Vietnam, there's not nearly as much chaos in Thailand as there is in Vietnam. But you compare Thai society with Chinese or Japanese society or, and I put in the same category of what is essentially an IF group with an IR overlay, Indonesia. It is essentially a people with IF values but with an IR organization. Now the Philippines at the time they were under control of the American government, this would be an example of an IF society under ER control. And one of the things that you can find in the Philippine culture, there's a strange overlay of the American cultural

input but it is not anything like the same kind of cultural overlay of the American input, for example, into the Japanese culture. The Japanese have integrated in a sense, integrated is not quite the word, they've only half-integrated. There's a kind of a splitting in terms of this. And the example that I've given before in terms of the Japanese man wearing a Western business suit to his office and changing to a Japanese costume as soon as he goes home, and eating with his knife and fork in the restaurant in the hotel in new Japan and going home and reverting to the regular way that he eats. This is a behavior in an IR culture. You rarely, except overseas Chinese who lived out of China for a long period of time, there is never the same characteristic for a Chinese to have the duality that the Japanese have of being very Western at one time and very Oriental at another time. The Chinese is Oriental all the time but there will be a kind of partial interface. Now, the Philipinos, while they interface in terms of this, while running into the problem of where and because of their innate culture, you walk along the streets of Manila at one particular period of time, you will see boys wearing hippy outfits, letting their hair grow long, chewing gum, being interested in American movie actors which is in a sense the overlay that the ER culture has given to them. But when you really begin to know them this is much more a facade than, I mean they don't go home and change into Philippine costumes but they are Philipinos with a facade that looks American but there is nothing American about them. It's a very difficult thing to describe because one of the things that's superficially going into Manila even as long

a time as it is now you will have the feeling this is an American city,
because in a sense it is built like an American city, to a certain ⁰⁰³⁹⁴
extent on the surface is run like an American city, is organized as
an American city, but it is as un-American as anything I can think of.
And I used to try to explain to them at one point because this is the
best way I knew how to do it, that if you went down to El Paso, Texas,
and I think it's Larado, Mexico, that's the other side of the border.
You've got El Paso right here and you've got Larado in Mexico, and a
totally cultural change when you move from one to the other but with an
overlay. Manila is very much as though all the people in Larado were
moved into El Paso and it's again what I call an example of IFA
characteristic. And you get some of the same kind of thing and cer-
tainly in recent periods of time. When I first started going to
Vietnam which was before the heavy American presence and it still had
this French overlay. And they called Saigon the Paris of the Orient
and as the Paris of the Orient there was a lot of French cultural
influence but the Vietnamese were not in any way, shape or form French
even though they had acquired this facade of a lot of French cultural
image. And you can contrast this a little bit with Hong Kong which
you would call the London of the Orient. It's as British as British
can be but you can split Hong Kong right down the middle. There's the
British element, there's the Chinese element, and never the twain
shall meet. I mean it's not a matter that the Chinese in Hong Kong
act British. They go along with the things in terms of this, but they
are still so much more obviously Chinese, because they have not taken
on the overlay of the British cultural debt, whereas you move to

Vietnam and you will find an awful lot of Vietnamese living like
Frenchmen but not being Frenchmen at all. You'll find a lot of ⁰⁰³⁹⁵ of
(Americans?) (Americans?)
Philippinos living like Philippinos but not being Philippinos at all.
You can move a few blocks in Saigon into Chong which is the Chinese
community there and you have nothing that/Vietnamese or French
about it. You have Chinese and it's as Chinese as Chinese can be.
And the Chinatowns in the United States, it's very interesting and
this is sort of off the subject, but it's always interested me. In
fact about fifteen years ago when we first began to try to make some
kind of cultural study in the Chinese communities in relationship to
this. The three major areas that we were using as sort of a test tube,
we started out in New York in the first one were Chinese students in
1950 ~~we~~ who were caught in the United States going to school in the
United States at the period of time of the Communist takeover, so
these were largely native Chinese. The other was the Chinese commu-
nity in New York City and the Chinese community in San Francisco and
the Chinese community in Hawaii. Now one of the most striking things
that came out in relationship to this, was that as you moved out and
as you got closer to the Orient the most Americanized Chinese that
we ever found were in the Hawaiian community. It was one of the few
places that I know on the basis of which the Chinese community has
moved into an amalgamation in a sense that the Chinese American
living in Hawaii does not have anything like the ties the Chinese
when you get the farthest away. And the most traditional Chinese
community was the one in New York City, which you would have a feeling
in terms of all of the pressure and everything else that is put in

it ~~xxxx~~ that it would be most Americanized. It is the least Ameri-
canized. San Francisco sort of half and half but more like New York
than it was like the Hawaiian Islands. A difference in what kind of
pressures, I don't know. But to move on, I started to say something
about what represents an IFU society, the difference between IFU and
IFA. The IFA society has this particular capacity to relate and
respond in order to get what it is that they want. The IFU society,
the U aspect of this society begins to move into the direction of which
it does not relate or respond at all. Then you get another kind of
a xenophobia and the xenophobia that comes in terms of this, because
the IFU society are really the most what we would call, the most
certainly un-American; in an ERA society, the IFU would be the most
primitive because it would be the most opposite form from what
our cultural patterns are, that the IFU society tends to be, certainly
Indian cultures for example, and very definitely the African and South
American aboriginal groups on the terms of which they have encap-
sulated themselves into what is a totally non-communicative except
to the people who grew up in that particular society. Now that's an
IFU society. Now let's move again and ~~xxxx~~ talk about EFA societies.
Again, it's a little harder to characterize EFA society, but the
primary characteristics of EFA is that you must be E, relating,
responsive, F - you must be sensual, sensate, emotional, and A - the
example of the stereotype is the difference between the EF's in France
for example, I would characterize France as an EFA society. I would
characterize Italy as an EFA society. I would characterize Greece

as an EFA society. Mainly because there is a kind of interactive sensuality. Not the same kind of sensitivity, there is not the ⁰⁰²⁹⁷gregariousness that I tried to talk about, of the Chinese gregarious society which is a ritualized way in which people interact. These EFA societies, part of the function has a great deal of interaction and that you handle a great deal of the things that you do by expressing emotionality. Talking with your hands and becoming very upset. This is a cultural stereotype that we attribute to this type of society and that essentially is what we're meaning, that expressiveness of an EFA kind is what is the value of good food, certain different kinds of cultural attitudes, and so forth, which characterize and in different ways, Greece as it is today, Greece with an ER overlay is an EF society run by ER's. EF, France. EF, Italy, in varying ways. Now you move and talk a minute about EFU societies. Now what's the difference between the A and the U in the EF sense? The EF still is in terms of expressive, of emotionality, of a great deal of sensual activity and controlled emotional output, but a suspiciousness and a tendency to keep others at a distance. And of course what I'm leading up to is that the Arab societies are primary ~~exampl~~ examples of cultural stereotype, EFU. Because they have the xenophobic, on the basis of which they maintain their culture the way the Chinese do. It's not anywhere near organized in anything like the same way the Chinese culture is, but it does include with it a great deal of the fact that a person begins to be a highly emotional but in many ways there is a negativistic quality in an EFU. I mean, an EFA stereotype Italian

44.

arguing in the marketplace can get very angry in a way that ⁰⁰³⁹⁸ doesn't upset you. An EFU Arab cultural one in terms of this, part of what he is trying to operate is to become so nasty that he gets his way. At least that's one way of putting it. This is the U difference as opposed to the A. What I really am referring to are the cultural values that are predominant values in the society. Those things that generally are considered as being the cultural standards. Now ~~but~~ obviously, for example, if I say that America is an ERA and that you have to react in a responsive, regulated, nice way, these are standard cultural values that are accepted as part of the American culture. Now obviously within that American culture there's going to be ERA manifestations. Now for example ERA you can be active, regulated, and responsive and a businessman. Or you can be intellectualized and be a teacher. There are all kinds of different things but the general overlay, I mean a teacher in a general stereotype is that he must be a relating, responsible, regulated nice individual. And if he's not nice, he has to have a rationalization for it. I mean you can be an IRU professor but you do this within the American culture on the basis of which you've earned the right to be an absent-minded professor, but even an absent-minded professor has grown up in an ER way and has had to make some kind of an adaptation or pressure to move into the direction of earning the right to be different than what the cultural stereotype calls for. A physician is supposed to be ERA in behavior and he can only become gruff and touch if he gets good enough at his job that in a sense he can rationalize it or it can be ~~re~~ rationalized that his behavior is...

Olga: "Nice" for an American means friendly, "nice" for a Japanese means "courteous."

00399

John: Pleasant, adapting.

Olga: How about the "nice" of Southeast Asia? Is that "nice" ~~frnd~~ friendly?

John: It's neither "nice" nor is it friendly, it's more a narcissistic cover. To me there is a much more negative, it is self-centered, it is the kind of a person who has learned to be nice or to be friendly, but all of this with the idea that you get ~~something~~ something. It's security. Again an I society is going to be much more occupied with a certain kind of security and how you go about getting that security. Now in the Chinese, in the Japanese society in terms of this, as a security oriented one, a difference between an ER obsession with security and an IR obsession with security, in an ER society at least we go through a process on the basis of which we say we earn our security, in that you go to school and when you go to school you're always in danger of being kicked out of it. And therefore there is insecurity in group membership to a certain extent. You begin to get into the Chinese and Japanese in different kinds of ways, group membership and acceptance in the group is oftentimes a guarantee of security. In that if you ~~gk~~ get accepted by the group and do what the group expects you to do you get the security that doing what the group expects you to do earns it for you. Let's give the Japanese example in terms of this. Again I am overstating it but it still is enough true that I think it makes my point very well. In the Japanese

44

society by the time you get ready to go to the equivalent of Junior High School, there's a great deal of competition in terms of getting in certain ones of the junior high schools. Now we're talking about 12, 13, 14 year-old children. Once you get in a certain junior high school, you are assured that you're going to go through. I mean for example, one of them will take you to Tokyo University on the basis of which you get out and you will go into a company and that this is almost assured. And that you have to do very little but do what you're told, in order to move that path. You may have seen in the paper lately that some of the labor union problems and various things in terms of some of the Japanese industrial firms right now because they're security oriented and they have people in terms of it, they may have large numbers of people working who are not doing anything. Now one of the things that they will attempt to do is that every once in a while somebody will attempt to fire these people. But because they're part of the group, they cannot be fired. This is an I. An I security-oriented type of thing. Now in the United States to give another example, over a period of time an I security-oriented organization in the United States is the railroad union, so the last 15 years on the basis of which with mechanization coming in and the diesel engine coming in, you don't need firemen, but they're still people who have to earn their living as firemen. The railroads have had to pay firemen, and they call it featherbedding. They ride on the trains but there is no longer any need for firemen. Now that is a security of an IR and is quite characteristic in terms of both the Chinese and the Japanese society in different kinds of ways. And this is where

you talk about cumshaw^{as}, that part of the responsibility that any individual whoworks has, is not to bribe people, this is one of the 00401 things that Americans can never understand; that it's not bribery in the sense that we know it. It is a sense of responsibility being placed to that particular group for whom you are responsible. And that if you have the right to hire somebody to work for you, you don't go out and try to get the best qualified man, you get that person that you know is in your security system who is going to do what he's told. Now that may be your relatives, it may be your friends, but it has an entirely different cultural connotation. Nepotism, which is against the law in the U.S., I doubt they ever could get rid of it in Japan.

Beverly: What about the English society? You know, getting into school at a certain age the way they're so carefully screened?

John: Well, the English society is an ERA society also. But the difference between the American ERA society and the British ERA society is that the British society is Ec+, I mean controlling feelings. Now when you get into a place on the basis of which there is a necessity to control feelings, you're beginning to deal with essentially an E orientation. American E society, you control your feelings, but you don't overcontrol them. You ~~must~~ must be properly emotional. We call that Ec. Ec+, because the primary characteristic of the British society is likely to be self-control and self-control over being too much E, still is essentially an E society rather than an I society. You don't have to have nearly ~~as much~~ as much pressure in the I oriented societies, in the Japanese or the Chinese in terms of this, because there is quite a different way in which feelings are

expressed in these particular patterns, therefore you learn how to express feelings in a proper way. That is Chinese and Japanese characteristics, proper, regulated. 00402

Cleo: But you wouldn't think they're U's? I thought they were U's.

John: Who, the English? Well it is essentially Ac, as again I still would call it primarily an A culture. An A culture in the sense that a characteristic that comes in terms of this, one of the things that begins to be different in terms of this, is there is considerably more cultural value or has been in the past, much more cultural value in the English culture in the sense of which you behave properly in order to take care of people who cannot take care of themselves. So there's a paternalism. And you get a paternalism on the basis of which a part of the characteristic of A is not xenophobic in the same sense as the ERU German society or the ERU Soviet society. It's not as friendly and as outgoing as the ERA American society, but again it is in a sense of beginning to learn how to properly take care and there's always an element in the British society on the basis of which you must interact with, be responsive to and be ~~xxxx~~ concerned about the effect you're having on other people. Now again because it's a class-oriented society, you behave in one way with your peers, you behave in another way with your servants or subservients, or you deal another way with a primitive group in a sense. And the British society and the British societies that moved, they took their society with them the same way that the Chinese took their society with them, or the same way the Americans take their society with them. But a difference in terms of the British because of the kind of Ec+ sensibility that they have --

I mean Hong Kong is going to run as long as the British are there, it's going to be run the way the British want it. And they're going to have a very strong sense of responsibility for the Chinese who live there and they're going to make sure those Chinese behave in the way in which they're supposed to behave. It's a concern. It is not a suspiciousness. They're proselyters.

Olga: "A" friendly which would be the American kind of A, wouldn't look at all like the European or English kind of A, which is not friendly because that is not in their tradition. Friendly is in a classless tradition as is American competitiveness, which I wish you'd also say something about, just listening to Jack Kilcommeter last night, he was talking about American traits and the two that he stressed most were competitiveness, which you only have in a classless society.

John: Which is also highly British now.

Olga: Maybe recently, yes.

John: Always, always.

Olga: In a really ~~na~~ class society, you can't be truly ~~competitive~~ competitive or truly friendly.

Cleo: Not friendly, but competitive you can among your own peers.

Olga: The other thing he said was characteristically American was carelessness. Where does that fit in? I mean Americans are ~~xxxx~~ traditionally careless, extravagant, and they throw things around, they litter everything, they use up everything.

John: Once we begin to talk about things like carelessness and other things ~~xxxxxx~~ in terms of this we are beginning

to talk about those things that occur in the society which tend to
break down the cultural stereotype. In the cultural stereotype, go
back to the British again, and if I had to put the formula it would be
Ec+ Rc Uc, now this is an A culture, but it has a Uc base. The Uc
base in terms of that, conventionalized...

Cleo: Uc, not Ac, I thought you said, Ac.

John: It can be Ac, but the best way to put it is that it is Uc. If
I had to write the characteristics that occur in individuals who best
fit the British stereotype are likely to be Ec+ R Uc. Now ~~they~~ there
will be many Americans who fit the ERA character by having this but the
Uc, it is more Ucu in the British society on the basis of which it is
a role uniform society but with an A connotation. An A connotation
means there is a tendency or a need to interact and respond on a
one-to-one basis. The EA, everything in an E society is related in
terms of how you deal with individuals. The difference between an E
society and an I society is that there is not nearly as much emphasis
on how you deal with individuals as there is in terms of how you deal
with concepts. There's not ~~x~~ the same kind of cultural training and
the basis of the method of how you deal on one-to-one relationships.
The one-to-one relationships in a traditional Chinese culture and a
traditional Japanese culture for that matter is highly stylized,
on the basis of which there are ways one deals with one-to-one relation-
ships. It's organized, it's ritualized. It's both ritualized and it's
conventionalized. In the British in terms of this you learn the role

that you're supposed to play, you learn that role in the most effective way. Now that's an A characteristic. You have to be effective at your role and your role is likely to be a socially oriented one. For example, a difference between a Soviet society and a British society is that a Soviet society being a U and a real U orientation in terms of this, they will have a facade on the basis of which they deal with you with suspicion but underneath it there can be a tremendous amount of emotionality and you've got a suspicious group of people who behind this are likely to get roaring drunk and sing and have a whole culture which is in a sense quite an open one. You don't find this in the British culture. The cultural stereotype, the idea of the role uniform upper middle class of Britain as a rule having a different set of how they behave when they're alone as opposed to how they behave when they interface, is inconceivable in a sense. That is, if you wanted to any of the unconventional things in that particular society, you had to do them very sub rosa. You can get drunk at a party in the Soviet Union without any problem, even today. Because it is a party on the basis of which you feel comfortable. An American to a certain extent, there are times that he can get drunk. In a traditional ~~British~~ British society you never have quite the same kind of possibilities in ~~xxxx~~ relationship to this.

Olga: Actually though, in upper class British society, everyone is perfectly aware that you get drunk, everybody is perfectly aware that you fool around, that you do all these things. And they probably accept it a lot more easily than in our kind of society. The great

thing that you don't do is, for heaven's sake, you don't make a spectacle of yourself. And as Lady Astor says, in her day, "We're very accepting. You can do whatever you want but you don't do it in the street and frighten the horses." That's probably the essential difference.

Beverly: But you are doing it in the street, because you know at 11:00 at night, pub closing time, the working class men go singing down the street, but you don't pay any attention to them. They're not going to hurt you and you just pretend that you don't see them and it's perfectly all right.

John: And again because everything has its place, if you get drunk and get drunk in a pub, it's acceptable and it's ignored, as long as you do not interfere with the conventionalized best. If you go to a party at someone's house, you would never consider getting drunk in someone's house unless it was a highly intimate friend and even many of them wouldn't even put it in terms of that because this is not the place, and the idea for example the American cultural idea of a group of businessmen going away for a convention in Chicago and all of them getting roaring drunk, and having a hoot and hollering good time, it is inconceivable to me that any group of British businessmen would do anything similar to that because their society does not allow that kind of manifestation.

Olga: In public?

John: In public.

Olga: I was thinking too about what you said about the Chinese in Hawaii. One factor that determines the closeness of the group, maybe just plain visibility. Because in the Hawaiian Islands, most of the people there have some sort of Oriental, ~~Polynesian~~ Polynesian kind of mix, I mean there are more orientals than not, whereas in New York... So you wouldn't feel the need to be a cohesive group whereas in New York there you are, the group of Chinese is a very visible group, and you're more likely to form a little enclave.

John: I'm sure that this has something to do with it, but it's not the total answer because among other things, for example, there is no more intermarriage between Chinese in Hawaii than there is intermarriage between Chinese in New York. Probably a little more but still it's not significant. In other words, intermarriage is not one of the things that has really taken over in terms of that. You don't have, in fact the Japanese still intermarry more than the Chinese do. There's a bit more of it but the Chinese even with this lack of intermarriage, so it's not just a blood mixture that is taking place. Both the husband and wife tend to be Americanized because they have grown up in a different kind of an Americanization process. But they don't intermarry. Well, I will bring some mental cases next time.

In a lot of these things there's relatively little change. The form stays. Now the content can be entirely different. In most cases when we're comparing something, we're comparing the content. For example, the White Russian, the content of their behavior is different than the content of the modern Red. The form of their behavior has not changed that much. It still has very definite similarities. They

haven't changed from emotive, outgoing, responsive, suspicious people
but they are outgoing, responsive, and suspicious for different reasons. 00408

Cleo: I wondered whether it was possible to change the basic characteristics.

John: Well, I suppose over a long period of time, it could be, but in many instances, because a cultural stereotype begins to get so embedded, I mean, there's a lot of difference between the ERA American culture of 1800 and the ERA American culture of 1975. It's still ERA, and it's still characteristic, the form is still there, amid lots of modifications, lots of changes, lots of different ways. But it still is essentially true that in the English, in the American and they're more alike than they are different, that many of the adjustments that the ERA American culture has made is against the two extreme compensations, against the ERA English culture.

Olga: It seems to me that in China today, one of the main intents, the whole thing of the cultural revolution is it devines to make fundamental changes in the Chinese.

John: Fundamental changes in content, but the form, for example, if you take just a simple thing like calisthenics. It's been traditional, some form of calisthenics, hasn't it in Chinese culture from time immemorial. Not for the same reasons that you do it now. The whole business of trying to break down in one phase in the earlier stages of the Communist revolution, to break the hold of the family ties, which was one of the things that they talked about. They weren't changing family tie loyalties. All that they were trying to do was get the same sense of responsibility to the Communist state that people

had in a family. There was nothing wrong with the way it was done. It was who they were doing it for.

00409

Olga: Isn't it more of a difference the national and the Chinese have? I think something you said once about the IRU government and the IRU leader and what they want is for you to do what's right and to conform and anything beyond that is not required. They don't require your soul as it were. They don't care what your convictions are. But the present Chinese intent seems to be that no, just going along is not enough, no sir. I mean you got to really be 100%...

John: You've got to genuinely be enthusiastic about going along.

Olga: They care about ~~xxxx~~ this whereas the IRU doesn't really care.

John: Again, it is a value system on the basis of which you certainly want and particularly if you begin to get an idea and you begin to think about it a minute in terms of what is likely to happen to any relatively reasonable thinking person looking at what's wrong say in a Chinese community. It is an IRU society on the basis of which traditionally people have done what they are supposed to do. And they've done it in a relatively lethargic way. And the biggest danger of an IRU lethargic society is that it has fantastic capacity to be able to adapt to any kind of regime. And as long as the regime gives you security, you get their support. If the regime fails to get security, if the drought begins to come along where you don't provide all the things that you promised in terms of that, somebody else comes along and does it. I'm putting this in an over-simplified way. Now you look at this. Obviously the thing that you are going to admire is how conforming these people are. But how wonderful it would be if we

could get meaning to the fact that these people are in terms of this. 00410
And obviously one of the primary things that the Chinese Communists group was attempting to do was to move in a direction on the basis of which to make the people get involved with their need to conform. Now there's not one whit of difference in terms of what the, excuse me, if you don't agree with me on this, there's not one whit of difference in the kind of way that they were trying to get involved & conformity on the mainland, and the kind of conformity that Chang Kei Shek was attempting to get on Formosa. The form again was identical. But they were very interested in trying to move into this business of where we're going to get sustained loyalty. This is the major problem in an IRU society. The society is always in danger of being overturned because if somebody comes along and offers you something better...one of the things we found out over a period of time, in an IRU oriented, and this is sometimes IRU people and sometimes not, one of the primary problems that an American has sometimes when he begins to deal in any kind of a business way with a Chinese. Again one of the things is the cultural tendency when you're hired, you work very hard. If you work very hard, you then have earned the right not to have to work so hard. And that in terms of an American trying to deal with a Chinese agent somewhere along the line, he would work very hard to get something and then would expect to be paid later on for....

(end of tape)