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SUMMARY

Maslow distinguished two types of self-actualizers: the “seers” or transcers, and the “doers” or nontranscenders. A previous study of self-actualization focused on Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, a poet who wrote in prose and was very much a “seer.” The present study focuses on Eleanor Roosevelt, a humanitarian and social reformer, who was very much the “doer.” The purpose of the study is to examine the differences and the similarities in self-actualization of a “doer” and a “seer,” as well as to provide material illustrative of the strong traits of self-actualization. Current instrumentation (the Personal Orientation Inventory) is criticized for not including the strong traits and distorting others.

Biographical material covering Eleanor Roosevelt’s “years on her own” was analyzed for the presence of traits of self-actualization and traits that would negate it (Imperfections). The self-actualization profile thus obtained turned out to be similar to that obtained for Saint-Exupéry. However, the nature of expression of certain traits—for example, More Efficient Perception of Reality and Problem Centering—reflects the nontranscender-transcender distinction posited by Maslow. On the other hand, the universal values and the power of the ideals which inspired both self-actualizers and with which they inspired others seem to transcend this distinction. It may thus be that to be self-actualizing, whether a “doer” or a “seer,” one’s motivation has to have transcendent roots.

The study of Eleanor Roosevelt also revealed certain characteristics which are likely to be exhibited by other self-actualizers, such as Humility and Equitableness. These had not been mentioned by Maslow.
I. CURRENT STATUS OF THE CONSTRUCT OF
SELF-ACTUALIZATION

Self-actualization is important both as a phenomenon and as a theoretical
construct. The phenomenon of self-actualization is presented by Maslow's
description of self-actualizing people. The theoretical construct of self-
actualization is presented by several ideas: (a) that self-actualization is a
cohesive cluster of traits, (b) that it constitutes the ideal norm of mental
health, (c) that it is a definite personality structure and perhaps the highest
form of human life.

A. EMPIRICAL STATUS

There has been virtually no study of self-actualization (SA) since Maslow
first described it. It would seem that his original study has been taken to be
complete and sufficient. Measurement of self-actualization has been taken
up without any further investigation of self-actualizing people, living or
from the past. Some people have ceased to believe that such people really
walk on this earth, while others, confident in the validity of their instru-
ments, go on measuring SA in group process, sensitivity training, marital
and family therapy, teaching, faculty development, adolescence, creativity,
self-improvement, adjustment, and even tennis skills. Among 644 papers
published from 1967 to early 1981 that respond to the code word "self-
actualization" there are virtually no studies of actual specimens of this life
form, persons like Max Wertheimer or Ruth Benedict, or Maslow's mother-
in-law, his initial models. Bonner (3) mentions a study of six self-actualizers
known to him but, noting the similarity of his findings to Maslow's, gives no
further detail, and Piechowski (28) made a study of Antoine de Saint-
Exupéry in order to define the theoretical structure underlying SA. This
is very little indeed. There is a great need for studies of individual cases to see
how the attributes of SA are realized in those people, and also to determine
the degree of variation among them in realizing those attributes so that
Maslow's description could be tested and possibly expanded and modified.

The measure in use, the Personal Orientation Inventory [POI (37, 38)],
leaves out of consideration some very important, in fact the strongest, char-
acteristics of SA. Among these are "Problem Centering," the sense of mission
in life; "Gemeinschaftsgefühl," the profound feeling of kinship with all
human beings expressed in compassion and respect for them; and the "Dis-
crimination between Means and Ends, Good and Evil," an unerring sense of
right and wrong. These are the very strong traits of self-actualizing indi-
viduals. Studies of construct validity of the POI have not included a test of
the match between the complete description of each trait as originally pro-
vided by Maslow and the instrument. In the usual methodology of testing,
the construct validity may appear to have been established empirically but
still lacks the theoretical scaffolding behind it. Construct validity is incom-
plete without a theory in which the construct in question is a logical piece of
a larger scheme. Because the POI represents too few of the characteristics of
SA and distorts others (e.g., by substituting a weak trait of "constructive
view of human nature" for the strong SA traits of Gemeinschaftsgefühl and
Democratic Character Structure), it lacks correspondence with the true
structure of SA.

Our knowledge of SA cannot advance by premature attempts at mea-
urement. Rather, the study of self-actualizing people must continue case by
case until the essential traits represented by these individuals are fully
grasped in their strong rather than weak, diluted, or distorted forms. Only
then can proper measures of SA be developed.

B. THEORETICAL STATUS

1. A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONSTRUCT OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION

Piechowski (28) showed that the whole cluster of characteristics of SA as
originally described by Maslow fits into a theoretical structure provided by
Dabrowski's theory of emotional development (1). This theory defines five
levels of development arranged in a hierarchical order from lowest to high-
est. Self-actualization was shown to correspond exactly to the structure of
Level IV, which is the level of moral autonomy, self-directed growth, and
genuine empathy. Thus Level IV in Dabrowski's theory provides the struc-
ture that underlies the traits of SA which are its outward expression. The
whole cluster of SA characteristics can be viewed as an attribute of Level IV.
Or to put it differently, SA and Level IV are isomorphic. Level IV is thus the
needed structure in which to place the theoretical construct of SA as a logical
piece in the larger scheme of a theory of development. This being so, we can
now ask whether the POI will meet a more direct, from the theoretical
point of view, test of construct validity. Since SA corresponds to a high level
of development, one would expect that the higher the level of development
in terms of Dabrowski's theory, the greater should be the correlation with
SA. But Beach (2) found no correlation when she compared the level of
development as measured according to Dabrowski's theory (10) with SA as
measured by the POI. Because the POI fails to correlate with a measure
based on a theoretical structure with established isomorphic relation with the complete description of SA, the construct validity of the POI as a measure of SA is brought into question.

2. **Self-Actualization as an Ideal Norm of Mental Health**

The logical implications of Maslow’s proposal that self-actualizing people represent the ideal norm of mental health had been ignored in empirical studies. For instance, Offer and Sabshin (27) in their study of concepts of normality completely overlook the theoretical issue of an ideal norm. They present a review of “ideal concepts” of mental health but do not make the distinction of “ideal” in the prescriptive sense of a good thing from the logical sense of a theoretically compelling concept. In the logical sense an ideal norm is not something prescribed for people to follow but a concept of a pattern, which, in turn, implies an underlying order or design. Self-actualizing people were to Maslow the psychologically healthy *par excellence*, the robust specimens of the human race showing what human beings can be but rarely are; this meaning of Maslow’s ideal norm is prescriptive. But in the sense, which Maslow also expressed, of self-actualization being the design for the full development of every human being, the concept of self-actualization as an ideal norm is used in its logical sense.

The study of self-actualizing people was Maslow’s attempt to find the design for psychologically healthy people, those who, like Olympic athletes, have developed their potential to the fullest. At first he thought the design was the fulfillment of basic needs, but that turned out not to guarantee that self-actualization would follow (25). The requisite design is provided by Dabrowski’s construct of Level IV in his scheme of things. Level IV is the theoretical structure underlying self-actualization. In this sense, Level IV is the design and the characteristics of SA are its attributes. Consequently, self-actualizing people represent the ideal or near-ideal form made flesh in individual lives.

3. **What is the Highest Form of Human Life?**

Maddi (23, pp. 214-218) proposed that all personality theories can be viewed in terms of three models: conflict, consistency, and fulfillment. Self-actualization fits the fulfillment model and so does the creative personality. Maddi then asks the question: what is the highest form of human life? He is inclined to see creative people as representative of the highest form of human life. Creative people, however, often do not represent all the strong traits of self-actualization, especially those that express universal empathy, kindness, and lack of ego involvement. In fact, the egos of creative people are very much involved. The strong ego of creative people is not infrequently also a big ego. In this they fall short of Maslow’s self-actualizers. Thus not all creative people are self-actualizing in Maslow’s sense. And conversely, not all self-actualizing people are creative—for example, Eleanor Roosevelt.

Maddi sees a difficulty in trying to achieve an empirical resolution in regard to what constitutes the highest form of human life. But an empirical resolution requires also a theoretical one. Though they share a number of distinct characteristics (8, 11) creative people are a heterogeneous group (compare the good-natured Schubert with the irascible and arrogant Beethoven, the ungrateful opportunist Wagner, or the miserly Victor Hugo). Self-actualizers are a more purified group. The theoretical solution to Maddi’s problem lies in the fit of self-actualizers to only one of the five structures in Dabrowski’s theory (or one of the eight or so levels of ego development in Loevinger’s theory), creative people can appear in any of the levels, save the lowest. Thus not all, or most, creative people can represent the highest form of human life, only those who also meet the criteria of higher levels of development.

**C. Two Types of Self-Actualization**

Maslow distinguished two types of self-actualizing people: transenders and nontransenders. He described transenders as those who are at home in the realm of Being—the realm of truth, goodness, beauty, wholeness, unity, perfection, justice (25, pp. 133-135, 280-295)—and the nontransenders as those who live in the realm of Deficiency—the realm of basic needs of safety, belonging, and esteem. The nontransenders are “more essentially practical, realistic, mundane, capable, and secular people, living more in the here-and-now world”; they are “doers” rather than mediators or contemplators, “effective and pragmatic rather than emotional and experiencing.” The transenders are creators and discoverers inspired by the realm of Being, they have “illuminations or insights or cognitions which changed their view of the world and of themselves” (i.e., they have life-validating peak experiences); truth, goodness, beauty, perfection, are to them a direct experience—the basic facts of existence. To the nontransenders the facts of existence lie in the deficiencies of human life which they strive to correct—their aim is the betterment of the human condition; the aim of the transenders is to awaken the human spirit and to lift it.

Maslow thought that the presence or absence of peak experiences would distinguish transenders from nontransenders. Later, however, he recog-
nized that mystic and peak experiences occur also in people who are in no way self-actualizing to the degree that the traits of SA would require (25, p. 280). Equating SA with peak experiences was probably one of the chief contributors to the watering down and vulgarizing of the concept of SA to simply mean no more than openness to experience and awareness of one’s feeling states and little more. As a consequence, the relationship with the strong traits of SA was lost. Current usage refers to SA as “the realization of one’s potential” which is but a vague generality.

The absence of mystic or peak experiences is thus not enough to decide that a given self-actualizer is of the nontranscending type. However, traits like More Efficient Perception of Reality or Problem Centering are differently expressed in a “doer” than in a “seer.” These traits offer a better criterion than peak experiences to distinguish between transcenders and nontranscenders.

At the end of this study we shall make some comparisons between Eleanor Roosevelt, the “doer” and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, the “seer.” We shall see that their way of viewing things was for the most part in keeping with the transducer-nontranscender distinction as was their way of defining problems that are urgent. But when we come to what inspired them to action and service for the sake of their fellow human beings and the ways in which they inspired them, the dual typology seems of little importance. Perhaps, what the self-actualizers have in common is of greater significance than their “doer” or “seer” calling.

D. THE PRESENT STUDY

Maslow never presented a case study of a self-actualizing individual. A first study of this kind was that of Saint-Exupéry, a French aviator and writer, a self-actualizer of the transcending type (28). According to Maslow (25, p. 280) Eleanor Roosevelt was a self-actualizer of the nontranscending type, She was the only woman cited by Maslow as an example of this type.

Hareven (14) had the opportunity to interview Maslow in 1964 on the subject of Eleanor Roosevelt. He observed her at her lectures at Brandeis University in 1959-60 and “was amazed to see cynical students listening to her truisms with rapt absorption. They trusted her sincerity because of her unassuming manner and because the record of her whole lifetime testified that she had practiced what she preached” (14, pp. 257-258). He also interviewed her and “concluded that Mrs. Roosevelt fitted most of the criteria for the self-actualizing personality . . . she stood apart, however, because she had no outstanding talents, no brilliant mind, no special training, no artistic genius” (14, p. 277). At that time she was also the only woman in his total sample; Jane Addams, Ida Tarbell, Harriett Tubman (24), and Maslow’s mother-in-law were included later (26). “Instead of rejecting her female role, she achieved a graceful union between femininity and activity in public life. Because of her sense of fulfillment there was no competitiveness in her” (14, p. 277). Actually, as Eleanor Roosevelt’s biographies show, there was little competitiveness in her not because she felt fulfilled but because of her humility and her sense of unimportance which was with her through the better portion of her life, as well as because of her ideal of being useful, and following Christ’s example.

Considering that Eleanor Roosevelt drew her inspiration from the highest human ideals, it is worth examining whether or not she was as clearly a nontranscender, a “doer,” as Maslow believed. And she was, too, an “endlessly surprising person” (17, p. 140).

In the present study we undertook to examine to what degree was Eleanor Roosevelt a self-actualizing individual. Her designation as a nontranscending “doer” is of particular interest because it raises all the questions that were already brought up, and many more. In carrying out this study we have been painstaking about method. We have tried to show that some traits of SA are more critical than others but that examples of behaviors and statements to bespeak self-actualization must match the strength and quality of Maslow’s descriptors. We have given close attention to the category of Imperfections to look there for anything that may counter the very character of SA.

Our study has several aims beyond presenting a detailed case as a test of SA of Eleanor Roosevelt; these aims are as follows:

(a) to detail Maslow’s descriptors of each characteristics of SA; enumeration of these descriptors is necessary to appreciate the strength and quality of each trait, it is also a necessary step before new instruments to measure SA are developed;

(b) to find out whether transcendence and nontranscenders have similar or distinctly different profiles of SA;

(c) to examine the differences between transcendence and nontranscenders to see if the distinction is worth maintaining;

(d) to find out if the traits of SA as described by Maslow are sufficient to accommodate all the significant characteristics of a self-actualizing individual, or are there additional ones to be observed;

(e) to restore the original meaning of the construct of SA as presented by
Maslow and to begin to examine in what ways the realization of SA may vary from case to case; in other words, to clarify what is constant and what is variable in the structure of self-actualization.

Finally, the continuing study of self-actualizing people is also of greater theoretical significance. We have raised the question of the relationship between construct validity and theory, which the attempt of measuring SA illustrated. We would want to know what is the relationship between SA and creativity; are self-actualizing people the highest form of human life, or are there even higher forms "beyond self-actualization"; for example, Kohlberg's stage 7 (16) or Dabrowski's Level V.

II. METHOD
A. SELECTION OF DATA SOURCE

As the best source for analysis of complex personality structures, Allport (1) long ago suggested personal material—autobiography, letters, diaries. Personality variables (e.g., traits of self-actualization) can be identified in the material through content analysis. In doing this kind of analysis in which questions are "answered directly from a description of the attributes of content . . . the investigator is, in large part, freed from problems of validity" because "the content data serve as a direct answer to the research question, rather than as an indicator from which other characteristics are to be inferred" (15, p. 610).

Maslow regarded Eleanor Roosevelt to be self-actualizing in her years 60-78 when, after F.D.R.'s death, she was on her own. The sources dealing with this period are her autobiographical writings, On My Own and The Search for Understanding (Part IV of her autobiography), which are limited in the amount of psychological detail revealing of her inner life; You Learn by Living, written at the age of 75, which presents her philosophy of life with a fair number of personal examples; Lash's Eleanor: The Years Alone, and Elliott Roosevelt's Mother R., both based on personal documents and recollections.

In order to limit the analysis of traits of SA in Eleanor Roosevelt to a manageable yet comprehensive sample, the choice fell to Lash's Eleanor: The Years Alone. Joseph Lash, a longtime friend of Eleanor Roosevelt, wrote this volume as a continuation of his opus magnum, Eleanor and Franklin. The two volumes are the most extensive and most comprehensive biography of her to date and, besides official sources and documents, are based on a large collection of Eleanor's personal documents (memos, diary, personal letters), recorded interviews with her closest associates, Lash's own diary, notes and letters, as well as her newspaper column, My Day. This biography, focused on Eleanor Roosevelt's point of view, is abundant with direct quotes from her. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., at first doubtful that anyone so devoted to Eleanor Roosevelt as Lash was could also be objective, praised it for its "scholarship, insight, objectivity, and candor" (18, p. ix). It is a pool of material with the kind of information suitable for content analysis aiming at the understanding of the person. Additional personal papers became available in 1978—the correspondence between Eleanor Roosevelt and her intimate friend Lorena Hickok (9). This material adds, for the most part,
our understanding of Eleanor Roosevelt's emotional development during the White House years, 1932-1945.

The SA profile of Eleanor Roosevelt given in Table 1 and Figure 1 is based exclusively on the analysis of material extracted from Lash's second part of the full biography. In Section IV some illustrative examples are drawn also from other sources. The traits of self-actualization were developing in Eleanor Roosevelt all her life from the time when as a young girl she set out to conquer her fears; she told Lash in 1940: "All my life I have fought fear, physical fear and fear of not being loved" (17, p. 129).

While Lash's two volumes provide a rich texture of the times and life of Eleanor Roosevelt, Heaven's book, Eleanor Roosevelt, An American Conscience, is valuable as a critical appraisal of her role as a public figure.

B. THE TEST OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION

Lash's biography of Eleanor Roosevelt was read and screened four times for selection of the appropriate kind of statements: i.e., those that were selected if they revealed spontaneous expression and conveyed a global sense of self-actualizing characteristics; we have also paid particular attention to statements that may contradict self-actualization.

The test of self-actualization went thus along two lines: the completeness of the set of traits and the absence of traits that would contradict the very character of SA. Since SA is a cohesive cluster of traits (28), absence of a significant trait would negate the subject's qualifying for the status of a self-actualizing individual; the presence of a trait incompatible with SA would also speak against the individual's self-actualization. Maslow has provided a category which he called Imperfections. Examination of the particular imperfections of the subject would reveal whether or not they are congruent with human failings occasioned by life situations rather than being enduring character traits that contradict the very concept of SA as described by Maslow.

After the first reading, 399 statements were selected for analysis. This initial selection was overconclusive; if there was any doubt about whether to include a statement, it was included. Hereafter, statements were eliminated if intricate inferences about the presence of a characteristic had to be made, or if special knowledge was needed for full understanding of the thought being conveyed. For example, some statements of her political actions were difficult to rate without more political acumen; consequently, such statements were eliminated. Further screening after the second reading left 229

statements; after the third screening, 212. The final count of statements was 197 after the fourth screening of the book.

Fifty of the 197 selected units do not contain direct quotes of Eleanor Roosevelt. Rather they contain paraphrases of statements attributed to Eleanor Roosevelt, or another's own statements about Eleanor Roosevelt based on either their own observations of her or summarizations of materials written about her (the author of the book was usually the person contributing the latter kind). These 50 rating units not only provide a different perspective on Eleanor Roosevelt but are also a primary source for revealing her negative characteristics.

In rating each excerpt all self-actualizing categories were considered. Thus, more than one rating is possible for each excerpt or rating unit.

Some excerpts contained statements that met the selection criteria but did not fit into any of the existing categories. Instead of forcing these statements or any of the categories to fit, it was decided to establish potentially new categories and decide their relevance and utility after the rating process was finished. Nine new categories were created this way.

C. AUDITING: A METHOD FOR RATING COMPLEX MATERIALS

Auditing, a method of gaining rating reliability in naturalistic inquiries (12, 13) was used in this study. In this method, a second rater or judge "audits the work of the first much like an examiner audits the work of an accountant. . . . a second judge should be able to verify that: (a) the categories devised by a first judge make sense in view of the data from which he worked, and (b) the data have been appropriately arranged into a category system" (12, 13).

In addressing the issue of reliability between these types of raters, Scott remarked, "Two skilled clinicians could be expected to show a higher proportion of agreements than average coders (college students) in assigning protocols to categories descriptive of personality types" (35, p. 322). Holsti (15) concurs by saying that the reliability of a study is a function of the raters' skills, insight, and experience. He goes on to say that, for a content analysis study, there is no standard acceptable level of reliability; rather, the acceptable level of reliability depends on the context of a given research problem. Furthermore, "... as categories and units of analysis become more complex, they are likely to become both more useful and less reliable" (15, p. 660).

Two trained clinicians were used as raters in this study. In order to rate the chosen statements appropriately, both raters must know the basic
theoretical and descriptive terms of Dabrowski's theory of positive disintegration and Maslow's theory of self-actualization. At least one of them must have prior experience and demonstrated expertise. Because of the complex information that needs to be understood before rating process could begin, one of the authors (C.T.) was the primary rater in the study and the other (M.M.P.) with more experience with the two theories and this type of rating was the second rater, or auditor.

First rating: excerpts selected from each of the 15 chapters in Lash's biography were rated in order of appearance (i.e., Chapter 1, Chapter 2, etc.) by the first rater. Second rating: the second rater audited this first set of ratings by reading the statements, agreeing or disagreeing with their respective ratings, and offering suggestions for rating changes. Ratings of the first and second rating sessions were reevaluated during the third, fourth, and fifth rating sessions. The sixth rating was again an audit. Statements were in random order in the third and fourth rating sessions and back to their original order of presentation for the fifth and sixth rating sessions.

As already mentioned, one excerpt, or unit of material, may be assigned more than one rating, hence the number of ratings exceeds the number of rating units, which is 197.

There were 289 ratings after the first round; 347 after the second; 349 after the third; 349 after the fourth; 342 after the fifth; and 337 after the sixth round. The second round was the one in which the second rater audited the 289 ratings from the first session. The auditor eliminated 25 ratings (9%) and changed 41 ratings (14%); further, he added 83 ratings [22 based on a new count of 372 (289 + 83) ratings] to the original 289. During the third round, the first rater added three and eliminated one; no changes were made in the fourth session; five ratings were added and 12 eliminated in the fifth session. In the sixth round, the auditor eliminated 10 ratings, corrected seven, and added five.

III. RESULTS

In reporting the results, the order and clustering of SA traits is the same as in Piegowski (28) with the exception of the categories which are new and listed under Z. In total 337 ratings were produced from the 197 rating units. The distribution of ratings among clusters of SA traits is as follows: A. Autonomy and Superior Perception of Reality, 82; B. Problem-Centeredness, 66; C. Spontaneity, 22; D. Gemeinschaftsgefühl, 34; E. Interpersonal Relations, 26; F. Imperfections, 41; G. Values, 46; Z. New Categories, 24.

The numbers of ratings for subcategories within each cluster are shown in Table 1. Two subcategories—Creativeness and Peak Experiences—have no ratings. The six new categories have 11 ratings for Humility, nine for Equitableness, two for Self-Discipline, and one each for the remaining four (cf. Section V).

Fifty of the 197 rating units were not direct quotes from Eleanor Roosevelt. These 50 units contained 83 of the 337 total number of ratings. Imperfections (F) received 31 of its 41 ratings from these units.

For Eleanor Roosevelt, self-actualization ratings were found for each of Maslow's categories except Creativeness (C3) and Peak Experiences (C4). Ratings were also found for the two categories that depict outcomes of SA—Values (G) and Resolution of Dichotomies (H). When the frequency of ratings in each category is compared with that obtained for Saint-Exupéry, one finds that they share a similar pattern (Figure 1). Considering that they presumably represent two distinct types of self-actualization, this similarity is rather unexpected. The actual number of ratings and their percentage distribution for both Eleanor Roosevelt and Saint-Exupéry are given in Table 1. As compared with Saint-Exupéry, there are twice as many units and twice as many ratings in Eleanor Roosevelt's material.

Part of the impression of similarity in the profiles can be attributed to the clustering of traits introduced in the first study (28); it also says something about the frequency with which one is likely to encounter material representative of each SA characteristic. The varied peaks of these frequency distributions should in no way suggest that the size of the peaks reflects the relative importance of the traits. Rather one may look upon the higher peaks as "activity" peaks—that is, those that are more frequently expressed because behaviors associated with them will occur more frequently. This is intuitively obvious for the B1 peaks—Problem-Centering, and the closely related B2—Discrimination between Means and Ends. The same can be
sought of the Imperfections peak: the more a person is involved in active life, the more there is occasion for the expression of common human failings and frustrations that are more the function of life situations than character traits of the person. In Eleanor Roosevelt's profile, A1 More Efficient Perception of Reality, reflects her active political life; further, her sound political judgment was valued and often requested, thus increasing the frequency of a "reality perception" statement.

The only area of noticeable dissimilarity lies in the C cluster. To what degree is it significant that, in her material, ratings of C1—Spontaneity,
Simplicity, Naturalness—are twice as numerous as those of C2—Continued Freshness of Appreciation—is hard to tell. The absence of the Creativeness peak (C3) will be discussed in the next section; suffice it to say that the lack of examples of C3 alone, without other ratings in the same unit, lies in the difficulty of trying to separate them from C2. The absence of the Peak Experience peak (C4) is consistent with Maslow's designation of Eleanor Roosevelt as a nontranscender, but as we pointed out in Section I, C, this is not enough to decide the matter.

Similarity of profile in no way implies that the content under each peak is similar. The question is, what, besides peak experiences, may distinguish a transcender from a nontranscender. The overall similarity of profiles of the two subjects requires a closer comparison of the content of rating units of their respective material. Differences between these two subjects are particularly apparent in the content of traits A1, B1, E, and F (see section VI). The next section is a review of Eleanor Roosevelt's material.

IV. TRAITS OF SELF-ACTUALIZATION: ELEANOR ROOSEVELT AT THE AGE OF 60-78

The complete material used in this study is contained in Tyska (39) but is too extensive to be included here in its entirety; consequently, we shall limit ourselves to examples of statements representative of each SA trait, as well as those that might contradict them. The descriptors derived from Maslow (24) are given at the beginning of each section; they are followed by examples from Lash (19); numbers are page references; occasionally other sources are included. The grouping of traits into A, B, C, etc. clusters was introduced by Piechowski (28) in order to bring out the broader features of the structure of self-actualization.

A. AUTONY AND SUPERIOR PERCEPTION OF REALITY

A1. More Efficient Perception of Reality and More Comfortable Relations with It

—ability to detect the spurious, the fake, the dishonest in personality;
—ability to see concealed or confused realities more swiftly and more correctly than others;
—better predictions of the future;
—can distinguish the fresh, concrete, and idiographic from the generic, abstract, and rubricized: live more in the real world of nature than in the man-made mass of concepts, abstractions, expectations, beliefs, and stereotypes;
—accept, are comfortable with, and are even more attracted to the unknown; they tolerate and like the ambiguous and unstructured; they are generally unthreatened and unfrightened by the unknown.

This rather complex trait is an expression of clarity of perception, penetration to the root of things, and a sense of truth—the hallmarks of self-actualizing people.

These characteristics began to develop in Eleanor Roosevelt ever since the awakening of her interest in politics when she accompanied Franklin during his campaign for the vice-presidency in 1920. In 1923 she wrote an article, "Why I Am a Democrat" in which she stressed that principles and ideals should guide one's choice of political party. She chose to be a Democrat because "the Democratic Party seemed to have been more concerned with the welfare and the interests of the people at large, and less with the growth of big business" (18, p. 280). In 1929 she was ahead of Franklin on labor issues (18, p. 329). In 1932 in the depth of the Depression she began to emphasize
the need for fundamental change rather than alleviation of distress (18, p. 352). In her “It’s Up to the Women,” published in 1933, she defined her own set of priorities—peace, the abolition of poverty, and a concern for youth, women’s rights, and the rights of minorities generally (18, p. 381). In 1935 she cooperated in drawing the plans for National Youth Administration. Thanks to her insistence Negroes received equal treatment by the NYA and by other New Deal agencies (14, pp. 69 and 74). She stressed tirelessly the link between relief and reform—permanent reforms were the necessary safeguard against another depression.

She was keenly aware of the need for long-range planning but she was equally aware that to move the nation in that direction a change in values was necessary (14, pp. 89-90). By holding regular press conferences, radio broadcasts, writing, lectures and talks around the country, she was educating the nation. From early on she saw the necessity of preparing the nation for fundamental social changes. She taught participatory democracy: “Politics is the participation of the citizen in his government” (33, p. 171); and, of course, this is what she was doing ever since she had become active in the League of Women Voters in 1921. As early as 1928 she said that the function of a leader in democracy is “the faculty of taking a complex problem of government and simplifying it so that people can go to the polls and vote on the issue intelligently” (18, p. 313); she stressed this principle often.

From her concern for lasting changes came her involvement in Arthurdale, a cooperative community in West Virginia, financed by the federal government in 1933. “She saw in homestead communities a promise of human dignity for people who had been hopelessly destitute” (14, p. 92). She spent much time there getting to know the people and helping them start their school and getting government action with every new problem in the project. The experiment failed and she was blamed for its failure because she was too much an idealist and social reformer who ignored economic and financial realities, and, further, that she gave it unnecessary publicity. “By condoning waste and mismanagement in her eager support of the ideas behind the project, Mrs. Roosevelt played into the hands of the critics and made herself and the government vulnerable to public attacks” (14, p. 111). Arthurdale was totally dismantled by 1948. It was a hard lesson in the making of an ardent and indefatigable self-actualizer.

Negro rights had become one of her major concerns about the time Arthurdale was getting started. Speaking to white audiences she put the blame for the status of Negroes on whites; speaking to black audiences she stressed their responsibility to be practical and to develop their abilities and skills within the existing political structures (14, p. 113). “Sometimes it is better to fight hard with conciliatory methods” (18, p. 524). It was one of her leading principles that change occurs by work from within, not by leaving the system and giving up all responsibility for constructive change by being outside of it. “Get into the game and stay in it. Throwing mud from the outside won’t help. Building up from the inside will” she told women in 1924 (18, p. 288).

It is perhaps worth recalling that in 1934 a bill prohibiting lynchings failed to reach the floor of the Senate (14, p. 121), and that when the war industry started to boom after 1940 blacks were not hired. Aware of what this meant to the black people and seeing their growing restlessness she foresaw the race riots of the 40’s when in 1943 in Detroit buildings were set on fire and 35 people were killed.

She began to stress the injury that discrimination inflicts on people's physical health and behavior: “I have long felt that many of the things which we deplore, the prevalence of tuberculosis, the mounting record of crime in certain sections of the country, are not just due to lack of education and to physical differences, but are due in great part to the basic fact of segregation which we have set up in this country and which warps and twists the lives not only of Negro populations, but sometimes of foreign born, or even religious groups” (18, p. 532). She wrote this in 1941. Studies of the emotional and physical consequences of helplessness and loneliness (the consequence of the distancing and isolation produced by even very subtle kinds of discrimination or segregation) fully support her insight on this point (22, 36).

Owing to her association with Pearl Buck she understood that the Oriental people have long been offended by the whites’ claim to supremacy. When in 1943 Churchill planned for Anglo-American control of world order after the war, Eleanor Roosevelt knew that this would offend the rest of the world. Churchill’s idea was an insult to democracy: “We should include all people who believe in democracy” (18, p. 669).

She saw clearly that the greatest dangers of communism came from lack of equal opportunity: unemployment, discrimination, uncertainty of the future: “The communists are dangerous only as we ourselves fail” (18, p. 602).

From the start of World War II, Eleanor Roosevelt stressed the need for civilian defense as an absolutely necessary back-up to military defense, except that to her preparation for an emergency was only a small part of a larger scheme of strengthening the social and political health of the nation—the fight for the Four Freedoms, equality of opportunity in education, justice before the law, the right to work, and the right to vote. “We
must continue with progressive social legislation as part of the national defense" (18, p. 637). This resulted in FDR's Executive Order to establish the Office of Civilian Defense in 1941.

After her trip to the troops in the South Pacific in 1942, she "was fearful that once the war was over the returning veterans would be forgotten . . . . "Legislation providing for jobs and education for veterans should be passed now and made known to the men in the services" (18, p. 691).

These examples clearly show Eleanor Roosevelt's more efficient perception of reality which she was developing through the wear and tear of her extraordinarily active life.

Eleanor Roosevelt's "years alone" began after FDR's death on April 12, 1945. In December, President Truman nominated her to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Assembly that was convening in London in January of 1946. In the post-World War II era the state of the world was precarious. She was aware of the profound changes the war had induced:

" 'The whole social structure of Europe is crumbling,' she counseled the president, 'and we might as well face the fact that leadership must come from us or it will inevitably come from Russia.' The key to the future was the economic situation in Europe. I feel very strongly that it cannot be handled piecemeal . . . . The economic problem is not one that we can handle with a loan to Great Britain, a loan to France, a loan to Russia. It must be looked on as a whole." (19, pp. 83-84, emphasis added).

She saw, too, that the threat of another war was real. World peace could be achieved if all the nations were willing to cooperate: "we have reached a place where it is not a question of 'can we live in the same world and cooperate' but 'we must live in the same world and cooperate' " (19, p. 272). She urged the United States to understand other nations in their own terms, something that she always made a special effort to do. A strong United Nations Organization was one of her lifelong concerns.

She had a gift for seeing political realities as human realities played out in individual lives and in each person's community (a distinction of the "fresh, concrete, idiographic from the generic, abstract, and rubricized"):"

"Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual persons; the factory, or farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity, without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerned citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world" (19, p. 81).

She continued to champion the political significance of women and of women's rights. In her final address as U.N. delegate in 1953 she said:

"Too often the great decisions are originated and given form in bodies made up wholly of men, or so completely dominated by them that whatever of special value women have to offer is shunted aside without expression" (19, p. 217). But, "she did not want women as a special group. She wanted them working together with the men on an equal basis" (19, p. 50). In 1961, at the age of 77, "she abandoned her forty-year old opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment. 'Many of us opposed the amendment because we felt it would do away with protection in the labor field. Now with unionization, there is no reason why you shouldn't have it if you want it!' " (19, p. 317).

Much of her appraisal of reality involved the political arena; her political judgment commanded respect and her political insight and the independence with which she expressed her views in her column would at times trouble the State Department: "Her criticism was read with anxiety at the State Department. Dean Acheson, the acting secretary of state, promptly dispatched a top aide to New York City to explain policy to her. She was not won over. She was troubled by the go-it-alone implications of the Truman Doctrine" (19, p. 95). This was not an isolated occurrence.

She had no difficulty detecting insincerity or downright political dishonesty of such figures as the political boss Carmine De Sapiio, Cardinal Spellman, or Richard Nixon. She said, in fact, after Nixon's Checkers speech: "He is not worthy to be in public life. If anything should happen to make him President, very serious times would develop for this country," and, in fact, they did (34, p. 200). She opposed McCarthyism and demanded that everyone who was a public figure must take a stand on McCarthy.

At times she reached for a truly universal perspective—we have seen this in her statement on human rights, and the following excerpt is another example:

"... and so I think the only thing to do is to point up the fact that as time passes, the perspective of what a man has lived by is probably more important than the actual things he did, because new situations necessitate new answers and one cannot apply the same theories or exact methods. The background of a man's thinking and acting is at all times a living thing" (19, p. 95). (Also rated B2 for Discrimination between Means and Ends.) This statement is an excellent example of E.R.'s comfort with the unknown, of being "unthreatened and unfrustrated by the unknown."

The above is only a small sampling of E.R.'s more efficient perception of reality and of her better rapport with it, epitomized in her statement, "when you are sure of fundamentals you can differ on nonessentials" (19, p. 46).
punch line is not in agreeing on fundamentals but in being sure of fundamentals; there lies the self-actualizers' reliable manner of discrimination between means and ends, right and wrong—their sense of truth [Maslow: "the truth that is so clear to him is for most people veiled and hidden" (25, p. 166)].

A2. Acceptance (Self, Others, Nature)

—inclined to accept all of the works of nature as is;

—accept their own human nature with all of its shortcomings and discrepancies from their ideals;

—look upon human nature and people in an undemanding and uncritical way;

—accept all levels of human nature in themselves, including the animal level (i.e., hearty appetites, enjoyment without regret/shame/apology, sleep well, enjoy their sex lives, etc.);

—dislike artificialities (e.g., defensiveness, protective coloration, pose) in themselves or others.

E. R. felt close to nature. "Perhaps nature is our best assurance of immortality," she wrote. "She accepted people, nations, and life in general, including her own age and the possibility of retirement from active life. She hated meanness and cruelty, but 'sins' arising from other qualities she found far from reprehensible. 'I love the whole of people but I've often liked so-called sins better than some kind of virtues'" (17, p. 197). "When you know your own weaknesses...you know that you are no better than other people, but because of your position you have a greater chance to do good. That is all."

"You don’t permit yourself false airs" (17, p. 89).

"I never use up any energy in indecision or regret. If I make a speech and know it isn’t good, I get on the plane and say I’ll do better next time. But I am never undecided about anything and never have time for remorse or regret about the decisions I make" (19, p. 244). (Also rated B1 for Problem-Centering.) This was a "doer’s" motto. There was, however, regret in regard to her past: she was capable of extensive self-blame in regard to her husband and her children (cf. section IV, F—Imperfections).

Her attitude of acceptance toward life was perhaps best expressed in her interview on Edward R. Murrow’s program "This I Believe," on which occasion she also expressed one of her life’s principles, "to do one’s very best!"

"I don’t know whether I believe in a future life. I believe that all you go through here must have some value, therefore there must be some reason. And there must be some ‘going on.’ How exactly that happens I’ve never been able to decide. There is a future—that I’m sure of. But how, that I don’t know. And I came to feel that it didn’t really matter very much because whatever the future held you’d have to face it in exactly the same way. And the important thing was that you never let down doing the best that you were able to do—it might be poor because you might not have much within you to give, or to help other people with, or to live your life with. But as long as you did the very best that you were able to do, then that was what you were put here to do and that was what you were accomplishing by being here.

“And so I have tried to follow that out—and not to worry about the future or what was going to happen. I think I am pretty much of a fatalist. You have to accept whatever comes and the only important thing is that you meet it with courage and with the best you have to give” (19, p. 332). (Also rated B1 for Problem-Centering.)

As for a "hearty appetite" it did not perhaps manifest in her in spectacular ways as it did in Saint-Exupéry’s taste for dramatic adventures in the air and discreet ones on the ground. She had an intense love of life. "I think probably the fact which influenced me the most in my early years was an avid desire, before I was aware of what I was doing, to experience all I could as deeply as I could" (33, p. 3). She enjoyed traveling, exploring new sights, mountains, architecture, museums, restaurants in foreign countries. She enjoyed showing these places to her young friends (19, pp. 61 and 255). It is curious, however, that in her adult life she was indifferent to food and "just could not comprehend what it was about food that gave pleasure to other people" and even said herself, "How I wish I could enjoy food" (9, pp. 164-165; 18, p. 343). Yet her recollections from childhood and youth contain numerous descriptions of meals and the taste of food (in the first 83 pages of “This Is My Story” there are more than 10 descriptions of meals and five references to an appreciation of how things tasted).

A3. Quality of Detachment; Need for Privacy

—find it easy to be aloof, reserved, calm and serene; remain “above the battle”;

—positively like solitude and privacy;

—seem to be able to retain their dignity even in undignified surroundings and situations;

—do not need others in the ordinary sense;

—are able to smile and laugh through a period of problems, worry, and responsibility.
Statements rated A3 show Eleanor Roosevelt detached and very much "above the battle": the following excerpt is a good illustration:

"No nastiness or insinuation was out of bounds for columnist Westbrook Pegler. 'If people want to believe that sort of thing,' she said after the appearance of one such column, 'there is nothing to be done.' So far as she was concerned, she was perfectly content to retire from public life to the country. She did the public things, but the ones that really mattered were her personal relationships and they could not be affected by such attacks" (19, p. 173).

In vigorous debate and under attack she would remain calm and unperturbed; amidst turmoil she was "an oasis of peace." But she did need others, those she loved, her children, her closest friends and co-workers, and though she valued solitude she did not do much to seek it. Faber speaking for Lorena Hickok uses terms like "dependence" and that Mrs. Roosevelt "hated to be alone although the idea of solitary peace and quiet always seemed appealing to the First Lady" (9, pp. 321 and 229).

A4. Autonomy; Independence of Culture and Environment; Will; Active Agents

—determinants of satisfaction and good life are inner-individual, not social;
—dependent for their own development and continued growth on their own potentialities and latent resources (self-governed);
—self-development and inner growth are of primary importance over honors, status, rewards, another's love;
—relative independence of physical and social environment.

Almost all the statements rated A4 show E.R.'s independence of mind, both politically and in personal affairs. An example of her political independence was given above in section A1.

Her will and self-discipline were formidable to the end: "she tried, as she had so often in the past, to shake off her illness by sheer will power" (19, p. 324).

She had particular aversion to being given special honors and consideration:

"When she was seventy-seven, Brandeis offered to send a car to the airport for her, but she refused. She did not want to be treated either as Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt or as an old woman, she said" (19, p. 303). (Also rated A5 for Resistance to Enculturation.) In India she refused special pro-

tection as she did through all her White House years when she would be chaperoned whenever she succeeded in eluding Secret Service men. Her disapproval of Krushchev's outrageous behavior at the U.N. did not stop her from inviting him to tea and facing widespread criticism. When Eisenhower took the opportunity of her expiring term to not reappoint her to the U.N. she offered her services as an "educational volunteer" to the American Association for the United Nations: "she moved into the small austerity furnished cubicle that she insisted would suffice. 'She walked into it as if it were the Gold Room at the White House, . . . and after a moment it did seem quite grand' " (19, p. 22). She noticed how often the men who have to leave a political office were lost when out of it (19, p. 139).

The concern with inner growth and self-development, stressed by Maslow and so prominent in Saint-Exupéry, is less evident in E.R.'s material considered here. We see the traits of self-actualization as a final outcome, but we are not witnesses to the process by which she arrived there. This process had taken place earlier—in her childhood, her teens, and her adult life with FDR. That she traveled a long and arduous path of inner growth is clear enough. She revealed important elements of this process in her You Learn By Living (33) in which she said that one cannot experience life to the utmost if one does not have knowledge of oneself, "a knowledge based on deliberately and usually painfully acquired self-discipline which teaches you to cast out fear and frees you for the fullest experience of the adventure of life" (33, p. xii). Discussing what constitutes maturity she stressed "an ability to take criticism and evaluate it" and when it is constructive to accept it and "try to profit by it, even though hurt by it," and then to go still further "to gradually eliminate the faults you see in yourself but that no one else knows exist" (33, pp. 71-72). Indeed, she sets a very high standard for self-perfection; first, to correct the faults others see and then those that only we can know in ourselves. This is the kind of self-knowledge and inner work that characterizes those who pursue spiritual discipline. Reconstruction and analysis of Eleanor Roosevelt's inner growth is taken up in a separate study (29).

A5. Resistance to Enculturation, Transcendence of Culture

—ruled by the laws of their own character rather than by the rules of society; autonomy in relation to one's culture;
—maintain an inner detachment from culture in which they are immersed; seem to be able to stand off from it as if they did not quite belong to it;
B. Problem-Centeredness

B1. Problem-Centering

—focused on problems outside themselves; they are problem rather than ego centered;

—have some mission in life; some task that they feel their responsibility, duty or obligation; "a task that they must do" rather than "a task that they want to do";

—live in widest frame of reference; they seem never to get "so close to the trees that they fail to see the forest"; they live in a framework of universal values, in terms of a century rather than the moment;

—impart a certain serenity that makes life easier for them and also for those associated with them.

This large group of excerpts includes a number of statements that amply represent this trait which was already well manifest when she joined the League of Women Voters in 1921. With her husband's death she briefly contemplated retirement, but it soon became clear to her that she "was looking for a job to do, groping for the assignment that would bring all her interests into a single focus. She had been deeply conscious during her White House years of how her energies had been scattered among a thousand enterprises" (19, p. 33). "What she really wanted to do was to make some contribution to what had been Franklin's wartime objective—the establishment of machinery that would help ensure a lasting peace" (19, p. 41). Truman nominated her as a delegate to the first meeting of the United Nations Assembly which convened in London in January of 1946, a post she held until 1952.

Nearly half of the B1 units deal with the United Nations and the American Association for the United Nations. She worked for six strenuous years on the U.N. Human Rights Commission and when the Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the 1948 General Assembly, it was generally acknowledged that without her enduring ability to reconcile opposing views and withstand attempts to jeopardize the task, as well as without her sense of the basic and universal values common to all people, this goal would never have been accomplished: "From the Commission's first meeting she had guided and inspired the work of the U.N. in the field of human rights" (19, p. 77 and p. 80); "The Russians seem to have met their match in Mrs. Roosevelt. The proceedings sometimes turn into a long vitriolic attack on the United States when she is not present. These attacks, however, generally degenerate into flurries in the face of her calm and undisturbed but often
pointed replies” (19, p. 69). In her own words: “Perhaps the biggest job to be done is to make people at home feel this is their machinery which they must use to build peace, but they will have to keep it oiled and make it run” (19, p. 49).

Adlai Stevenson said about her: “She did everything because it was worth doing. She did nothing because it would help to enhance her own role. Of that she seemed simply to be unconscious” (19, p. 308); there are many incidents to support this (cf. Section V, New Categories: Humility and Equitableness).

Here is an example of how for the sake of a higher yet practical goal she would put aside her own habitual modesty. She did not like to have people make any fuss over her birthday, but she made an exception when the American Association for the U.N. proposed to commercialize her birthday. She wanted them to be rid of their debt and so she gave her permission and even asked her friends to make a donation in lieu of a birthday present. (Also rated B2 for Discrimination Between Means and Ends.) Characteristically, she felt the responsibility to help young people “to move into the management of the world in which they lived” (19, p. 139). In this she was acting as a mentor in the manner described by Levinson (20). Her mentorship showed most strongly in her efforts to coach Adlai Stevenson on his presidential campaigning. But she was also a mentor to Lash and scores of others whom she took under her wing.

The above examples are only fragments of the vast scope of her work and as such they cannot convey the inexhaustible energy and dedication born of her conviction that if one works for the ideals of peace, justice, and nondiscrimination, they will become a reality.

B2. Discrimination Between Means and Ends; Between Good and Evil

— distinguish clearly between means and ends, right and wrong;
— fixed on ends rather than means, but often regard as ends in themselves many experiences and activities that for others are only means; they are more likely to appreciate the doing itself;
— strongly ethical, have definite moral standards; they do right and do not do wrong.

E.R.’s goals were world peace, an end to discrimination, equality of men and women, equality of races, freedom of religion, and human rights for every member of the human race. She believed that anything that could strengthen the UN as an instrument of peace was worth the effort, such as, for instance, the UN police force or striving for acceptable wording of the 1st Article of United Nations’ Declaration of Human Rights:

“When you write an international document, you try not to let the words interfere with getting as much agreement as possible and as much acceptance as possible to obtain the ends you want. Now, we wanted as many nations as possible to accept the fact that men, for one reason or another, were born free and equal in dignity and rights, that they were endowed with reason and conscience, and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood. The way to do that was to find words that everyone would accept, and so this is why it says ‘are born’ instead of saying ‘are created’ ” (19, pp. 70-71). (Also rated B1 for Problem-Centering.) This work was her contribution that she valued the most. She said on her seventieth birthday: “I got the most satisfaction from my work in the UN. There I was part of the second great experiment to bring countries together and to get them to work for a peaceful atmosphere in the world, and I still feel it important to strengthen this organization in every way” (19, p. 238). (Also rated B1 for Problem-Centering.)

When she was no longer a delegate at the UN she worked tirelessly for the American Association for the United Nations, beginning in 1953—she was then 69. Calling herself an “educational volunteer,” she put stress on organization and grass roots education: “I am not having any holiday but am working as hard as I know how on the organizing of the American Association for the United Nations and have just come back from a trip covering the whole Western part of our country. It was unbelievably strenuous but successful and as I have always told you I thrive on work” (19, p. 221). (Also rated B1 for Problem-Centering.)

Her pace would break a younger person. Her schedule seemed humanly impossible. The editor of the Boston Globe sent a reporter to accompany her on her trips to expose her schedule as an exaggeration. “Mr. Banner strung along with me for a few days, but with some difficulty. He did, however, acknowledge that I was keeping with my schedule of meetings in various towns” (31, p. 174).

There was no discrepancy between her professed principles and her actions. Her sense of right and wrong was also expressed in her concern for maintaining the true purpose of the political process: “We must preserve our right to think and differ,” she said to the ADA [Americans for Democratic Action], because Americans should be able to disagree and to consider new ideas (19, p. 234). “She saw a role for independents... to make the two
major parties uncomfortable when they stand for something which is really wrong" (19, p. 141). She elaborated on this in You Learn By Living (33, p. 174): "It is a sound idea to attend . . . the meetings . . . of the oppositions. Find out what people are saying, what they are thinking, what they believe. This is an invaluable check on one's own ideas" (emphasis added).

C. Spontaneity

C1. Spontaneity, Simplicity, Naturalness

- relatively spontaneous behavior (closer to childlike acceptance and spontaneity);
- lack of artificiality or straining for effect;
- relatively higher degree of spontaneity in their inner life (thoughts, impulses, feelings, etc.);
- simple and natural behavior, not necessarily unconventional behavior; the unconventionality is more internal than external;
- straightforwardness in their communications with others;
- search for company that allows them to be more free, natural, spontaneous.

Simplicity, naturalness, and lack of artificiality can be easily seen in E.R.'s statements and others' observations of her. In Geneva, at the session of the Human Rights Commission, she gave in to a childlike impulse: "I'd love to slide on these floors," Mrs. Roosevelt had confided to Jim Hendrick at the beginning of the session, when she first felt their polished marble under her feet. 'Now you can take your slide,' Hendrick solemnly advised her as they walked away from the Palais des Nations chambers in which the Commission was meeting. Whereupon Mrs. Roosevelt gave a little run and slide, ran again, and slid once more (19, pp. 71-72). She was 63 at the time. In India she "was furious that she allowed herself to be kept from riding an elephant" (19, p. 201). In her middle fifties she would amuse her friends with her efforts to stand on her hands in the water (17, p. 128); she would also get down on the floor to play with FDR's dog, Fala (17, p. 167).

When Maureen Corr came to work for her she was quite amazed when she first met her: "I expected some kind of royalty, and here was a warm, kind, embracing person. Her total simplicity was such a revelation to me, her lack of any feeling of self-importance" (19, p. 175).

Privately or publicly she was straightforward and open in her communication: "These representatives of ours don't build friendship for us. They have no confidence, so they are rude and arrogant and create suspicion . . . Why can't we be natural and feel right inside and just let it come out?" (19, p. 51).

Elliott Roosevelt reports an incident that well illustrates her simplicity, naturalness, and helpfulness: "One evening, a harrassed woman came looking for the maid to see whether she would fill in for a babysitter who had let her down. It happened to be the maid's day off, so Mother pinch-hit in her servant's place, taking charge of the infant when its mother left, changing diapers, feeding a night-time bottle, tucking the baby into bed, then carefully putting the rubber nipple to soak before the parent returned" (34, p. 153).

These examples show that in spite of her self-discipline, modesty, and privacy for which she was well known, Eleanor Roosevelt was capable of free expression of her feelings, thoughts, and childlike impulses. Elliott Roosevelt notes (34, p. 196) that "since 1945 she had changed almost beyond recognition as a personality," one of the changes being that she began to express her emotions more openly and vent them when they became overwhelming. But the change was not as drastic as it seems, it was that previously she did not allow herself these outbursts with her family, only with Louis Howe, who was FDR's campaign manager and who coached her in public speaking and politics, and with whom she became friends in 1920, or with Lorena Hickok, a journalist who became her closest friend in 1932 (9).

C2. Continued Freshness of Appreciation

- capacity to appreciate, again and again, freshly and naively, the basic goods of life with awe, pleasure, wonder, and even ecstasy, however stale these experiences may have become to others;
- derive ecstasy, inspiration, and strength from basic experiences of life;
- constant sense of good fortune and gratitude for life and its "blessings."

Eleanor Roosevelt had an intense appreciation of life: "I suppose I should slow down," she acknowledged when children and friends remonstrated with her, but to reporters on her seventy-seventh birthday she said: "I think I have a good deal of Uncle Theodore in me, because I could not, at any age, be content to take my place in a corner by the fireside and simply look on. Life was meant to be lived. Curiosity must be kept alive. The fatal thing is the rejection. One must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life" (19, p. 303). (Also rated B1 for Problem-Centering.)
"There is something rather exciting about starting a new thing and one's ideas run riot! If the day comes when someone talks to me about something and it does not at once start a dozen trains of thought, I shall feel that the real springs of life are slowing up and that age is truly upon me!" (18, p. 476).

In her White House years she would take people to see the nighttime reflection of the Washington Monument in the pool next to the Lincoln Memorial and to see Lincoln "almost alive" in the nocturnal play of lights and shadows (17, p. 96). At other times before she went to bed she took her dogs for a walk around the White House Circle and drank in the beauty and the stateliness of the mansion (18, p. 371). When she attended religious services, the beauty of a church enhanced her sense of the sublime (17, p. 150). In 1934 she said in words much the same as Maslow's long before he uttered them, "Americans had lost the ability to enjoy simple things—a landscape, the breath of a crisp October day, the play of sun and shadow, the view from a high hill—and above all the joy that comes from sharing" (18, p. 382). When she traveled through Istanbul on the way back from India and went out to view the Golden Horn, her description of the experience is a pure expression of an awareness of her freshness of appreciation. "It was an almost awesome feeling, not overshadowed even by the impression of the age and beauty of many of the treasures of India and the Far East gave me" (31, p. 134).

C3. Creativeness

—fresh, naïve, direct way of looking at life, like the universal and naive creativeness of an unspoiled child;
—originality or inventiveness as a pervasive approach to everything;
—this creativeness touches whatever activity the person is engaged in; whatever one does can be done with a certain attitude, a certain spirit (can be a creative shoemaker, carpenter, etc.).

In describing the creativeness that he characterized self-actualizing people, Maslow stressed its similarity with greater freshness of perception: "Perhaps when we speak of creativeness here we are simply describing from another point of view: namely, from the point of view of consequences, what we have described above as a greater freshness, penetration and efficiency of perception. These people seem to see the true and the real more easily. It is because of this that they seem to other more limited men creative" (24, p. 171). In referring to it as a "fresh, naïve, direct way of looking at life" Maslow makes it almost identical with C2, Continued Freshness of Appreciation. The only differentiating qualifier seems to be "originality or inventiveness" which is "projected upon the world or touches whatever activity the person is engaged in." It is thus difficult to select excerpts that would exemplify this without at the same time exemplifying C2. Hence, as in the case of Saint-Exupéry, we have not assigned any statement the rating C3 because all such statements were first rated C2. Here is an example: "Although over seventy-five, she retained a freshness of vision that was always on the lookout for excellence, . . . , an unspoiled goodness of heart that was especially responsive to integrity and courage" (19, p. 305). It is a pervasive quality for which it seems impossible to find isolated examples:

"She campaigned on street corners and in living rooms and spoke to audiences of fifteen with the same intensity as to those of 1500. 'She never asked how many people were going to be present' . . . She was as solicitous of her neighbors and friends in Hyde Park as of the diplomats and statesmen who thronged the United Nations, as content to work with her neighbor Dorothy Bourne on a project to improve the health of the children of Dutchess County as with Maurice Pate of UNICEF to improve the health of the children of the world. She appeared before the New York City Planning Commission to argue against tampering with Washington Square and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to warn against tampering with the UN Charter" (19, p. 308).

In brief, as she said herself, "The purpose of life . . . is to live it, to taste experience to the utmost, to reach out eagerly and without fear for newer and richer experience" (33, p. xii).

C4. Mystic Experience; Peak Experience

tremendous intensification of any experience in which there is loss of self or transcendence of it (e.g., problem-centering, self-forgetfulness, intense concentration, sensual experience, enjoyment of music or art).

The absence of mystic or peak experiences is not enough to establish E.R.'s type as a self-actualizing nontranscender (see section I, C). Rather, the character of her traits such as More Efficient Perception of Reality (A1), Problem-Centering (B1), and her stronger involvement in action rather than introspective contemplation is more that of a "doer" than of a "seer." The character of these traits offers a better criterion than peak experiences to distinguish between transcenders and nontranscenders.

But there was another side to her. Eleanor Roosevelt was profoundly religious. In The Moral Basis of Democracy she wrote: "the fundamental thing which we must all have is the spiritual force which the life of
Christ exemplifies" (18, p. 613). Although, according to her son Elliott, she did not believe in the possibility of personal communion with God, which to a mystic is a direct experience of a dialogue with the Transcendent Person, prayer was for her a continuous influence, something carried in the heart and mind all the time, shaping one's active life (17, p. 80). Her prayer was a means of keeping her ideal alive and an instrument of her inner growth. This active religious feeling raises the question whether or not she should be regarded as a nontranscender.

Her capacity to inspire others is another thing one must take into account. To Maslow transcenders were the truly inspired and inspiring but was not she when in 1940 she addressed the conflicted and nearly in chaos Democratic Convention in Chicago and in few simple phrases stilled "the tumult of 50,000" (18, p. 623). She knew it herself, "One thing among others I've learned, if we have trouble anywhere that is where I must go because it does seem to calm people down" (18, p. 648). One must ask—where is the source of this striking quality?—and remain without an answer. It is, however, a quality that would seem to fit a transcender, regardless of the presence of or absence of mystical experiences.

D. Gemeinschaftsgefühl

These three traits are among the most telling characteristics of self-actualizing people: genuine kindness, sense of good will, and considerateness—a "basic underlying kinship" with everyone. Combined with lack of defensiveness and lack of ego-involvement (24, pp. 183 and 208), they provide rigorous criteria for judging someone to be self-actualizing or not.

D1. Gemeinschaftsgefühl

—deep feeling of identification, sympathy, and affection for others;
—feel basic underlying kinship with everyone which transcends their dislike of others for whatever reason they have for disliking them;
—genuine desire to help the human race.

The statements rated D1 leave little question that Gemeinschaftsgefühl—the feeling of kinship with all people—was one of the motivating forces of E.R.'s life. She explained that one must be a good listener and have the imaginative ability to put oneself into another's place if one is to discover the meaning of other people's lives: "to try to discover what he is thinking and feeling; to understand as far as you can the background from which he came, the soil out of which his roots have grown, the customs and beliefs and ideas which have shaped his thinking." "It was by sitting and talking with miners' wives that I came really to know what they thought and felt, what it was like to be a miner's wife. This awareness did not come at once. It never does. But countless times during the years of the great depression I sat in their small kitchens, sometimes with their husbands, sometimes without them... Listening to such a woman talk, taking in the surroundings, one finds oneself, little by little, coming to understand the feelings of that other human being. Intellectually, one may have known for years that certain needs exist, but until one sees with one's own eyes and comes to feel with one's own heart, one will never understand other people" (33, pp. 156 and 137).

Mankind to her was not an abstraction to be calculated in terms of the common good or the greatest good for the greatest number, but individual lives, each with their own personal relationships and aspirations: "Where, after all, do universal rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world."

According to Lash, what made her an outstanding radio performer was her constant awareness of her unseen audience; she tried consciously to picture the women who were listening to her all over the country in the most diverse conditions (18, p. 419). In the beginning of her work on the Human Rights Commission, she said that if she helped her learned colleagues to put their "high thoughts" into words easily understood by an average person, she would be of some value on the commission (19, p. 63). (Also rated Z for Humility.)

Here is an instance of how she stood up for the rights of expatriates after World War II. The Russians wanted to force repatriation of refugees: "There were still one million displaced persons in Europe, and Committee III debated the charter of an international refugee organization whose function it would be either to help repatriate, if that was what the refugee wished or to re-settle them. Mr. Vishinsky's view is that the problem is very simple and can be solved by repatriating all the displaced persons... This thesis ignores the facts of political changes in the countries of origin have created fears in the minds of millions of persons who remain, of such a nature that they choose the miserable life in camps in preference to the risks of repatriation" (19, p. 60). Here is another example of her genuine concern and helping attitude:

"Why do you bother with the small groups?" she was sometimes asked.
"But nobody else will go," she replied. 'It's important they should know someone cares" (19, p. 308).

Her own daily column was judged in a scholarly analysis to be written so
plainly that one needed only a fifth grade education to understand it, while at least two years of college were required to follow Walter Lipmann or Arthur Krock (31, p. 165).

**D2. Democratic Character Structure**

—unaware or do not pay attention to differences of class, education, race or color;
—"humility of a certain type" . . . honestly respectful and even humble before people who could teach them something they don't know or who have a skill they don't possess;
—give a certain quantum of respect to any human being, just because he is a human individual; they do not wish to go beyond a certain minimum point, even with scoundrels.

There can be little question of E.R.'s democratic character structure as defined by Maslow. This trait pervaded her ideas and her actions—it reflected in her being able to give total attention to everyone she met, no matter who the person was (18, p. 100; 17, p. 185).

"If you approach each new person in a spirit of adventure you will find that you become increasingly interested in them and endlessly fascinated by the new channels of thought and experience and personality that you encounter. I do not mean simply the famous people of the world, but people from every walk and condition of life. You will find them a source of inexhaustible surprise because of the unexpected qualities and interests which you will unearth in your search for treasure. But the treasure is there if you will mine for it" (33, p. 136). And, "there is no human being from whom we cannot learn something if we are interested enough to dig deep" (33, p. 3).

The "humility of a certain type" which Maslow describes was certainly present in Eleanor Roosevelt—it was the by-product of true self-knowledge (cf. section A4—Autonomy), but she also possessed a deeper humility which persuaded us to isolate it as a separate category ([2], see section V).

**D3. Philosophical, Unhostile Sense of Humor**

—their humor is intrinsic to the situation, and spontaneous, thoughtful, philosophical;
—their kind of humor is poking fun at themselves or people in general when they are foolish or forget their place in the universe;
—don't laugh at hostile humor (making people laugh by hurting someone), superiority humor (laughing at someone else's inferiority), or authority-rebellion humor ("dirty jokes").

Eleanor Roosevelt was known for her seriousness and lack of lighthearted humor especially through her White House years. However, her books contain amusing anecdotes and she was capable of a spark evoked by a given situation or of fun at herself or at others' foolishness. She loved to laugh. On at least one occasion she expressed strong distaste of humor that was hostile and derogatory (19, p. 110). She was amused by others' and her own inconsistencies. While on the UN delegation in London: "She preferred her work in Committee III, but other members of the delegation took more happily to the social end. 'My buddy, Sen. Townsend, and Dulles went to Germany on Sat. a.m. and today I got a message they were grounded in Paris. The boys, no matter what their age, can't resist a good time' " (19, p. 47).

"She was indulgent toward her young friends, more so, often, than toward her own children. Al Lowenstein was frequently late and sometimes turned up with acquaintances whom he had not asked whether he could bring. She had a double standard, Maureen gently complained—stern in these matters with her children, easygoing with people like Al. 'By now, Maureen,' she said, twinkling, 'you ought to know me well enough to know that I like young men' " (19, pp. 311-312).

**E. Interpersonal Relations**

—tend to be kind to or at least patient with almost everyone; have compassion for all mankind ("democratic" kind of interpersonal relations);
—exclusiveness of devotion to a small circle of friends; deeper and more profound relations with a few individuals ("exclusive" kind of interpersonal relation);
—especially tender love for children and are easily touched by them;
—capable of more fusion, greater love, more perfect identification, more obliteration of ego boundaries;
—can have hostile reactions to others; this hostility is reactive or situational, not character-based (i.e., person either deserves it or reaction is for the good of that person);
—attract admirers, even worshippers but the relation tends to be one-sided—the admirer demanding more than the self-actualizer is prepared to give; these devotions can be distressing, even embarrassing to the self-actualizer.

"I don't lump people together. I don't think of them except as individuals whom I like or dislike" (19, p. 110) In this statement we have an expression of what self-actualizing people do not do: they do not categorize people and they do not think in stereotypes. This is the basis of Gemeinschaftsgefühl (D1) and Democratic Character Structure (D2). E.R.'s compassion, kind-
ness, and patience with others have already been discussed. Here we are looking at examples of specific relationships.

"Her relationships to people about whom she cared followed a pattern. At first there was a kind of rosy glow as she saw them as she wanted them to be, but as time went on, she knew them for what they really were" (19, p. 312).

"She had a compelling emotional need to have people who were close, who in a sense were hers and upon whom she could lavish help, attention, tenderness. Without such friends, she feared she would dry up and die" (17, p. 141).

Close personal relationships took on special significance in her later years. In 1947 in a letter to Dr. David Gurewitsch, her personal physician, she said: "I've always liked you & was drawn to you since we first met & the trip just made me sure that we could be friends. I never want to burden my young friends & with all my outward assurance I still have some of my old shyness & insecurity & that is probably what makes you feel shy. I've really taken you to my heart however, so there need never be a question of bother again. You can know that anything I can do will always be a pleasure for me & being with you is a joy" (19, p. 183). On another occasion she explained to him the relationship of the public to the private in her life: "The people I love mean more to me than all the public things even if you do think that public affairs should be my chief vocation. I only do the public things because there are a few close people whom I love dearly & who matter to me above everything else. There are not so many of them and I shall just have to try not to bother you too much!" (19, p. 183).

This cherishing of close friendships made separation and parting more keenly distressing for her: "To me all goodbyes are poignant now," she wrote him as he left for Peru. "I like less & less to be long separated from those few whom I deeply love" (19, p. 324).

"No relationship was ever terminated because of her neglect or thoughtlessness. If the other person was forgetful, she was careful, in reminding him of his neglect, not to make him feel guilty. She carried on and remembered where others had long left off" (19, p. 309).

But there was one relationship which waned considerably in the last years of her life. Lorena Hickok was her most intimate friend since the presidential campaign in 1932. It was a love relationship. Eleanor Roosevelt depended on her emotionally during the first years in the White House but in those years Eleanor Roosevelt grew in self-confidence and strength and though the friendship continued the need for emotional sustenance from Lorena gradually diminished. And when in 1955 she took her to live in Hyde Park near her, Lorena Hickok was by then eclipsed by Mrs. Roosevelt's greater closeness with the Lashies and the Gurewitsches (9). Eleanor Roosevelt, the most loyal of friends, was nevertheless aware that relationships have their own course: "Human relationships, like life itself, can never remain static. They grow, or they diminish. But, in either case, they change. Our emotional interests, our intellectual pursuits, our personal preoccupations, all change. So do those of our friends. So the relationship that binds us together must change too; it must be flexible enough to meet the alterations of person and circumstance" (33, p. 86).

Whether or not she was capable of "more fusion, greater love" and "obliteration of ego boundaries" in love is much harder to say. Her biographies point rather toward a certain reserve here. The one relationship that was characterized by emotional richness and intensity indicative of such "fusion" was probably the one with Lorena Hickok.

She had special love for children. "There were two types of letters that she answered meticulously—questionnaires, because they challenged her to make up her mind, and inquiries from children" (19, p. 171). She held annual picnics for children, the Wiltwyck School (located in Esopus near Hyde Park, N.Y.) for troubled boys, and for youth groups. She read and told them her favorite stories as she did to her grandchildren (19, p. 307).

Examples of hostile reactions to others are of two kinds. The "situational" kind that Maslow put in this category is represented by her criticism of the labor leader John L. Lewis (14, pp. 196-198), of Richard Nixon, and by the occasion of her conflict with Cardinal Spellman who, piqued by her stand that private schools are not entitled to aid from public funds, accused her of "discriminations unworthy of an American mother." But when they met the Cardinal behaved as if the conflict never occurred: "She came away from her encounter with the cardinal, she wrote a young friend, 'with a horrible feeling of insincerity. In his visit he never once mentioned the fact that he had written me that letter and you would think I was one of his most cherished friends. That does not give me any explanation of the letter nor much sense of security in his sincerity'" (19, p. 166). The other kind of hostile reaction is a more personal bias, even resentment, and is represented by E.R.'s attitude toward the Kennedy clan. Maslow placed this kind of hostile reaction in Imperfections and we shall return to it there.

F. Imperfections

—stubbornness, irritations, petulance, selfishness, anger, pride, superficial vanity, temper outbursts;
The third area of Imperfections relates to her biases and lack of acceptance: partiality to her own family, to friends, prejudice, and lack of acceptance (14 ratings in all).

Five of the remaining Imperfections rating emphasize inner experience: depressions, anxiety, and guilt (six ratings in all). Finally, one rating indicated an inappropriate use of “discrimination between means and ends.”

One half of the instances of imperfections are occasioned by political situations: for example, her stance on Palestine, or the political game itself: “She impressed me as having an open mind on every subject other than Palestine,” said Sandifer. “She was not open to persuasion on that issue” (19, p. 122); “She was, of course, an astute politician and at times could be as implacable and unforgiving as FDR and Louis Howe [FDR’s campaign manager] in avenging a treachery. That was the case with Franklin, Jr.’s defeat for state-wide office in 1954. ... Deeply unhappy for her son, Mrs. Roosevelt, although she was aware of Franklin’s shortcomings, in time came to hold De Sapió primarily responsible for his defeat” (19, p. 274).

Her critical and occasionally prejudiced stance toward John F. Kennedy had its source in her negative attitude toward his father, Joseph Kennedy, and the Catholic church: “Although Maureen Corr, Mrs. Roosevelt’s Irish-bred secretary ... considered her boss one of the least prejudiced human beings she ever knew, she sensed Mrs. Roosevelt’s deep fear of the church in politics in her opposition to Kennedy” (19, p. 282); Mrs. Roosevelt “knew the sins of the father should not be visited on the sons ... but she had to admit she was strongly affected by her feeling about Joe Kennedy” (19, p. 287). Bitterness, resentment, and evasion were evident in her reactions at the 1960 Democratic convention at which she hoped Adlai Stevenson would be nominated. When Kennedy won on the first ballot, she immediately left for the airport. Kennedy called her there but at first she did not want to take the call, then she told him that if he wanted to give her any messages he could do it through Franklin, Jr. (19, p. 296). These political occasions drew from her reactions rated here as petulance, bitterness, prejudice, coldness, stubbornness, and defiance.

Partiality to her own family was expressed in two ways: loyalty to the memory of FDR and loyalty to her children. While on one occasion she had replied negatively to a friend’s request that she ask a favor of President Truman, saying, “I am terribly sorry not to be able to do what you want but since I left Washington, I have never made a personal request of any kind of the President” (19, p. 171), when it was her son James asking her to speak on his behalf to President Truman (because in 1948 James Roosevelt supported
Eisenhower, not Truman), E.R. went to see the President. And when later James was not endorsed by him she was so upset and resentful that she refused to attend the United Nations, even though James' race by that time was viewed as hopeless" (19, p. 178). On this occasion she failed to separate loyalty to her family from her role as a public servant.1

Her depressions, which tended to be intense but brief, were triggered by quarrels between her grownup children or by reactions from close friends that she took as rejection.

"Sometimes... the banter and argument among her children became angry and sarcastic. She would try to stop it, but if unsuccessful, withdrew into herself" (19, p. 180). "One evening two of her sons nearly came to blows at her dinner table. When she tried to restrain them, both turned their accusations against her. The next day... she was in a deep depression, wishing, in fact, she were dead. 'My children would be much better off if I were not alive,' she said. 'I'm overshadowing them!'" (19, p. 182).

This pattern of depression is typical of those who in childhood have had occasions to become anxious over the availability of their parents. As a child E.R. enjoyed her father's attention and affection but she also put her through a number of painful nonappearances, when she ardently expected him to come, or disappearances while she was waiting for him to return (18, chap. 6; 30, chap. 1). He died when Eleanor was not yet 10 and she rarely saw him in the last three years of his life; they wrote each other frequently and these letters she carried with her to the end of her life. Eleanor's mother was cold and reproving toward her; she died when Eleanor was eight. These early childhood conditions do not fulfill Maslow's expectation that self-actualizing people grow up with well satisfied basic needs. The need for love and belonging was not satisfied for Eleanor, since her developmental need of secure attachment (4, 5) was severely undermined as was her need to belong—she felt as an outsider all through her teens (18, chap. 7). "Just as her response to being disappointed by her father had been silence and depression... so in later life she would become closed, withdrawn, and moody when people she cared about disappointed her" (19, p. 58). Eliot Roosevelt recalls her saying, "If I have one weakness, it is the need for approbation from people I love" (34, p. 115). At the age of 68 she could not face the thought of solitude and repeatedly appealed to her sons Elliott and John not to move away: "Living at Hyde Park itself means little to me. Keeping it for you and Johnny would have had a meaning" (34, p. 202).

Sometimes depressed moods were occasioned by bad memories. When she went to Campobello Island, where she used to spend the summers with the children and Franklin, she would be haunted by memories: "There are good and bad memories there, but the bad get the better of me when I'm there alone. I'll read a lot & practice typing & the lamps aren't too good for the night reading & there the night has a thousand eyes" (19, p. 187).

She felt guilt over the suicide of her former son-in-law, John Boettiger and discussed it with psychiatrist, Dr. Lawrence S. Kubie. In his words "she brought up very frankly her sense of guilt over John Boettiger's suicide, that he had written to her out of his depression and she had brushed it aside with hearty impatience and now felt that this had been insensitive and ruthless" (19, p. 181). She showed a bias against psychiatry, surprising in someone who saw several members of her family (her father, her uncle, and her brother) destroyed by lack of emotional coping and inability to overcome their flaws. Dr. Kubie said that she would catch what he meant but then she would lose it: "She never completely freed herself from the feeling that if one had courage enough, guts enough, and worked hard enough, one could hoist oneself by one's own bootstraps" (19, p. 182).

She blamed herself for FDR's love affair with Lucy Mercer (34, p. 37), and she blamed herself for his death: "The guilt remained for the rest of her life. She felt certain that had she supported and comforted him, they might have shared some autumn years content with each other's company" (34, p. 38). She blamed herself for the 17 divorces of her five children: "None of you older children experienced security... All you could possibly see in me was the disciplinarian, and bad-tempered too, sometimes" (34, p. 169); "I have to blame myself" (34, p. 170).

Having reviewed the instances of Imperfections identified in E.R.'s material we face the critical question: do these findings raise doubts about her self-actualization? We have seen that half of the material was occasioned by only three political situations: her position on Palestine, her attitude toward the Kennedys, and her attitude toward the political boss Carmine De Sapio. The remaining half of the instances of Imperfections were generated by her vulnerability toward those she loved. Her moments of depression, her bitterness, sarcasm, even her occasional coldness, are all understandable in terms of the occasions on which they occurred. These responses were not

---

1 On balance, it might be worth noting that in her column describing opening of the U.N. General Assembly in 1948 she humbly omitted any mention of the homage which was given to FDR's memory and to her presence.
chronically debilitating nor frequent enough to be regarded as enduring traits. These imperfections are within the range observed by Maslow, consequently, they do not contradict the completeness of her SA profile. However, her self-blame in regard to FDR and the divorces of her children appear unreasonable. This conflicts somewhat with A1 (More Efficient Perception of Reality) and A2 (Acceptance).

The fact that her need for love and belonging was not satisfied in her childhood explains her vulnerability and self-blame for the unhappiness of those closest to her heart. It also explains her fear of loneliness. It is the one area in which she did not completely transcend the wounds of her childhood. But then we do not know whether anyone ever does. What made her a self-actualizing individual was her compassion for others, her striving for independence, the conquest of her fears, the development of her talents as a public speaker, writer, and politician, and a sense of her own mission. The strength with which she carried on these tasks was the emotional power of her idealism and the “few close people whom I love dearly and who matter to me above everything else.” Thus, the source of her vulnerability was at the same time the source of her strength and self-actualization.

G. VALUE STRUCTURE AND SELF-ACTUALIZATION

The value structure is a consequence of the presence of traits of SA. As Maslow put it, the value structure is “automatically furnished to the self-actualizer by his philosophic acceptance of the nature of his self, of human nature, of much social life, and of nature and physical reality.” Value judgments of self-actualizing people “can often be understood as surface derivations of this source trait of acceptance.” The other sources are (a) Gemeinschaftsgefühl, (b) a basically satisfied condition, and (c) a characteristically discriminating relation to means and ends (24, p. 176).

From a theoretical point of view, the value structure of SA is an attribute of Level IV in Dabrowski’s theory (28). Level IV is a high level of development characterized by an autonomous hierarchy of values which are felt to be universal and intrinsically valid; inner growth is one of its central values and goals; there is congruence between belief in these values and their enactment. In the study of Saint-Exupéry it was first established that he was representative of Level IV; consequently, his value structure was given on the strength of this fact. In the present study we have not yet established to what degree Eleanor Roosevelt’s material meets the criteria of Level IV. If her material did not quite correspond to Level IV then we would be left with the intriguing question of the structure underlying her self-actualization. This question is taken up in a separate study (29).

Forty excerpts received G ratings for Values. For the most part they represent values of Justice and Truth, while the third, Beauty, is not represented. A number of the excerpts rated G deal with human rights: rights of the people above those of the government and rights of the individual against those of society. Other excerpts deal with world peace, honesty, and good will needed in the process of developing cooperation between individuals and between nations, congruence between the principles one believes in and one’s actions, citizen responsibility (mostly herself as a citizen): “It is not fair to ask of others what you are not willing to do yourself”; “… whether it defeated my son for office at any level, I would stand for the things in which I believe. It would be unworthy of an American citizen to do otherwise. I shall in the course of his [James’s] career take stands whether they help him to be elected to office or whether they defeat him” (19, p. 179). (The degree of individual political freedom among the Roosevelts in Eleanor’s family was remarkable. Her son John was a Republican and her other sons went to help Eisenhower in his presidential campaign, while she remained in opposition to his election. When her sons worked for Kennedy, she was campaigning for Adlai Stevenson and did not accept Kennedy until after the nomination.)

Twenty-eight of the 40 excerpts rated G for Values also had other ratings: A1, eight ratings; B1, eight ratings; B2, seven ratings; D1, five ratings; E, three ratings; Z, three ratings; A2, A4, and D2, two ratings each; A3, D3, C., C2, F, one rating each. (Because some excerpts received multiple ratings their total number, 45, is greater than the number of excerpts.) This distribution shows that E.R.’s value structure is represented mainly by the traits of More Efficient Perception of Reality (A1), Problem-Centeredness (B1 and B2), and Gemeinschaftsgefühl (D1). However, the overall picture is consistent with Maslow’s Being-values of Justice and Truth. In contrast to Saint-Exupéry, we find in her material little evidence for the value of Beauty. This does not mean that she was not sensitive to beauty in nature and in art,

---

1 The material collected to bear on this question is ample. Eleanor Roosevelt’s development was multilevel and the evidence shows first the dynamisms of Level III and later all the dynamisms of Level IV and perhaps beyond. Her development thus meets all the criteria for a Level IV structure. This closes the gap between Eleanor Roosevelt, the “doer,” and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, the “seer” (see section VI).
which indeed she was, but that her sensitivity here was not of the kind that sought active expression in the way the other values did. While she worked directly at creating justice and truth she was not working at creating beauty—the expressive beauty that is the artist's gift or the ecstatic beauty that is the mystic's gift.

V: NEW CATEGORIES: HUMILITY AND EQUITABLENESS

Our study suggests the possible addition of several new categories to Maslow’s original list of traits of self-actualization. A number of ratings—26 to be exact—were attributed to traits indicative of self-actualization but not represented in Maslow's categories. New possible categories and the numbers of excerpts by which they are represented include: Self-Discipline, two; Granting Autonomy, two; Using a Negative Experience in a Positive Way, one; Vitality, one; Humility, 11; Equitableness, nine.

There were two statements rated as Self-Discipline (a self-imposed regime of work for the sake of living up to one's calling). Self-discipline was a ruling principle in her life. She always subordinated immediate gratification to duty and long-range purposes (19, p. 181). She kept all engagements, sometimes against serious obstacles like snowstorms or physical pain (see below) and she answered all the 50 to 100 letters she was receiving daily (19, p. 170).

Using a Negative Experience in a Positive Way (being able to find some good in a painful or hurtful event or situation) best fits with Problem-Centering (B1) because the experience is viewed within a wider frame of reference. The one statement that was rated under this category was the result of her having been knocked down by a car in the street. In spite of the pain she insisted on making her appearance and keeping her appointment: “... People saw that I was in pain and we raised more money...” (19, p. 305). Granting Autonomy (deferring to another and setting the condition for the other to be free in his judgment, opinion, etc.) indicates a sense of fairness or equitableness and may best fit in with another new category, Equitableness (see below). It would have made her happy if Hyde Park had been chosen for the location of the UN headquarters for this would have been a fitting tribute to FDR but because the Big House was already turned over to the government she refrained from expressing any preference (19, p. 45-46).

Vitality is a kind of force or thrust toward living. Eleanor Roosevelt

---

1 It might be worth noting that using negatives experience in a positive way was characteristic of her even though this incident in Elliott Roosevelt’s description (34, p. 250) ends with her cancelling all engagements for the rest of the day; Lash, however, describes it as a witness (17, p. 357). The critical negative experiences in her life, her father’s death, her fears, Franklin’s affair with Lucy Mercer, she took as opportunities for inner growth. “The encouraging thing is that every time you meet a situation you may think that at the time it is an impossibility and you go through the tortures of the damned, once you have met it and lived through it you find that forever after you are freer than you were ever before. If you can live through that you can live through anything. You gain strength, courage, and confidence. ... You are able to say to yourself, ‘I lived through this horror. I can take the next thing that comes along” (33, p. 29).
showed an incredible level of energy and resistance to fatigue. In her White House years she often slept no more than three or four hours a night and sometimes would work through the night without ever going to bed. While at times she would deny having more energy than other people, she was quite capable of an accurate appraisal of her resources: "In a way I have been singularly fortunate in my heritage. From the Roosevelts, the Halls, and the Livingstons I have inherited great vitality, and a large capacity for both work and play. And I learned, as a small child, to follow a common-sense regime in living and to feel responsible for keeping myself in good health" (33, p. 54). But this characteristic of vitality is clearly underrepresented in our material because it did not occur to us to consider it as a category until late. However, in her "years alone" there are numerous examples of her stamina, energy, and strong will enabling her to carry on with so many strenuous tasks: traveling around the world on fact-finding missions, working at the United Nations, speaking on national issues, writing her column every day, writing books, running a television show, answering letters, campaigning. In her middle seventies she was still giving about 150 lectures a year. As mentioned before (cf. section IV, B2) younger people could not keep pace with her. When she was 74 she said: "I do not grow weary of travel and I do not tire easily—not so easily as some younger people I know . . . if I have a complaint about the kind of life I lead, that is—itI simply cannot find time to read as much as I wish" (31, p. 19). Vitality, however, is Eleanor Roosevelt's personal characteristic, whether or not it is common to all self-actualizing people remains to be seen, but it was also a characteristic of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry.

Humility received 11 ratings. These instances differ from the notion of humility embodied in Democratic Character Structure (D2) which Maslow described as being "honestly respectful and even humble before people who can teach them something they don't know." Eleanor Roosevelt's humility is more profound—a lack of any feeling of self-importance (see section IV, C1). On a number of occasions, Eleanor Roosevelt took respect she felt her as meant for FDR or the U.S. For example, when the people of Karachi knelt in the streets when she passed, she commented: "That's not for us . . . That's for someone of importance who is arriving," and upon reflecting on the event later, she commented, "I hadn't realized how they cared about Franklin" (19, p. 198). This clearly indicates that she did not believe they were offering the respect to her. Three other excerpts (19, pp. 19, 44, 210) refer to FDR in a similar manner. Here is another instance which occurred at the 1960 Democratic convention:

"She was as popular and beloved as ever. When she came into the Convention Hall, all heads turned, people stood up, and there was an ovation. She quickly took her seat and began fiddling with her purse. David nudged her. It's for you. You have to get up. Under protest, she did, but sat down quickly. 'It was rude to interrupt the speaker on the platform,' she said, and later wrote him an apology" (19, p. 295).

She was humble about herself and her presumed significance. For example, she was proposed for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1948 and was nominated in 1962; on both occasions she did not object to her name being submitted but did not see why she should be nominated at all (19, pp. 79 and 81). Considering the work she had done for world peace it is astonishing that she was not awarded the prize [see Appendix A: Eleanor Roosevelt and The Peace Prize in Lash (19)]. At 75 when she taught at Brandeis University as a visiting lecturer she declined to be called "professor" because she felt she did not deserve the title (19, p. 303).

This kind of humility is not mentioned in any of Maslow's original descriptions of traits of SA. One could, however, see a relation between humility and Democratic Character Structure (D2) and also Gemeinschaftsgefühl (D1). Dabrowski notes (7, vol. 1, pp. 186-187) that at higher levels of development feelings of inferiority become superseded by genuine humility. At Level II, one experiences strong feelings of inferiority toward others, there is a need for approval, acceptance, and recognition by one's social milieu. At Level III, there is a feeling of inferiority toward higher values, hence a feeling of inferiority toward oneself—frustration with not being all that one can become which Maslow named the "Jonah complex" (25, p. 35). At Level IV there is a balance of feelings of inferiority toward oneself and feelings of inferiority toward an ideal. Finally, at Level V all feelings of inferiority yield place to genuine humility (7, p. 193-194). In the early part of her life Eleanor Roosevelt felt inadequate and inferior and very much in need of others' approval but the guiding force of her life was the example of Christ (18, p. 350) hence her genuine humility grew out of strongly felt inferiority to an ideal.

Another potentially new category is Equatableness, the capacity to advocate or stress what, regarding a given issue, is in the best interests of all concerned. E.R.'s equatableness manifested itself in a number of ways—e.g., she refused the lifetime pension that the Congress wanted to award her (19, p. 41), she stressed women's contribution and need to participate in government, "Among our best workers in all campaigns are the women" (19, p. 141), she supported entrance of war veterans and young men
and women into leadership (19, p. 138). A staunch worker for civil rights she
did not forget consideration for the other side: “I think understanding and
sympathy for the white people in the South is as important” (19, p. 246).

In his last work, The Farther Reaches of Human Nature (25), Maslow
notes that self-actualizing people delight in bringing about justice which he
lists as a Being-value. Given the nine instances of Equitableness in the
present study, there is some justification for establishing it as a trait of
self-actualization.

VI. A “DOER” AND A “SEER”—NOT TOO FAR APART

The two principal questions of the study were whether or not Eleanor
Roosevelt was a self-actualizing person and whether the basis for distinc-
tion of two types of self-actualizers—the transscenders and the nontrans-
scenders—can be supported by more detailed analysis.

The material presented here and the history of her striving for inde-
pendence, overcoming her great fears, development of her talents as a public
speaker, writer, and politician, and her unswerving dedication to goals out-
side of herself, leave little doubt that she was a self-actualizing person. But
there is still the question whether she was self-actualizing in ways faithful
to Maslow’s description of self-actualizing people. Several differences have
surfaced in our study. Her depressions, need for others, and self-blame in
regard to her family appear to be of greater degree of intensity and, perhaps,
frequency, than Maslow’s descriptors would allow: “guilt over improvable
shortcomings” (A2, Acceptance) or not needing others “in the ordinary
sense” (A3, Quality of Detachment). These behaviors of hurt and with-
drawal have a common source in her emotional vulnerability going back to
her childhood. The evidence presented here shows that all the characteristics
of SA found robust realization in Eleanor Roosevelt. Her emotional vul-
nerness, rather than being an impediment, was one of the mainsprings of
her inner growth and self-actualization.

The second question regards the basis of distinguishing transscenders from
nontranscenders. Maslow saw Eleanor Roosevelt as a “doer” and thus a
transcender. Antoine de Saint-Exupéry was a transcender (28). The
self-actualization profile of Eleanor Roosevelt, as shown in Figure 1, is not
much different from that of Saint-Exupéry.

Because of the presence or absence of peak experiences, (C4) is not a
reliable criterion by which to distinguish transscenders from nontranscenders
(see section I, C), we have focused on the content of several traits: More
Efficient Perception of Reality (A1), Problem-Centering (B1), Interpersonal
Relations (E), and Imperfections (F). These traits appear to offer interesting
differences between Eleanor Roosevelt and Saint-Exupéry, and thus, pre-
sumably, between nontranscenders and transscenders. Maslow described
transcenders as those who live more in the realm of Being, the realm of
goodness, truth, beauty, wholeness, perfection, and justice, a realm of cre-
tion and vision; nontranscenders as those who live in the realm of Defi-
ciency, the realm of basic needs for safety, belonging, recognition, and es-
teem, a realm of action and social reform. Let us review briefly the content of
the SA traits suggested above.
Reality in Eleanor Roosevelt's way of perceiving things (A1 statements) is the reality of each individual life, one's network of relationships, the customs and traditions of one's home, one's economic situation and political beliefs, one's degree of access to the Four Freedoms: equal opportunity for education, justice before the law, right to work, and the right to vote. Reality in Saint-Exupéry's way of perceiving things is an unseen order, an inner unity, a "certain arrangement of things" and their "invisible links," "the divine knot which binds things together." The real life is the life of the spirit engaged in the search for the meaning of human existence—man transcending himself.

The problem-centering statements (B1) of Eleanor Roosevelt are more often, though not exclusively so, task-oriented, whereas those of Saint-Exupéry are most often problem-oriented in a more general philosophical, visionary sense. But both dealt with problems basic to the human race as a whole: Eleanor Roosevelt with world peace, human rights, and democracy, Saint-Exupéry with the spiritual survival of mankind. They are closest when they stress the necessity to partake of life and to be actively engaged in it, be it socially, politically, or creatively. This is what makes for living fully. They both tended to be concerned with problems that are universal, central to human existence and to its having meaning, and they both wanted to awaken their fellow humans to the utter urgency of these problems. While Saint-Exupéry pursued them to their ultimate roots and existential meaning, Eleanor Roosevelt acted on them in the present in the hope of building a better future. He spoke the language of Being because he was a poet, she spoke the language of action and cooperation because she was a human activist.

The analysis of the excerpts assigned the categories A1 and B1 shows that although the frequency ratings for a given characteristic of SA may be similar for two subjects, the nature and expression of the subjects' aims and actions may be quite different. We shall also see differences in regard to the content of excerpts rated as Imperfections (F) and Interpersonal Relations (E).

In regard to interpersonal relations there is a great deal of similarity in the way in which both Eleanor Roosevelt and Saint-Exupéry valued the friendships and bonds of love they established with a number of persons, but there are also some significant differences. Being a writer, Saint-Exupéry is more expressive and the theme of friendship is one of the main themes of his literary output and his personal letters. As civilization was to him more real in its unseen links than in its artifacts, so, too, friendship was to him another dimension of reality, a door to the essence of the other's being. What is characteristic of Eleanor Roosevelt's close relationships is the cherishing of each person, of finding in them her reason for living and carrying on her work. So, too, her depressions were occasioned always by the threat of loss of a relationship—a personal rather than existential despair. But if Eleanor Roosevelt did not like being alone, neither did Saint-Exupéry. And while her emotional vulnerability made her always think of the other person first, Saint-Exupéry habitually called his friends at 2:00 or 4:00 a.m. to read to them over the phone what he had just written so they could tell him if it sounded right. Saint-Exupéry suffered anxieties over his writing, Eleanor Roosevelt over not being wanted; they both needed others for reassurance. To be self-actualizing does not mean to be self-sufficient nor does it mean a detachment from others.

In terms of their imperfections, Eleanor Roosevelt's were occasioned in part by political situations and unavoidable feelings of irritation, anger, or bitterness, and in part by feeling rejected, by self-reproach for having failed those she loved. Saint-Exupéry's anxieties, sadness, depression, psychosomatic troubles were occasioned by a sense of spiritual solitude, pessimism and deep anguish over the fate of France under German invasion, and over the morass of political acrimony disuniting the French. At times his emotional balance was disturbed to the degree that it alarmed his friends. He would say then that he was tired of life (6, p. 478). Elliott Roosevelt believes that at one time Eleanor Roosevelt was close to suicide (34, p. 133). Looking at the sources of their imperfections reveals one striking difference: while Eleanor Roosevelt was most affected by disappointments in personal relationships, Saint-Exupéry was most affected by the threat of spiritual annihilation of humanity. We should not forget, however, that Eleanor Roosevelt was aware of the need for a United Nations Organization long before Hiroshima. After all, the U.N. was chiefly FDR's idea. After his death her work at the U.N. was motivated by her constant awareness of the possibility that mankind could wipe itself out.

Thus we see again that in some ways they were different from each other in keeping with the Being vs Deficiency, transcendent vs nontranscendent typology, but they are similar in their life of ideal, universal values, and deep sources of inspiration.

They both impressed people who met them for the first time with their kindliness and simplicity. They did not take advantage of the power and influence of their friends to ask favors for themselves: Eleanor Roosevelt because she never asked anything for herself, Saint-Exupéry because it
would have been an abuse of friendship. They both said about themselves that they were fatalists. It was not a passive stance, rather an acceptance of life and the inevitable that prevents a self-actualizing individual from futile thrashing about.

They were both troubled by psychosomatic ailments at times of deep distress; Saint-Exupéry more than Eleanor Roosevelt. This should not be surprising since they each carried heavy burdens of others and for others, it would be a misunderstanding to expect them not to be subject to the emotional wear and tear that goes with a deep engagement in their missions and the strenuous effort to fulfill them.

Each individual life was to them intrinsically valuable, not negotiable in terms of any logic of numbers or measures of large scale social good if it left someone out. The focus on the intrinsic value and inalienable rights of the individual forms the foundation of their life philosophies that human reality is first and foremost an individual reality because only individuals can be brothers. The ideal of universal brotherhood was an ideal that both Eleanor Roosevelt and Saint-Exupéry lived and worked for: she through her role at the United Nations, he through his job as an air pilot and a writer. Guided by the ideal of peace-making and cooperation their political aims were similar. They both recognized and expressed repeatedly that if men are to be brothers they must really know each other by which they meant a true understanding and appreciation of commonalities and differences.

They both abhorred the senselessness of war yet were not pacifists but realists who knew that war cannot be abolished by avoidance of fighting and that the pacifist stance can only lead to a takeover by the aggressor.

They were similar in their views regarding leadership. Eleanor Roosevelt stressed that a democratic leader must also be an educator, Saint-Exupéry stressed the leader's moral responsibility. They both adhered to the principle that human life is realized in actions guided by a goal outside of oneself. Because “what one does” means the work of one's whole life, everything that takes a person out of routine and thoughtless robot existence. Eleanor Roosevelt said it simply as “doing one's best” but her actions made world history; Saint-Exupéry said, “man becomes slowly, step by step by virtue of ceaseless striving and mastery,” and made world literature.

Thus they both lived basic human truths. Ideals that to many seem abstract or naive were to them a living thing. The significance of self-actualizing people lies in the fact that by living these truths they inspire others by their example. They are the carriers of universal values, they are individuals in whom everything human is concentrated and undistorted; they are evidence of the vitality of human spirit, they reaffirm the value of service to others and to an ideal, but not any ideal, only that which sets man free, which makes human beings into brothers and sisters, which allows people to trust one another, which expands their horizons, which awakens them to the life of spirit and enables them to go beyond and outside themselves.

"Somehow or other, human beings must get a feeling that there is in life a spring, a spring which flows for all humanity, perhaps like the old legendary spring from which men drew eternal youth. This spring must fortify the soul and give people a vital reason for wanting to meet the problems of the world today, and to meet them in a way which will make life worth living for everyone. It must be a source of social inspiration and faith" (Eleanor Roosevelt).

"There is one problem, one only: to rediscover that there is a life of the spirit which is still higher than the life of the mind, the only one which satisfies man. ... And the life of the spirit begins there where an 'integral' being is thought of over and above the materials which compose it" (Antoine de Saint-Exupéry).

The point of this brief impressionistic comparison is that what the two exemplars of self-actualization share is life inspired by the highest human ideals. Consequently, what they share is perhaps more significant because it inspires. But the power to inspire is a transcendent quality. In view of this, the difference between Eleanor Roosevelt and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry diminishes and the transcender-nontranscender distinction becomes less important. What emerges is the sense of a deep source of motivation in such people, what Dag Hammarskjöld called when he saw it in himself “a magnetic field in the soul.” At the present state of our understanding of extraordinary human beings we lack adequate models; at least we have an image.

The question remains whether there exist nontranscender self-actualizers who are less rooted in the ideal and less motivated by it than was Eleanor Roosevelt. Is it indeed possible to be self-actualizing and not be anchored in the transcendent realm?

---
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