

5-1-1978

Martin Buber's I-Thou Concept as Utilized in the Therapeutic Relationship of Selected Theories of Humanistic Psychotherapy

Stephen Eric Pitts

Recommended Citation

Pitts, Stephen Eric, "Martin Buber's I-Thou Concept as Utilized in the Therapeutic Relationship of Selected Theories of Humanistic Psychotherapy" (1978). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 261.
https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/261

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

MARTIN BUBER'S I-THOU CONCEPT AS UTILIZED IN
THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED
THEORIES OF HUMANISTIC PSYCHOTHERAPY

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Religion

by
Stephen Eric Pitts

May 1978

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Rev. Walter S. Moody

Co-operative Reader: Norman N. Bonner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE	1
THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	5
DELIMITATIONS	5
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	5
Definitions of Terms	5
Psychotherapy	5
Humanistic Psychotherapy	6
Client	6
Therapist	6
Basic Assumptions of Humanistic Psychotherapy	6
METHOD OF PROCEDURE	8
2. MARTIN BUBER'S I-THOU CONCEPT	10
BUBER'S LIFE AND BACKGROUND	12
Educational Background	12
Post University Years	14
Academic Career	16
I AND THOU: PART ONE	17
Primary Concepts	17
Three Spheres of Relation	20
Relation to Nature	21
Relation to Men	21

J. of W. 7-3-18

Chapter	Page
Relation to Spiritual Beings	21
The Thou Relation	22
Totality	22
Will and Grace	22
Immediacy	23
Mutuality	24
From You to It	24
Silence	28
Awareness	29
THE IT-WORLD	29
Forms of the Spirit	31
Relation with Men	32
Relation with Nature	33
THE ETERNAL YOU	36
I-You Relationships with Men and God	36
Other Relationship Positions	38
God: The Eternal Thou	41
Buber's Conclusion	43
3. THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP IN HUMANISTIC PSYCHOTHERAPY .	45
GESTALT THERAPY	45
History of Gestalt Therapy	45
The Therapeutic Relationship	47
Perls	47
Yonteff	50
Fagan	51
Erving and Miriam Polster	53

	iv
Chapter	Page
Zahm	55
Pfeiffers	57
CLIENT-CENTERED THERAPY	57
History of Client-Centered Therapy	57
The Therapeutic Relationship	59
Client-Centered Therapy	60
On Becoming a Person	62
Person to Person	67
Congruence	67
Empathy	68
Positive Regard	69
Unconditionality of Regard	69
The Client's Perception	70
Rogers' Conclusion	70
REALITY THERAPY	71
The History of Reality Therapy	71
The Therapeutic Relationship	73
Involvement	73
Acceptance of client - rejection of irresponsible behavior	75
Relearning	77
The Identity Society	78
Rachin	79
4. I-THOU IN THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP	83
Gestalt Therapy and the I-Thou Concept	83
Here and Now	83
Wholeness	85

Chapter	Page
Reciprocity	85
Openness	88
Intimacy	89
Silence	90
Awareness	91
Contact Rhythm	91
Client-Centered Therapy and The I-Thou Concept	92
Complete Communication	92
Equality	93
Genuineness	94
Acceptance	95
Totality and Wholeness	95
Freedom	97
Immediacy	97
Congruence	99
Empathy	100
Positive regard	101
Unconditionality of regard	101
The client's perception	102
Reality Therapy and the I-Thou Concept	103
Involvement	103
Reciprocity	104
Here and Now	105
Acceptance	105
Separateness	106
Genuineness	106

Chapter	Page
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	107
Gestalt Therapy	109
Client-Centered Therapy	110
Reality Therapy	111
CONCLUSIONS	111
Gestalt Therapy	112
Client-Centered Therapy	113
Reality Therapy	114
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	116

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem

Individuals, couples and families in contemporary society are subjected to a number of stresses. If a person is unable to adequately cope with such stresses, the resultant effect can be excessive emotional pain which may manifest itself in a number of ways. Depression, loneliness and fear are examples of problems experienced by many people within our society. Although such emotional feelings are normal and present within well-adjusted persons, these difficulties listed as well as others, may escalate to a point where professional counseling is required.

Modern society along with its technological advances has produced new vehicles of stress for its members. An example is the modern nuclear family and its lack of support systems. Prior generations were more likely to remain in one area where the extended family could serve as a support system for the nuclear family. Grandparents, aunts and uncles, and cousins were a part of the community in which one grew up and stayed to further perpetuate extended family support systems. Modern families are highly mobile, often making several moves during the years that the children are growing up. Such moves often create more distance between traditional support systems and also involve feelings similar to grief with each successive move.

Virginia Satir pointed out other stresses affecting the modern family such as the tendency to equate individual worth with income earned.¹ Thus exists the phenomenon of the upwardly mobile family which psychologist Michael J. Ebner characterizes as having "two cars and color T.V.s, a boat, home in the suburbs, and well dressed and absolutely miserable children."² Satir also mentioned the de-personalization of our mechanized society and the subsequent specialization of roles leaving individuals "feeling powerless to influence outer events."³

Satir also wrote of the transitory nature of assumptions, absolutes, norms and values. Roles are no longer pre-determined by family background, tradition and social order. Roles have to be learned with the uncertainty that often accompanies learning.⁴ Such questioning of traditional beliefs, although merited in many instances, nevertheless weakens bases on which the family could rely.

The industrial revolution also started trends in the area of family life that required the male to spend most of his waking hours away from his family and at the same time required the female to spend all of her time at home with the children. The male assumes a role that has little room for intimacy or the display of emotions and instead encourages a competitive drive to get ahead by making more money. The feminist movement with its philosophy of greater degrees of equalization

¹Virginia Satir, Conjoint Family Therapy, (Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1967), p. 23.

²Michael J. Ebner, "It's All In The Family", (Portland, Oregon: Preliminary Findings on the Case Management Project, 1975), p. 1.

³Satir, p. 23.

⁴Ibid.

of sex roles would seem to benefit men as well as women with the re-opening of areas such as the display of emotions or openness to intimacy. The feminist movement however, can also be a cause of stress as it represents a change from the status quo.

Individuals are subjected to the previously mentioned vehicles of stress and most are able to adequately cope with the strain. Yet, even the well adjusted person is subject to events in life that also cause stress. Death of a spouse, child, parent or other loved one presents a time of strain that everyone endures. Marriage, divorce, childbirth, school, employment and loss of employment are other incidents which may lead to inability to cope with the event without help even for the well adjusted person.

Finally, the recent emphasis on personal growth is noted. The establishment of growth centers and the subsequent acceptance of the concept of therapy for personal growth is increasingly evident in our western culture.

Traditional members of the so-called helping professions, which would include ministers as perhaps the most often utilized "helper" as well as social workers, counselors and physicians, seem to indicate a continued need for professionally trained mental health practitioners to provide counseling and psychotherapeutic services to members of the community.

These counselors and psychotherapists do not agree on what is the best or most efficient method or theory. Psychoanalytic, behavioristic and humanistic schools of thought all differ in basic assumptions and methodology. However, as C.H. Patterson stated:

There does seem to be agreement that counseling or psychotherapy are processes involving a special kind of relationship between a person who asks for help with a psychological problem (the client or patient) and a person who is trained to provide that help (the counselor or the therapist).⁵

The goals of such counseling that takes place within the framework of such a relationship have been identified by the Committee on Definition, Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association as "to help individuals toward overcoming obstacles to their personal growth, wherever these may be encountered, and toward achieving optimal development of their personal resources."⁶

Thus, it is the relationship between client and therapist that assumes the important role as the vehicle through which the goals of counseling are achieved.

The term relationship however is rather vague and open to interpretations. I and Thou, by Martin Buber, a volume on the essence of relationships has served as a basis for clarification of the types of relationships persons can have with each other. The I-Thou concept which is essentially religious in nature, has been a foundation for discussions regarding relationships in theological and philosophical as well as counseling spheres. It seems to be of particular interest to the humanistic psychotherapist. In the counseling area, I and Thou, and the relationships described therein would appear to be of help in understanding the nature of the client-therapist relationship.

⁵C.H. Patterson, Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy, Second Edition (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), p. xii.

⁶American Psychological Association, Division of Counseling Psychology, Committee on Definition, Counseling Psychology as a speciality, American Psychologist, 1956.

Statement of the Problem

Therefore, it has been the problem of this study to determine if, and to what extent, elements of the I-Thou relationship are utilized in the client-therapist relationship in the selected theories of Gestalt, Client-Centered and Reality therapies viewed as being within the theoretical framework of humanistic psychotherapy.

DELIMITATIONS

This study has been limited to the school of counseling, commonly referred to as humanistic psychotherapy. It has not been the purpose of this study to make a full investigation of all aspects of humanistic psychotherapy. Rather, the purpose was to examine the client-therapist relationship in the three selected theories of Gestalt, Client-Centered and Reality therapies which are generally classified as humanistic. Nor did this study involve investigation of psychoanalytic or behavioristic theories of psychotherapy either in terms of their totality or the client-therapist relationship.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Definition of Terms

Psychotherapy. The following definition which was based upon a statement of the American Psychological Association, Division of Counseling Psychology, Committee on Definition, Counseling Psychology as a Speciality, was used:

Psychotherapy is a method of treatment for problems of an emotional nature. A professional relationship is established between client and therapist with the general objectives of helping

'individuals toward overcoming obstacles to their personal growth, wherever these may be encountered, and toward achieving optimal development of their personal resources'.⁷

The term psychotherapy has, in this paper, been used synomously with counseling and therapy.

Humanistic psychotherapy. Humanistic psychotherapy is the so-called third force of psychotherapy and psychology based on humanistic assumptions of the nature of man as described in the section below.

Client. The client is the person with problems of an emotional nature undergoing psychotherapy - used synomously with patient.

Therapist. The therapist is the trained professional providing the psychotherapy.

Basic Assumptions of Humanistic Psychotherapy

The field of humanistic psychotherapy sometimes referred to as the third force in psychotherapy and psychology, was formally drawn together in 1962 at the instigation of Abraham Maslow. A professional organization, The Association of Humanistic Psychology, was formed at that time to promote the exploration of "the behavioral characteristics and emotional dynamics of full and healthy human living."⁸ The association published four elements of a healthy life which, by definition, become the objective of therapy. They are:

⁷American Psychological Association, Division of Counseling Psychology, Committee on Definition, Counseling Psychology as a Speciality, American Psychologist, 1956.

⁸Charlotte Buhler and Melanie Allen, Introduction to Humanistic Psychology, (Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972) p. 1.

- 1) A centering of attention on the experiencing person, and thus a focus on experience as the primary phenomenon in the study of man. Both theoretical explanations and overt behavior are considered secondary to experience itself and to its meaning to the person.
- 2) An emphasis on such distinctively human qualities as choice, creativity, valuation, and self-realization, as opposed to thinking about human beings in mechanistic and reductionistic terms.
- 3) An allegiance to meaningfulness in the selection of problems for study and of research procedures, and an opposition to a primary emphasis on objectivity at the expense of significance.
- 4) An ultimate concern with and valuing of the dignity and worth of man and an interest in the development of the potential inherent in every person. Central in this view is the person as he discovers his own being and relates to other persons and to social groups.⁹

G. Donald Polenz, a professor at the School of Social Work at Arizona State University, wrote of the theoretical assumptions of the third force where he began with an existential/humanistic/perceptual basis.

The premise is: an understanding of people and the helping process must both be substantially based upon other people's perceptions of their world and their problems and not primarily upon the helper's perception and orientation. Humanistic helping processes accept, as valid, the premise that a problem exists as it is perceived by the person owning the problem. Helping, then, continues as a process closely tied to the here-and-now experiences as the foundation within change will occur. Helping in this manner (in an oversimplified sense) is very existential, very experiential, very here-and-now reality based, and very humanistic.¹⁰

Polenz went on to explain the theoretical overview of two approaches to understanding other people. The first is that an outsider can understand an individual through his own perception. He continued:

A helper can look at others, observe their behavior, hear their life histories, use projective devices and, on the basis of selected

⁹Buhler and Allen, p. 1.

¹⁰G. Donald Polenz, Ed., Helping As A Humanistic Process: Perspectives and Viewpoints, (Milburn, N.J.: R.F. Publishing, Inc., 1975), p. i.

theory, infer that the helper then understands and knows those individuals. The other choice of approach is that people can also be understood primarily from the vantage point of their own perceptions of their persons and their beings. The latter choice implies the knowing of another person and their being as that other person perceives himself to be. The issue is one of whether to elect knowing another person by placing substantial reliance upon the helper's perception of the other's reality or whether to give primary emphasis to the validity of the perception another individual holds of himself.¹¹

Thus, exists the emphasis upon knowing the client and the acceptance of his perception of himself. Other elements of import to the humanistic psychotherapist involve the assumptions about human nature. They are:

(1) that human beings are distinct and different from animals, (2) human beings deserve dignity and a higher place in the scheme of life, (3) human beings are the only beings able to construct a sense of self, (4) human beings are autonomous, (5) man is a whole, (6) man's dysfunction is manifested by painful or unacceptable behavior, thoughts and feelings, and (7) the process of changing behavior involves insight into the thought, behavior and feelings.¹² The humanistic psychotherapist assumes a holistic approach to the nature of man.

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

The primary function of chapter two was to provide a survey of the concepts presented in I and Thou and other writings of Martin Buber. This was accomplished by a brief biographical study of Buber followed by analysis of the three sections of I and Thou covering the basic framework

¹¹Ibid., p. 1.

¹²Dennis Saleebey, "A Proposal to Merge Humanist and Behaviorist Perspectives", Social Casework, LVI. No. 8, (October, 1975), pp. 469-471.

of I-Thou and I-It relationships, the It-world and the Eternal Thou. The dialogical elements of silence and awareness were also dealt with.

In chapter three, an examination was made of the client-therapist relationship in Gestalt, Client-Centered and Reality therapies. Brief historical sketches of each theory were also included.

Chapter four was the discussion phase of this paper. It was concerned with the elements of commonality and utilization of I-Thou principals in the client-therapist relationship of each theory.

Chapter five was a summary of the study, including conclusions reached by the writer.

Chapter 2

MARTIN BUBER'S I-THOU CONCEPT

Martin Buber has had a profound impact on the field of religious philosophy in this century. Although Buber's life, study and writings were rooted in his Jewish background, the influence of his thought has extended beyond the Jewish community. His influence has also touched spheres other than philosophy and theology. Education, literature, psychology, sociology, psychotherapy and social work all have benefited from Buber's thought and work.¹ His contribution to the related fields of social work, psychology and, in particular, psychotherapy are examined in this paper.

The core of Buber's writings is the I-Thou concept as originally developed in the German language as Ich und Du, completed in 1923. The first English translation I and Thou completed by Ronald Gregor Smith, Professor of Divinity at Glasgow University, became available in 1937.² Professor Smith's translation has served as the standard English language version of I and Thou until Walter Kaufmann, who is a professor of philosophy at Princeton University completed a new translation in 1970 at the request of Martin Buber's son, Rafael.³ The most noticeable

¹Will Herberg, The Writings of Martin Buber (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), p. 11.

²Martin Buber, I and Thou, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937).

³Martin Buber, I and Thou, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970).

change that Dr. Kaufmann makes is the elimination of the word Thou and the substitution of the more contemporary You. Kaufmann's position has been that the term Thou is archaic and leads to misunderstandings of Buber's original German text.⁴ Although Smith's translation will be utilized, Kaufmann's translation shall serve as the primary basis for this writer's examination of the I-Thou concept.

The I-Thou relationship has been expanded upon by Buber, particularly in his book Between Man and Man first published in English in 1947. His stated purpose was "filling out and applying what was said in I and Thou with particular regard for the needs of our time."⁵ The first segment of this volume, Dialogue, "proceeded from the desire to clarify the dialogical principal presented in I and Thou, to illustrate it and make precise its relationship to essential spheres of life."⁶ Thus the concept of the I-Thou relationship encompasses more than a single volume. Herberg went on to state that the I-Thou relationship and the dialogical concept are interwoven into Buber's entire life and writings.⁷

In order to adequately examine the I-Thou concept, this chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) Buber's life and background, (2) part one of I and Thou, (3) part two of I and Thou, and finally (4) part three of I and Thou. Pertinent material dealing with the

⁴Buber, I and Thou, p. 14.

⁵Martin Buber, Between Man and Man, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. vii.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Herberg, p. 11.

I-Thou relationship from Buber's other works shall be investigated in the appropriate sections as listed above.

BUBER'S LIFE AND BACKGROUND

Mordecai Martin Buber was born on February 8, 1878 in Vienna. At the age of three, his parents divorced and he was sent to live with his grandfather, Solomon Buber, in Lemberg in Galicia. Solomon Buber was interested in business and farming but his primary involvement was as a Midrash scholar. Young Martin Buber was immersed in Jewish culture and tradition with his grandfather emphasizing a respect for study of the Hebrew Bible and language. R.G. Smith stated that the influence of his grandfather was to create the framework for Buber's entire life.⁸ The study of Judaism was to remain one of Buber's life tasks. While living with his grandparents, Buber first came in contact with Hasidism which also had a significant influence on his thought and writings. Hasidic communities, which emphasized Piety and strict observance of Jewish law were being established at that time and Buber spent time in the summer with his father at such a settlement at Sadagora in Bukovina. The study of languages was also encouraged by Solomon Buber and his grandson eventually learned French, Latin, Hebrew, along with his native German and Polish.

Educational Background

At the age of fourteen, Martin Buber returned to his father who had remarried and enrolled at a Polish grammar school in Lemberg. This

⁸R.G. Smith, Martin Buber (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), p. 2.

time at school led him away from his grandfather and Hasidism's affect which lasted until his twenty sixth year. Buber wrote of the changes that occurred when he left his grandfather's house and was no longer under his influence:

So long as I lived with him, my roots were firm, although many questions and doubts also jogged about in me. Soon after I left his house, the whirl of the age took me in . . . my spirit was in study and multiple movement, in an alternation of tension and release, determined by manifold influences taking over new shape, but without center and without growing substance.⁹

Buber was not able to completely work through these feelings for twelve years.

While at school, Buber became haunted over the questions and meaning of time and space as it relates to man. It became such an overwhelming mystery that he, for a while, contemplated suicide. He finally became acquainted with Immanuel Kant's Prolegomena which introduced him to the concept that time and space exist in the minds of men and the struggle he was involved in was with the questions of his own being rather than just time and space.¹⁰ Kant's writing remained as an influence throughout Buber's life.

In 1896 Buber enrolled at the University of Vienna where he studied literature, philosophy, the history of art and the theatre. He received his Ph.D. from this university in 1904. Buber's life, aware from the influence of his grandfather and Hasidism, continued with Buber turning away from his Jewish background. At Vienna, Buber became acquainted with the thought of Ludwig Feuerbach, who's philosophical

⁹ Martin Buber, Hasidism and Modern Man, trans., Maurice Friedman (New York: Harper Torchbacks, 1958), p. 53.

¹⁰ Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 11.

position emphasized totality of man and his relationships with others. As will be seen in later sections of this chapter, these two aspects of Feuerbach's formed a focal point of the I-Thou concept.

Buber studied at the University of Berlin from 1898 to 1901. It was during this time that Buber developed his interest in the mystical, the first of three stages of his philosophy, the last two being the existential and the dialogical, that led to the formation of I and Thou.¹¹

Buber also studied at the Universities of Leipzig and Zurich. During his final periods of study, he gradually returned to a closer alignment with his Jewish roots and culture.

Post University Years

During the first year of his work at the University of Berlin in 1901, Buber became directly involved in the Zionist movement as editor of the journal Die Welt in Vienna and moved to that city. This was short lived however, as Buber's ideas concerning Zionism involved the cultural and spiritual aspects over the purely political motives of the movement's leaders. He left this position in less than a year to move back to Berlin. In Berlin he formed a publishing house which became a forum for Zionism that emphasized his interest in the spiritual and cultural basis of the movement.

Buber's life took a change in direction in 1904. He withdrew from his activities as a leader and spokesman for Zionism and returned instead to the study of Hasidism. He would spend the next five years reading Hasidist texts and writings. The movement took a special interest

¹¹ Maurice Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1955), p. 27.

in the concept of the whole man which seemed to intrigue Buber and was indeed to become a core element of the philosophy of I and Thou.

Buber's interest in Zionism reappeared in 1916, when he founded the journal Der Jude which became a forum for his ideas. He continued as editor for this publication until 1924.

During this period, Buber went through two significant philosophical changes. The first being his change from his mystical orientation to that of the existential. This change to the "everyday", as Buber called it, was first developed in Daniel published in 1913.¹² The second change in Buber's thought was his gradual movement from the existential to the dialogical approach. This came about in the years 1916 to 1923 during which he wrote the first draft of I and Thou and had it published in 1923.

It should be noted however, that although there was a progression from mystical to existential to dialogical, Buber's primary concern remained in the realm of the whole man. Wood stated:

But the single thread that runs through the whole of Buber's life and thought, gathering them together into a dynamic unity, is his concern for unity: unity of the whole being, unity within an individual being, unity between individual beings. And the constant elements in that concern for unity were God, the world, and man, seen in varying relationships as his thoughts develop.¹³

Thus it is his concern for unity as seen throughout the three stages of mystical, existential and dialogical approaches that leads to the development of I and Thou.

¹² Martin Buber, Daniel: Gespräche von der Verwirklichung (Leipzig: Insel. Verlag, 1913).

¹³ Robert E. Wood, Martin Buber's Ontology (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1969), p. 6.

Academic Career

In 1923 Martin Buber accepted a position as Professor of Jewish History of Religion and Ethics at Frankfurt University. This position was subsequently expanded to include the entire area of religious history. In 1933, the German government was under the control of the Nazi's and Buber was removed from his professorship. For the next five years, Buber was involved in the struggle of Jews in Germany, primarily engaging in education of the Jewish community.

At the age of sixty, in 1938, Buber was called to be Professor of Social Philosophy at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. He remained at the University until his official retirement in 1951. During this time, Buber also established the Institute for Adult Education which focused on personal contact and living together in a small community.¹⁴

These were difficult years for Buber. World War II and the annihilation of millions of Jews in Germany was followed by the Jewish war for independence in 1948. The formation of Israel was filled with controversy for Buber. His form of Zionism had always included the concept of Arab and Jewish cooperation in Palestine. This concept was unwelcomed by those in authority who had less concern for Arab rights.

Upon his retirement in 1951, Buber began an extensive tour of lectures in Europe and the United States which finally ended in 1958. Also during this time, he gathered together his writings in a number of larger volumes.

In 1965, at the age of eighty seven, Martin Buber died at his home in Israel.

¹⁴Wood, p. 25.

I AND THOU: PART ONE

The first part of I and Thou presents the basic framework of Buber's I-Thou theme. It consists of concise sentences and paragraphs that introduce the reader to the primary concepts that then lead to the discussion of the It world in Part Two and in Part Three, the Eternal Thou. As will be seen, I and Thou refers to the I-Thou or as it is translated by Kaufmann, I-You relationship. It is a relationship of the highest quality and is characterized by wholeness and totality and involves true, reciprocal relationship between subject and subject as opposed to subject and object. The relation is based on "meeting" or "encounter" and takes place in the present. It is important to note that the basic words I-You and I-It do not signify things but relation.

Buber used a rather unique style of writing. There are three separate untitled divisions of the book. Each section within the three divisions is separated by an asterisk. Occasional reference shall be made to these sections.

Primary Concepts

Buber began the first of the three untitled sections by stating "The world is twofold for man in accordance with his twofold attitude."¹⁵ Buber's notion of the world sets an important basis for his philosophy. There are not two worlds, but one which is twofold and one which is "in accordance with man's twofold attitude."¹⁶ The world that Buber talked

¹⁵Buber, I and Thou, p. 54.

¹⁶Ibid.

about is one that is experienced through its physical existence.¹⁷ Thus, it is man's perception of the world that forms a basic concept of I and Thou.

The attitude of man determines which one of the two aspects of the world exists in a given situation. This attitude expresses itself through the basic terms I-You and I-It. (As does Kaufmann, this paper shall, for the most part, use the more modern term You in place of Thou.) The word pairs signify the relationship between the two words. Buber pointed out that I is never used by itself. There is always an additional word in the pair, either It or You. For when one says I, it is in relationship to something else. Thus, it is either an I-You or an I-It relationship. The I-You relation is one that involves the whole being. The I-It word pair and relationship can never involve the whole being.¹⁸ In this regard, Buber also pointed out that the It of the basic words I-It can be replaced by He or She. Thus, the relationship signified by I-It can and does involve other humans. However, both You and It can involve humans, nature and spiritual beings.¹⁹

The ideas of the type of relationship is expanded upon in the first few pages of I and Thou. He stated of the world of It:

I perceive something. I feel something. I imagine something. I want something. I sense something. I think something. The life of a human being does not consist merely of all this and its like. All this and its like is the basis of the realm of It.²⁰

¹⁷Wood, p. 34.

¹⁸Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 57.

²⁰Ibid., p. 54.

From this discussion of the realm of It, he then turned to the You:

Whoever says You does not have something for his object. For wherever there is something there is also another something; every It borders on other Its; It is only by virtue of bordering on others. But where You is said there is no something. You has no borders. Whoever says You does not have something; he has nothing.²¹

Thus Buber's emphasis on relationship is now stated. Of this relationship, Herberg stated:

The 'primary word' I-Thou points to a relationship of person to person, of subject to subject, a relation of reciprocity involving 'meeting' or 'encounter', while the 'primary word' I-It points to a relation of person to thing, of subject to object, involving some sort of utilization, domination, or control, even if it is only so-called 'objective' knowing.²²

Buber also eliminated the term "experience" from the I-You relationship. If one experiences the world Buber would say he is traveling over something and "experiences" only its surface. The I-You relation is one of intimacy which is developed through a "prolonged dwelling with the other."²³ This analogy emphasizes the depth of the I-You concept. Experience of the world is in the realm of I-It. I-You establishes the world of relation.²⁴

The fifth asterisk section of I and Thou gives a concise sketch of the relationship with the Other where Buber stated "You has no borders. Whoever says You does not have something; he has nothing. But he stands in relation."²⁵

²¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

²²Herberg, p. 14.

²³Wood, p. 40.

²⁴Buber, I and Thou, p. 56.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 55.

Three Spheres of Relation

Buber elaborated on the concept of the areas of relation. They are: (1) life with nature, (2) life with men, and (3) life with spiritual beings. He initially described the characteristics according to the following formula. Life with nature remains "below language" and the relation "vibrates in the dark." In life with men, "the relation is manifest and enters language. We can give and receive the You."²⁶ Life with spiritual beings becomes more complex and in the third major segment of I and Thou Buber deals in this realm in more detail. The basic framework however, presents the following outline of this area. Buber stated:

Here the relation is wrapped in a cloud but reveals itself, it lacks but creates language. We hear no you and yet feel addressed; we answer-creating, thinking, acting; with our being we speak the basic word, unable to say You with our mouth.²⁷

Buber next addressed the question "how can we incorporate into the world of the basic word what lies outside language?"²⁸ He stated:

In every sphere, through everything that becomes present to us, we gaze toward the train of the eternal You; in each we perceive a breath of it; in every You we address the eternal You, in every sphere according to its manner.²⁹

This section brings into focus Buber's concern for a relationship with what believers call God and philosophers call the absolute.³⁰ The Eternal You is present in every You.

²⁶Buber, I and Thou, p. 57.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid., p. 59.

²⁹Ibid., p. 57.

³⁰Wood, p. 45.

Relation to Nature. Buber treats each realm separately, the first through his contemplation of a tree. Buber described the tree's physical dimensions and points out how it remains an object. He then wrote of the I-You relationship with nature by stating: "But it can also happen, if will and grace are joined, that as I contemplate the tree, I am drawn into a relation, and the tree ceases to be an It."³¹ Buber follows this description by mentioning one of the major points of I and Thou relationships, the idea that relation is reciprocity.³²

Relation to Men. Buber then shifted to an elaboration of the relation to men starting out by stating that "he is no thing among things nor does he consist of things."³³ He further stated that "neighborless and seamless, he is You and fills the firmament. Not as if there were nothing but he; but everything else lives in his light . . . The human being to whom I say You I do not experience. But I stand in relation to him, in the sacred basic word (I-You)."³⁴

Relation to Spiritual Beings. The third area has proven to be more difficult to translate from German. Wood disagreed with Smith's translation into English of the term spiritual beings. What seems to be an intent of Buber in this particular passage is relation to forms of the spirit in art, thought and activity.³⁵ He utilizes the relation with a

³¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 58.

³²Ibid.

³³Ibid., p. 59.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Wood, p. 50.

work of art as his example for this section.

The Thou Relation

Buber completed his initial frame work of basic concepts in the preceding asterisked section and now begins his discussion of the elements of the Thou relation consisting of totality, will and grace, immediacy and mutuality.³⁶

Totality. Buber wrote succinctly regarding the characteristic of the relationship when one knows of the You.

What, then, does one experience of the You? Nothing at all. For one does not experience it. What, then, does one know of the You? Only everything. For one no longer knows particulars.³⁷

Of this element, Buber stressed the importance and depth of the word "know" and indicates that seeing the whole is involved.³⁸

Will and Grace. Buber began this section by stating that the "you encounters me by grace - it cannot be found by seeking."³⁹ The conscious seeking out of the I-You relation is inadequate, it occurs through grace. Wood illustrated this point by using the analogy of entering a friendship where the relationship is more tangible. He stated that the openness to relation is preparation only, a prerequisite, as the You must ultimately give of itself for a true I-You relationship to occur.⁴⁰ Buber stated:

³⁶Wood, p. 50.

³⁷Buber, I and Thou, p. 61.

³⁸Wood, p. 58.

³⁹Buber, I and Thou, p. 62.

⁴⁰Wood, p. 53.

The You encountered me but I enter into a direct relationship to it. Thus, the relationship is election and electing, passive and active at one: An action of the whole being must approach passivity, for it does away with all partial actions and thus with any sense of action, which always depends on limited exertions.⁴¹

Wood commented on this section by stating that the ". . . I attains its wholeness through the Other. One's life totality is possible only through the Other's cooperation."⁴² The final sentence of Buber's section of will and grace ends by stating: "All actual life is "encounter."⁴³ Smith translated it as "meeting" rather than "encounter."⁴⁴

Immediacy. Maurice Friedman who is generally acclaimed as the most knowledgeable expert on Buber emphasized the concept of real life being encounter. He went on to point out the characteristics of the encounter, which are mutuality, directness, presentness, intensity and ineffability, as it forms the I-You relationship.⁴⁵ Buber encompasses these characteristics in several asterisked sections as is his style. He began by stating:

The relation to the You is unmediated. Nothing conceptual intervenes between I and You, no prior knowledge and no imagination; and memory is itself changed as it plunges from particularity into wholeness. No purpose intervenes between I and You, no greed and no anticipation; and longing itself is changed as it plunges from the dream into appearance. Every means is an obstacle, only where all means have disintegrated encounters occur.⁴⁶

⁴¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 62.

⁴²Wood, p. 54.

⁴³Buber, I and Thou, p. 62.

⁴⁴Buber, I and Thou, trans. Smith, p. 11.

⁴⁵Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1955), p. 57.

⁴⁶Buber, I and Thou, pp. 62-63.

Buber expanded this theme when he listed the prerequisites for the "present" as it relates to immediacy. They are as Friedman indicated, presentness, encounter and relation.⁴⁷ These must exist before the "actual and fulfilled present exists."⁴⁸ Thus, the "present of the I-Thou relation is not the abstract point between past and future that indicates that something has just happened but the real filled present."⁴⁹

Mutuality. Buber wrote of another element of the I-You relationship when he stated:

Relation is reciprocity. My You acts on me as I act on it. Our students teach us, our works form us. The "wicked" become a revelation when they are touched by the sacred basic word. How we are educated by children, by animals! Inscrutably involved, we live in the currents of universal reciprocity.⁵⁰

Friedman commented on the concept of mutuality or reciprocity:

To be fully real the I-Thou relation must be mutual. This mutuality does not mean simple unity or identity, nor is it any form of empathy. Though I-Thou is the word of relation and togetherness, each of the members of the relation really remains himself, and that means really different from the other. Though the I is not an It, it is also not 'another I'. He who treats a person as 'another I' does not really see that person but only a projected image of himself. Such a relation, despite the warmest 'personal' feeling, is really I-It.⁵¹

From You to It

After defining the I-You relation in the first portion of this section, Buber abruptly shifted from the You to the It. He wrote:

⁴⁷ Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 57.

⁴⁸ Buber, I and Thou, p. 63.

⁴⁹ Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 58.

⁵⁰ Buber, I and Thou, p. 67.

⁵¹ Wood, p. 61.

This, however, is the sublime melancholy of our lot that every You must become an It in our world. However, exclusively present it may have been in the direct relationship - as soon as the relationship has run its course or is permeated by means, the You becomes an object among objects, possibly the noblest one and yet one of them, assigned its measure and boundary.⁵²

All I-You relationships inevitably cease to exist. With this shift in the text Buber stated how the qualities of I-You relationship will end. Wood commented: "Every thou encountered in immediacy, totalization, responsibility, affirmation, and mutuality inevitably becomes an It, a thing among things."⁵³

Buber once more emphasized the importance of the relationship when he stated: "In the beginning is the relation."⁵⁴ Wood pointed out that "out of relation all thing-like structures emerge to people man's world."⁵⁵ Buber moved from this statement regarding relation as the beginning to a historical analysis of men and how "primitive" people have a more natural wholeness of relation. Buber wrote of how more primitive cultures have developed words and phrases that encompass more depth in their meaning regarding relationships. He used as an example the "Fuegian who surpasses our analytical wisdom with a sentence-word of seven syllables that literally means: 'they look at each other, each waiting for the other to offer to do that which both desire but neither wishes to do.'"⁵⁶ This accentuation of the natural manner that primitive man relates in an I-You fashion is dealt with in several sections

⁵² Buber, I and Thou, p. 67.

⁵³ Wood, p. 61.

⁵⁴ Buber, I and Thou, p. 69.

⁵⁵ Wood, p. 62.

⁵⁶ Buber, I and Thou, p. 70.

quite specifically where he stated that ". . . the primitive man speaks the basic word I-You in a natural, as it were still uninformed manner not yet having recognized himself as an I: but the basic word I-It is made possible only by this recognition, by the detachment of the I."⁵⁷

Buber then discusses the natural characteristics of I-You as seen in the child. Various elements of the I-You relationship occur naturally in the child. Buber stated:

Here it becomes unmistakably clear how the spiritual reality of the basic words emerges from a natural reality: that of the basic word I-You from a natural association, that of the basic word I-It from a natural discreteness.⁵⁸

Buber's emphasis on the relation coming first in a natural manner lead Friedman to comment:

In this process the effort to establish relation comes first and is followed by the actual relation, a saying of Thou without words, only later is the relation split apart into the I and the thing. Hence, 'in the beginning is relation', 'the inborn Thou' which is realized by the child in the lived relations with what meets it.⁵⁹

Buber elaborated on the natural state of the child from the womb where he described the association as "bodily reciprocity."⁶⁰

Buber completed this section by stating again: "In the beginning is the relation - as the category of being, as readiness, as a form that reaches out to be filled, as a model of the soul; the a priori of relation: the innate You."⁶¹ It was Buber's position that the desire for

⁵⁷ Buber, I and Thou, p. 73.

⁵⁸ Buber, I and Thou, p. 76.

⁵⁹ Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 60.

⁶⁰ Buber, I and Thou, p. 76.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 78.

relation is primary and basic to man's needs.⁶²

Buber used the last few pages of the first untitled portion to again go over the basic themes of I and You relationships and the It word and ties them together in his conclusion. He began by repeating the opening lines of the book stating: "The world is twofold for man in accordance with his twofold attitude."⁶³ He continued by describing men's world and the way in which man organizes the beings around him into things and processes. Man categorizes his world in a system of space and time from which to operate. This "It world" was described by Wood:

To become aware of this ordered world is to enter into a community of truth where one can be understood with relative ease by others. But just as such an ordered world is not the ordering of the world, so much readily communicable truth is not truth in itself but truth as humanly constructed.⁶⁴

This is the world of the It. A world of detachment and separation from relation.

Buber then changed his discussion of the It world into a discussion of the You.

The It-world hangs together in space and time. The You-world does not hang together in space and time. The individual You must become an It when the event of relation has run its course. The individual It can become a You by entering into the event of relation.⁶⁵

However, he then shifted to the notion that man cannot live entirely in the You. Buber said that it would "consume us." Man can live

⁶²Buber, I and Thou, p. 84.

⁶³Buber, I and Thou, p. 82.

⁶⁴Wood, p. 71.

⁶⁵Buber, I and Thou, p. 84.

entirely in the It-world. It is orderly, predictable and does not threaten. But by living only in the It, man ultimately loses his humanity.

Buber concluded with: "And in all the seriousness of truth, listen: without It a human being cannot live. But whomever lives only with that is not human."⁶⁶

Silence

In 1929, Martin Buber completed Dialogue, the first of his five works that would later compose the volume Between Man and Man. Its purpose was to clarify the I-You concept. One of the areas Buber discussed was the element of silence in communication. He stated:

Just as the most eager speaking at one another does not make a conversation . . . , so for a conversation no sound is necessary, not even a gesture.⁶⁷

Language is not a necessity for the establishment of an I-You relationship. The relationship can transcend such a limitation and the "Between" that is essential to I and Thou can develop. Buber elaborated:

Yet he does something. The lifting of the spell has happened to him - no matter from where - without his doing. But this is what he does not know: He releases in himself a reserve over which only he himself has power. Unreservedly, communication streams from him, and the silence bears it to his neighbor.⁶⁸

Buber concluded this portion by writing: "For where unreserve has ruled, even wordlessly, between men, the word of dialogue has happened sacramentally."⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Buber, I and Thou, p. 85.

⁶⁷ Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 4.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 5.

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

Awareness

Buber listed three ways "in which we are able to perceive a man . . . ," which are observing, looking on and becoming aware.⁷⁰ The first two do not lead to relation, only the third. Awareness is perception of a deeper quality that opens the door to relation. Awareness occurs when ". . . in a receptive hour of my personal life a man meets me about whom there is something which I cannot grasp in any objective way at all, that 'says something' to me."⁷¹ This awareness necessitates a response and this type of perception allows dialogue to begin. Buber analogically noted that this awareness is not limited to man but could include "animal, plant or stone."⁷²

THE IT-WORLD

Martin Buber's second untitled section discussed the It-world in detail. Buber spelled out his framework and definitions in Part One and then concentrated on the realm of It in Part Two. He began by stating that throughout history there has and continues to be a "progressive increase of the It-world."⁷³ Buber used as an example the way in which one culture, as it develops, accepts It-world influences from a preceding culture such as the Greeks from the Egyptians and Occidental Christendom from the Greeks.⁷⁴ He wrote:

⁷⁰ Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 4.

⁷¹ Ibid., p. 8.

⁷² Ibid., p. 9.

⁷³ Buber, I and Thou, p. 87.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

Generally, the It-world of every culture is therefore more comprehensive than that of its predecessors, and in spite of some stoppages and apparent regressions the progressive increase of the It-world is clearly discernable in history.⁷⁵

Thus, we are, according to Buber, faced with a snowballing increase of the It-world. Wood commented:

The history of the individual and the race shows a progressive augmentation of the world of It. Cultures enlarge that world through their own experience and through the assimilation of the experience of other cultures preceding or contemporary with their own. Advancement of technical achievements differentiation of social forms and the expansion of speculative knowledge all add to the world of It. As this occurs, direct experience is replaced by indirect experience propagated in books and in the schools.⁷⁶

Woods' commentary seems to be reinforced by Buber's discussion regarding the term "experience." He stated:

The basic relation of man to the It-world includes experience which constitutes this world over and over again, and use, which leads it toward its multifarious purpose - the preservation, alleviation, and equipment of human life.⁷⁷

Maurice Friedman became more specific in regard to our times when he stated in his analysis:

Our culture has, more than any other, abdicated before the world of It. This abdication makes impossible a life in the spirit since spirit is a response of man to his Thou. The evil which results takes the form of individual life in which institutions and feelings are separate provinces and of community life in which the state and economy are cut off from the spirit, the will to enter relation.⁷⁸

However, Friedman pointed out another quality of the world of It when he stated: "In both cases I-It is not evil in itself but only when it is

⁷⁵Buber, I and Thou, p. 88.

⁷⁶Wood, p. 73.

⁷⁷Buber, I and Thou, p. 88.

⁷⁸Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 62.

allowed to have mastery and shut out all relation."⁷⁹

These general areas of the It-world are then separated into three segments by Buber. They are relation with forms of the spirit, with men and with nature.

Forms of the Spirit

Buber stated that the term "spirit" refers to "word." This refers back to the books opening when the terms basic words are used. Buber elaborated on this theme:

Spirit is not in the I but between I and You. It is not like the blood that circulates in you but like the air in which you breathe. Man lives in the spirit when he is able to respond to his You.⁸⁰

Thus it is Buber's intent that spirit is not in man but between. It is out of this "between" that language develops. Buber stated that ". . . in truth language does not reside in man but man stands in language and speaks out of it - so it is with all words, all spirit." Buber next discussed the "response" of man to his You. The stronger the response, the more it "ties up the You and binds it into an object."⁸¹ Silence only will keep the You free. Friedman commented on Buber's writing:

But man's greatness lies in the response which binds Thou into the world of I, for it is through this response that knowledge, work, image and symbol are produced.⁸²

Buber wrote of three elements of forms of the response and Wood commented

⁷⁹Freidman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 62.

⁸⁰Buber, I and Thou, p. 89.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 62.

on these three elements:

Now responses occur in three forms of the spirit: in knowledge, which terminates in idea structures as they find expression in language; in art, which terminates in the work; and in pure action, which terminates in a life formed in the spirit. In all three cases, the object structures which follow from the response are there for the community of other men who are to be drawn by these forms - in the same way that their creators were originally drawn - to a meeting in and through the world with that which transcends the world.⁸³

The ultimate end is further movement towards the It-world. The idea structure, the work of art and the action all lose the spiritual life within and become instilled in the realm of It.

Relation with Men

The man who is in understanding of the It-world that surrounds him as developed by his culture deals with it by dividing it into two segments: one of institutions and one of feelings. Buber wrote:

Institutions are what is 'out there' where all kinds of purposes one spends time, where one works, negotiates, influences, undertakes, competes, organizes, administers, officiates, preaches. . .

Feelings are what is 'in here' where one lives and recovers from the institutions. Here the spectrum of the emotion swings before the interested eye; here one enjoys one's inclination and one's hatred, pleasure and, if it is not too bad, pain. Here one is at home and relaxes in one's rocking chair.⁸⁴

Feelings and institutions lack real substance however, "Neither knows person or community."⁸⁵ Buber stated that the relation of men involves "community." This community is achieved only through its members being involved in a single goal which is their relation with the Eternal Thou.

⁸³Wood, p. 74.

⁸⁴Buber, I and Thou, p. 93.

⁸⁵Ibid.

Buber called it a "living, reciprocal relationship."⁸⁶ Buber also described marriage stating that it ". . . can never be renewed except by that which is always the source of all true marriage: that two human beings reveal the You to one another."⁸⁷

However, the community cannot dispense of the It world and neither can the individual. Buber saw man's will to profit and the will to power as legitimate. However, they must be "tied to the will of human relations and carried by it."⁸⁸ If the will is not, it is in the realm of the It, and the community cannot prevent its further occurrence. I-You must give the individual and the community direction if the It world is to be transcended.

Relations with Nature

"Out of many meetings with nature over the course of generations, a culture comes to form its particular view of nature, its cosmos."⁸⁹ Buber's discussion regarding nature center on the concept of cause and effect. "The modern world has its own version of fate: the dogma of universal causality."⁹⁰ Buber dismissed the concept of fate through causality. He wrote of the world of relation:

Here I and You confront each other freely in a reciprocity that is not involved in or tainted by any causality; here man finds guaranteed the freedom of his being and of being.⁹¹

⁸⁶Buber, I and Thou, p. 94.

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, p. 97.

⁸⁹Wood, p. 78.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁹¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 100.

Buber elaborated on his theme of freedom from causality when he wrote:

Only those who know relation and who know of the presence of the You have the capacity for decision. Whoever makes a decision is free because he has stepped before the countenance.⁹²

In the last segment of Part Two, Buber expanded his discussion of the free man, the self-willed or the capricious man as translated by Kaufmann, and discussed the I in the It-world. Of the self-willed man he wrote: "The capricious man does not believe and encounter; he only knows the feverish world out there and his feverish desire to use it."⁹³ Buber's concept of using the world is negative and is on the opposite scale. The word use is closely associated with experience as noted earlier in the book where he stated: "The improvement of the ability to experience and use generally involves a decrease in man's power to relate."⁹⁴

Buber also used this last section of Part Two to differentiate between the I of the I-You and the I of I-It. He wrote:

The I of the basic word I-It appears as an ego and becomes conscious of itself as a subject (of experience and use).

The I of the basic word I-You appears as a person and becomes conscious of itself as subjectivity (without any genitive).⁹⁵

It is important to note that the term "ego" is not used as it is in psychoanalytic theory. The German word used by Buber was Eigenwesen literally meaning own-being or self-being. Buber continued this theme of the different I's of the basic words:

⁹²Buber, I and Thou, p. 101.

⁹³*Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 92.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 112.

Egos appear by setting themselves apart from other egos. Persons appear by entering into relation to other persons. The purpose of setting oneself apart is to experience and use, and the purpose of that is 'living' which means dying one human life long. The purpose of relation is the relation itself - touching the You. For as soon as we touch a You, we are touched by a breath of eternal life.⁹⁶

Buber further elaborated on the person standing in relation:

Whoever stands in relation, participates in actuality; that is, in a being that is neither merely a part of him nor merely outside of him. All actuality is an activity in which I participate without being able to appropriate it. Where there is no participation, there is no actuality. The more directly the You is touched, the more perfect is the participation.

The I is actual through its participation in actuality. The more perfect the participation is, the more actual the I becomes.⁹⁷

Buber completed his discussion of the I of I-You and the I of I-It. "How much of a person a man is depends on how strong the I of the basic word I-You is in the human duality of his I."⁹⁸ The way a man says I reveals towards which end of the polarity he leans. Buber used three examples of the I of I-You. Socrates is described as saying the "I of infinite conversation."⁹⁹ Goethe is described as using the "I of pure intercourse with nature." Jesus is described as saying the "I of the unconditional relation in which man calls his You 'Father' in such a way that he himself becomes nothing but a son."¹⁰⁰

Thus, the It world is a world that lacks relationship, that is absent of I-You relations. It is a world concerned with objects and of

⁹⁶ Buber, I and Thou, p. 112.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 113.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 115.

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 116.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

relationships that use another. This section of I and Thou is generally concerned with the increasing sophistication of the It realm. However, the central religious theme of Part Three is briefly dealt with when Buber wrote of the relationship between Jesus and His Father.

THE ETERNAL YOU

Martin Buber's third untitled section of I and Thou deals with his "most essential concern" which is "the central significance of the close association of the relation to God with the relation to one's fellow man."¹⁰¹ Buber's writings and thought are extensively concerned with the realm of religion. It was Buber's position that man is responsible to actualize his own unique self which is God-given. From this basis, Buber wrote of man's relation to God.

I-You Relationships with Men and God

Buber began this section by stating "extended the lines of relationship intersect in the Eternal You. Every single you is a glimpse of that. Through every single you the basic word addresses the Eternal You."¹⁰² This provides an important element of Buber's concept of the Eternal You. "The inborn Thou is expressed and realized in each relation but it is consummated only in the direct relation with the Eternal Thou."¹⁰³ The Eternal You is by nature the only you that does not become an It.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 171.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 123.

¹⁰³Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 70.

¹⁰⁴Buber, I and Thou, p. 124.

Buber continued by stating that "men have addressed their Eternal You by many names. When they sang of what they had thus named, they still meant you."¹⁰⁵ The terms and language used are of secondary importance. The name one uses is unimportant as "what really matters is that one really says Thou in an unconditional way . . ."¹⁰⁶

Buber then changed the focus back to a discussion of will and grace as it regards relationships. He wrote that "our concern, our care must be not for the other side but for our own, not for grace but for will."¹⁰⁷ The meeting with the Eternal You must involve the will of the individual. He must want to reach out for the establishment of the relationship. Passive waiting for grace will be fruitless. "Grace concerns us insofar as we proceed toward it and await its presence; it is not our object."¹⁰⁸ One must enter into the relation before one can comprehend its meaning which is becoming whole. This "whole man is one who does not intervene in the world and one in whom no separate and partial action stirs."¹⁰⁹ It is this man who is ready to proceed to the meeting with the Eternal You. This meeting will break the "spell of separation" described by Buber.¹¹⁰

This supreme meeting is available to the one who meets the finite you who subsequently has the "self-unity requisite" for meeting

¹⁰⁵Buber, I and Thou, p. 124.

¹⁰⁶Wood, p. 89.

¹⁰⁷Buber, I and Thou, p. 124.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁹Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 70.

¹¹⁰Buber, I and Thou, p. 125.

the Eternal You.¹¹¹

At this point Buber began a discussion regarding the nature of relationships. He wrote:

Every actual relationship to another being in the world is exclusive. Its You is freed and steps forth to confront us in its uniqueness. It fills the firmament - not as if there were nothing else, but everything else lives in its light.¹¹²

However, if the You becomes an It its "exclusiveness becomes separateness and exclusion of the others."¹¹³ From this basis of relationship with other beings in the world Buber describes the relationship to God. He wrote:

In the relation to God, unconditional exclusiveness and unconditional inclusiveness are one. For those who enter into the absolute relationship, nothing particular retains any importance - neither things nor beings, neither earth nor heaven - but everything is included in the relationship. For entering into the pure relationship does not involve ignoring everything but seeing everything in the You, not renouncing the world but placing it upon its proper ground.¹¹⁴

Other Relationship Positions

In this portion, Buber examined positions that are not in congruence with concept of I and Thou. He first looked at the improper interpretation of the role of feelings in the relationship to God. He stated:

The essential element in our relationship to God has been sought in a feeling that has been called a feeling of dependence or, more recently, in an attempt to be more precise, creative-feeling.

¹¹¹Wood, p. 90.

¹¹²Buber, I and Thou, p. 126.

¹¹³Wood, p. 90.

¹¹⁴Buber, I and Thou, p. 127.

While the insistence on this element and its definition are right, the one-sided emphasis on this factor leads to misunderstanding of the character of the perfect relationship.¹¹⁵

Buber then elaborated on this "perfect relationship" by first of all describing again where this relationship occurs. He wrote: "feelings merely accompany the fact of the relationship which, after all, is established not in the social but between an I and a you."¹¹⁶ He went on to explain that feelings are all replaced one by another and are "subject to the dynamics of the soul."¹¹⁷ Relationships transcend this realm. "The absolute relationship includes all relative relationships and is, unlike them, no longer a part but the whole in which all of them are consummated and become one."¹¹⁸ Feelings also involve a polar opposite. Buber described the perfect relationship as being bipolar and includes the "fusion of opposite feelings."¹¹⁹

Buber provided a further description of this perfect relationship:

In the pure relationship you feel altogether dependent, as you could never possibly feel in any other - and yet also altogether free as never and nowhere else; created and creative. You no longer felt both without bonds, both at once.¹²⁰

Buber then moved from a refutation of the over emphasis on dependency to expressing the need for mutuality in the relationship to God. He stated:

¹¹⁵ Buber, I and Thou, p. 127.

¹¹⁶ Ibid. p. 129.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 130.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

That you need God more than anything, you know at all times in your heart. But don't you know also that God needs you - in the fullness of his eternity, you? How would man exist if God did not need him, and how could you exist? You need God in order to be, and God needs you - for that which is the meaning of your life.¹²¹

Buber's purpose in these passages was to renounce the type of philosophy that prevents dialogue. One way to eliminate dialogue is to reduce one partner in the relation. The first position would accomplish this through misinterpretation of feelings specifically by reducing relationship to God as a feeling of dependency. Buber's emphasis is on reciprocity.

The second position dealt with by Buber is an attempt to "collapse the divine pole by reducing the all to the self."¹²² This position primarily comes from the mystical Indian doctrine of the Upanishads that the real is the self as in Buddha. The Upanishads' goal is deep sleep without dream or any aspect of consciousness where unit occurs. Buber wrote at length to critique this position. Friedman summarized Buber's thoughts:

In lived reality, even in 'inner' reality, there is no unity of being. Reality exists only in effective, mutual action, and the most 'powerful and deepest reality exists where everything enters into the effective action, without reserve' . . . the united I and the boundless Thou.¹²³

This doctrine of "immersion" as Buber called it is based "on the colossal illusion of the human spirit that is bent back on itself, that spirit exists in man."¹²⁴ Buber submits that spirit is relation and not in man

¹²¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 130.

¹²²Wood, p. 93.

¹²³Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 72.

¹²⁴Ibid.

but between. Between man and what is not man.¹²⁵

This philosophy has as its aim the achievement of unity. Friedman commented:

To seek consciously to become a saint, or to attain 'union' as is advocated by some modern mystics, is to abandon oneself to the world of It - the world of conscious aims and purposes supported by a collection of means, such as spiritual exercises, abstinence and recollection.¹²⁶

Buber's emphasis is on the reality of the present and the whole of man. Any position that minimizes the wholeness of one of the partners in relation ultimately destroys the concept of relation. Reciprocity is dependent on mutual wholeness. Buber devoted a substantial portion of his book refuting those who would define relation as dependency and those who would mistakenly interpret union as relation.

God: The Eternal Thou

Buber used the last portion of his text for presentation of an overview of God as the Eternal Thou in the world of You. He began by describing the manner in which the You of an I-You relationship must ultimately become an It. He wrote:

Love itself cannot abide in direct relation; it endures, but in the alternation of actuality and latency. Every You in the world is compelled by its nature to become a thing for us or at least to enter again and again into thinghood.¹²⁷

The I-You relationship as previously noted is doomed to becoming an I-It relationship. However, Buber allows for the one all-embracing relationship to transcend such a limitation. That all-embracing relationship is the

¹²⁵Buber, I and Thou, p. 141.

¹²⁶Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 72.

¹²⁷Buber, I and Thou, p. 147.

I-You relationship with God. Buber elaborated:

Every actual relationship in the world alternates between actuality and latency; every individual you must disappear into the chrysalis of the It in order to grow wings again. In the pure relationship, however, latency is merely actuality drawing a deep breath during which the You remains present. The Eternal You is You by its very nature; only our nature forces us to draw it into the It-world and It-speech.¹²⁸

This concept that the Eternal You by its nature can never become an it is essential to Buber's position. It is the pure and all-embracing relationship. Of this section, Wood wrote:

Here we begin to see the extent to which Buber takes the notion of mutuality in the Thou relation. Thou is not just a matter of our attitude. Thou is a perfection, not of our side of the relation alone, but of the Other as well. Just as the self can become itself only through the gift of the Other, so likewise the Other can become itself only through the gift of the self. Through our response when will and grace meet, the 'sparks' are released from things and brought to fulfillment. However, in the case of God, He is always present, always fully there, perfected as Thou.¹²⁹

Throughout this last section, Buber re-emphasized the basic elements of the I-You relationships. He repeated the reference to time and space to begin the linking of the lines of relation. He wrote:

The It-world coheres in space and time. The You-world does not cohere in either. It coheres in the center in which the extended lines of relationships intersect in the Eternal You.

In the great privilege of the pure relationship the privileges of the It-world is continuous: the isolated moments of relationships join for a world life of association.¹³⁰

The It-world can be changed by the permeation of the Eternal You.

From this introduction to the essence of the Eternal You, Buber then repeated the concept of the three areas of relation - life with

¹²⁸ Buber, I and Thou, p. 148.

¹²⁹ Wood, p. 99.

¹³⁰ Buber, I and Thou, pp. 148, 149.

nature, life with men and life with spiritual beings. However, he then wrote of the nature of these relationships in regard to their connection with the Eternal You. He wrote:

In every sphere, in every relational act, through everything that becomes present to us, we gaze toward the train of the Eternal You; in each we perceive a breath of it; in every You we address the Eternal You, in every sphere according to its manner. All spheres are included in it, while it is included in none.

Through all of them shines the one presence.¹³¹

Buber also wrote of solitude and how it can be a portal to relation with God. Solitude can free one from using and experiencing and free one for relation. But there is also solitude or loneliness from relation that prevents dialogue and an I-You relation with the Eternal You.¹³²

Buber also wrote of the congruence between relation with the world and with God. An I-You relationship with the Eternal You is not accompanied by an I-It relation with the world. A person cannot use and utilize the world and at the same time have a reciprocal relationship with God. The two are exclusive.¹³³

Buber's Conclusion

Buber began his conclusion of this section on the Eternal You by again describing its nature:

By its very nature the Eternal You cannot become an It; because by its very nature cannot be placed within measure and limit, not even within the measure of the immeasurable and the limit of the unlimited; because by its very nature it cannot be grasped as a sum of qualities, not even as an infinite sum of qualities that have been raised to transcendence; because it is not to be found either in or outside the world; because it cannot be experienced; because it

¹³¹ Buber, I and Thou, p. 150.

¹³² Ibid., p. 156.

¹³³ Buber, I and Thou, p. 156.

cannot be thought; because we transgress against it, against that which is being, if we say: 'I believe that he is' - even 'he' is still a metaphor which 'you' is not.¹³⁴

Buber also wrote of man's longing for something that will last, that will fulfill his desire for continuity. He spoke of man's actions to try and resolve his need for continuity and how man sees God as an object of faith and then a cult object. Neither will suffice. What is required is embodiment of the relation into the "whole staff" of life.¹³⁵ "Man can do justice to the relation to God that has been given to him only by actualizing God in the world in accordance with his ability and measure of each day, daily."¹³⁶

Buber's final pages speak of the necessity for man to say You with his undivided being and to do this he must "come out of the false security of community into the final solitude of the venture of the infinite."¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Buber, I and Thou, pp. 160, 161.

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 163.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 76.

CHAPTER 3

THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP IN HUMANISTIC PSYCHOTHERAPY

Humanistic psychotherapy, as does to some extent psychoanalysis and behaviorism, covers a wide range of specific theories all within a general framework of basic assumptions. However, the "third force" of psychotherapy and psychology, because of its broad basis of understanding of human nature seems to have a particularly large assortment of individual theories.

This paper has made an examination of three of the most prominent theories of humanistic psychotherapy. Gestalt Therapy, Client-Centered Therapy and Reality Therapy, have all received wide acceptance and use within the helping professions.

This chapter was concerned with an analysis of the therapeutic relationship of each of the three above mentioned theories. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first examines the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy. A brief introduction is also given. The second and third sections are written in a similar fashion with brief introductions followed by examinations of the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy and Reality Therapy, respectively.

GESTALT THERAPY

History of Gestalt Therapy

Friedrich (Frederick or Fritz) S. Perls is the primary individual involved in the development of Gestalt Therapy. Perls was born

in Berlin and educated in Germany, receiving both a M.D. and a Ph.D. He spent part of his life in South Africa after the rise of Hitler and then moved to the United States in 1946. He founded institutes of Gestalt Therapy in New York and Cleveland and during the last years of his life was associated with the Esalen Institute at Big Sur, California. He died in 1970 at the age of seventy six.

More recent leaders in the field of Gestalt Therapy have been Joen Fagan, Erma Lee Shepherd, James Simkin and Erving and Miriam Polster. These therapists have been referred to as being of a new school of Gestalt Therapy and most are involved in training at various institutes and workshops.

As do other therapies within the general framework of humanistic psychotherapy, Gestalt relies on the related field of philosophy in its approach. The concept of man as a whole is intrinsic to Gestalt. The organism is and functions as a whole and does not break down into individual elements which determine behavior. The whole organism is composed of body, mind and soul which are inseparable. They are all aspects of the whole organism which is a feeling, thinking and acting being.¹ Gestalt Therapy is also classified as an existential therapy with an accompanying emphasis on man's present as opposed to past or future and on the relationship of man and his environment.

The primary goal in Gestalt Therapy is awareness. The healthy person "is completely in touch with himself and reality."² Perls

¹C.H. Patterson, Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), p. 345.

²Frederick S. Perls, Gestalt Therapy Verbatim (New York: Books, 1971), p. 46.

stated that this is achieved through a growth process that takes time. He cautioned against instant cure or insight and instead calls for a commitment of self-investment of the patient. Perls also scoffed at our hedonistic western culture and its emphasis on fun and pleasure to the exclusion of real being here.³ Therapy is concerned with the establishment of contact and normal interaction with the environment. "Contact is the lifeblood of growth, the means for changing oneself and one's experience of the world."⁴

The Therapeutic Relationship

Although Fritz Perls is the most prominent of the Gestalt Psychotherapists, there are many others who have made significant contributions to both theory and techniques. Several of these Gestalt Therapists are examined in this section.

Perls. Perls did not present a systematic model of methods and techniques. He used exercises and experiments extensively with the goal of re-establishing growth towards maturity. The object of the therapeutic encounter is for the patient to discover the self which is achieved not through introspection but action. Perls' most inclusive work, Gestalt Therapy, written with Hefferline and Goodman, dealt with these exercises which Patterson summarized as follows:

Even the average person is lacking in awareness. The first half of Gestalt Therapy consists of exercises in developing awareness of the person's functioning as an organism and as a person. The first set of exercises is for everyone and is directed toward (1) contacting

³Perls, Gestalt Therapy Verbatim, p. 2.

⁴Erving and Miriam Polster, Gestalt Therapy Integrated, (New York: Vintage Books, 1973), p. 101.

the environment through becoming aware of present feelings, sensing opposed forces, attending and concentrating, and differentiating and unifying, (2) developing awareness of self through remembering, sharpening the body sense, experiencing the continuity of emotion, listening to one's verbalizing, and integrating awareness, and (3) directing awareness by converting confluence into contact, and changing anxiety into excitement. Another set of exercises deals with processes that are chronic in organismic malfunctioning and is directed toward changing malfunctioning processes through (1) retro-flection, by investigating misdirected behavior, mobilizing the muscles, and executing the re-reversed act, (2) introjection, by introjecting and eating, and dislodging and digesting introjects, and (3) projection, by discovering projections and assimilating projections. These exercises are aspects of therapy.⁵

One of the first elements of the therapeutic relationship that Perls dealt with was the emphasis on the here and now. Perls would state that whereas orthodox psychotherapy speaks of a "neurotic as a person who had a problem and that the resolution of this past problem is the goal of psychotherapy."⁶ The Gestalt viewpoint is that there is a continuing problem here and now in the present. From this he stated that the goal of therapy is to give the patient the means to solve his present and when needed his future problems. Self support is the tool by which he can achieve this goal.⁷

In Gestalt Therapy, as described by Perls, the relationship between patient and therapist is one that requires a great deal from both participants. It is a relationship that consists of the therapist being totally tuned in to the patient. The "whole" of the therapist is in contact with the "whole" of the patient. Perls spoke of the therapist in this regard:

⁵Patterson, p. 353.

⁶Frederick S. Perls, The Gestalt Approach and Eye Witness to Therapy, (New York: Bantam Books, 1976), p. 63.

⁷Ibid.

The same thing applies to the therapist. He has to take full responsibility for his reactions to the patient. He is not responsible for the patient's neurosis, nor for his misery and misunderstandings, but he is responsible for his own motives and his handling of the patient and the therapeutic situation.⁸

The therapist's main activity in therapy is the asking of questions of the patient with the objective of establishing support and at the same time frustrating the patient. By bringing the patient to an impasse and then frustrating him, the inhibitions and blocks that have helped in the avoidance of growth are dealt with.

In regard to the therapeutic relationship, it is important to note that the patient too is free to question the therapist, although Perls cautioned that such questioning can be a method of avoidance. Perls stressed the concept of the therapist being on the same level as the patient. The therapist is not a power figure but is "elevated" to a human being.⁹ Both the questioning and the humanity is stressed on both sides of the relationship.

Perls wrote of three courses of therapeutic involvement open to the therapist. They are sympathy, empathy, and apathy. He stated that the ideal therapist is the empathist where "the therapist's interest is centered exclusively around the patient and his reactions."¹⁰ However, Perls went on to say that the therapist must not deprive himself of his intuitive sensitivity to his patient's ongoing processes. He elaborated on this theme:

⁸ Perls, The Gestalt Approach and Eye Witness to Therapy, p. 79.

⁹ Ibid., p. 77.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 105.

He must have a relational awareness of the total situation, he must have contact with the total field - both his own needs and his reactions to the patient's manipulations and the patient's needs and reactions to the therapist. And he must feel free to express them.¹¹

Perls also wrote of communication within Gestalt Therapy. He stated that it "functions as a field event; it is of concern and it is real to both sender and receiver."¹²

Yonteff. Gary Yonteff, a clinical psychologist and Gestalt Therapist wrote of the therapeutic relationship. He stressed the existential aspects of the interpersonal encounter and quoted James Simkins' description of Gestalt Therapy as "I and Thou; Here and Now."¹³ Yonteff also wrote of the existential encounter and described the models used by Gestalt Therapists Shostrom and Perls:

According to this model there is a continuum from manipulation or deadness to actualization or aliveness. The actualizer treats each human being as an end (a 'Thou') and not a means (an 'It'); the manipulator controls himself and others as things, or allows himself to be controlled as a thing. The actualizer expresses his feelings directly to people as they arise; the manipulator judges, withdraws, blackmails, gossips, lives exclusively in a single time dimension. The manipulator does not trust his natural organismic self-regulatory system and therefore depends on the moralistic regulatory system of society not on his own support.¹⁴

The goal of therapy in Yonteff's description is to reach that end of the continuum known as the actualization or aliveness. He quoted Walter Kempler, a Gestalt Therapist, who emphasized the experiential encounter who says that there are two "commandments" to follow: (1)

¹¹Perls, The Gestalt Approach and Eye Witness to Therapy, p. 106.

¹²Ibid., p. 113.

¹³Gary M. Yonteff, A Review of the Practice of Gestalt Therapy, (Los Angeles: California State University - Los Angeles, 1971), p. 10.

¹⁴Ibid.

"attention to the current interaction as the pivotal point for all awareness and interventions, and (2) involvement of the total therapist-person bringing overtly and richly his full personal impact on the families with whom he works."¹⁵

Yonteff spoke briefly of the I-Thou relationship in therapy when he described Perls as advocating "discovery by the patient using his own senses while maintaining for experimental purposes an I-Thou: Here and Now relationship."¹⁶ Yonteff elaborated:

The Gestalt Therapy position is that the therapist makes direct contact with the patient with his senses, attending to an agreed on task, expanding the awareness of the patient. A competent Gestalt Therapist must be able to be aware of his inner feelings as he attends to them, and express them spontaneously when he wishes.¹⁷

Yonteff concluded his section on the existential relationship in Gestalt by stating that the therapist must be open to genuine feelings and must respond in availability and honesty. He must "aggressively stay in the I and Thou; Here and Now framework."¹⁸

Fagan. Joen Fagan, who is of the new school of Gestalt Therapy, gives further perspective to the therapeutic relationship. She described five "tasks" of the therapist: patterning, control, potency, humanness and commitment.¹⁹ She stated that "the therapeutic relationship is both a technique and a transcendence of techniques."²⁰

¹⁵Yonteff, A Review of the Practice of Gestalt Therapy, p. 11.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁹Joen Fagan and Irma Lee Shepherd, Gestalt Therapy Now, (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1971), p. 88.

²⁰Ibid.

Patterning is likened to diagnosis although she disliked the terms relationship to the medical model. The therapist comes into contact with the patient through the relationship and develops his process of patterning throughout therapy.

Control is rather self-explanatory and involves the therapist getting the client to follow procedures he has set.

Fagan's use of the term potency refers to the "something" in the relationship and technique that helps the patient to make positive changes.²¹

Fagan places emphasis on humanness in the therapeutic relationship. She wrote:

The therapist's contribution to the therapeutic process as a person and the importance of the genuineness and depth of the therapeutic relationship have been emphasized by a large number of therapists. Humanness, as it is used here, includes a variety of involvements: The therapist's concern for and caring about his patient on a personal and emotional level; his willingness to share himself and bring to the patient his own direct emotional responses and/or pertinent accounts of his own experiences; his ability to recognize in the patient gropings toward deeper authenticity, which need support and recognition; and his continued openness to his own growth, which serves as a model for the patient.²²

Fagan went on to discuss the importance of the patient possessing qualities of humanness in his relationship to the patient which in certain instances outweigh therapeutic techniques. Fagan also wrote of the aspect of wholeness of the therapist which she sees as being extremely valuable. She stated:

The making of oneself into a whole and genuine person is probably the most difficult and painful aspect of becoming a therapist, but, for many, it is also the most valuable and important part. Many therapists who see authenticity as a primary task of the

²¹Fagan and Shepherd, Gestalt Therapy Now, p. 96.

²²Ibid., pp. 100, 101.

therapist fear those who, having stopped short in their own struggles with growing, substitute increased emphasis on control and potency, with a corresponding lack of regard for questions of value associated with the ability to produce personality change.²³

Fagan emphasized the direct experience with the therapist's humanness and its "here and now awareness, pleasure, excitement, deep emotional involvement and direct interaction" as opposed to computing by the therapist.²⁴

Finally, Fagan wrote of the commitment necessary for the therapy process. The vocation can produce stress that causes depression and doubt. The therapist must be aware of this and be willing to commit himself to the demands of his occupation. He must also commit himself to his clients. Fagan specifically mentioned the high level of interest and energy required for the Gestalt Therapist and its influence on humanness in the therapeutic relationship.²⁵

Erving and Miriam Polster. The husband and wife Gestalt Therapist team of Erving and Miriam Polster have had a great deal of emphasis on Gestalt Therapy on the west coast. The Polsters are co-directors of the Gestalt Training Center of San Diego. Their workshops and various training programs have been well attended by many therapists. Their book Gestalt Therapy Integrated, refers to the therapeutic relationship and its elements. They began with a description of the therapist as "his own instrument." They wrote:

Naturally, just as the artist painting a tree has to be affected by that particular tree, so also must the psychotherapist be tuned

²³Fagan and Shepherd, Gestalt Therapy Now, p. 103.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 103, 104.

in to the specific person with whom he is in touch. It is as if the therapist becomes a resonating chamber for what is going on between himself and the patient. He receives and reverberates to what happens in this interaction and he amplifies it so that it becomes part of the dynamic of the therapy.²⁶

The Polsters emphasized the interaction that takes place and the therapist's own experience as being a reciprocal part of the therapeutic process. They elaborated:

The range of interaction within the therapist's experience is pertinent - even indispensable - to full therapy engagement is very large. Recognition of the centrality of the therapist's own experience exists not only within gestalt therapy, but also within Rogerian work, experiential therapy, sensitivity training, and among the psychological workers who are existentially oriented and who see therapy as a two-way human engagement.²⁷

The Polsters saw this reciprocal relationship as being natural to therapy and that the use of one's self and experience in therapy should come freely and in a spontaneous manner.

The Polsters' particular model of Gestalt Therapy stresses the significance of contact between patient and therapist. They describe contact:

Contact is not just togetherness or joining. It can only happen between separate beings, always requiring independence and always risking capture in the union. At the moment of union, one's fullest sense of his person is swept along into a new creation. I am no longer only me, but me and thee make we.²⁸

This contact between client and therapist places emphasis on the wholeness of both participants. The Polsters wrote:

Unless I am experienced in knowing full contact, when I meet you full-eyed, full-bodied, and full-minded, you may become irresistible and engulfing. In contacting you, I wager my independent

²⁶ Erving and Miriam Polster, Gestalt Therapy Integrated, p. 18.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 20.

²⁸ Ibid.

existence, but only through the contact function can the realization of our identities fully develop.²⁹

The Polsters' concept of Gestalt Therapy views contact as the "lifeblood for growth" and change in the individual.³⁰ Change is an "inescapable product of contact."³¹

Zahm. Dr. Stephen Zahm, a clinical psychologist and Gestalt Therapist, conducts training in Gestalt Therapy in the Portland and Vancouver areas. He has received training from the Polsters and has a similar style of therapy. Regarding the therapeutic relationship, Dr. Zahm stressed several elements. As do the Polsters, Zahm described the client-therapist relationship as contact which is the primary vehicle of therapy. Personal growth is a goal of therapy and is described as another aspect of the term contact. This growth process is called expansion of the contact boundary.³² Zahm places a great deal of importance on the totality of the relationship. Quality contact between client and therapist requires the full attention and energy of the participants and is reciprocal in nature. The wholeness of each participant is a basic assumption. Contact, which assumes awareness as utilized in Gestalt Therapy, is in and of itself therapeutic.³³

Dr. Zahm's style of Gestalt Therapy also allows contact to occur in silence. Language is not a prerequisite to communication and

²⁹ Erving and Miriam Polster, Gestalt Therapy Integrated, p. 99.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 101.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Statement by Stephen Zahm, classroom lecture, January 12, 1977.

³³ Statement by Stephen Zahm, classroom lecture, May 25, 1977.

subsequent contact. The prerequisite to contact is awareness which leads to the contact cycle. Awareness to Zahm is a "selective process. . . it's a matter of focusing one's attention."³⁴ Awareness also leads to increased quality of choice. It is the basis for taking charge of one's actions and taking responsibility for one's behavior.³⁵

Thus the awareness that Zahm described leads to contact which is mobilization of awareness and "getting in touch." The contact can be with other people such as the therapist, with the individual's own feelings or with "otherness" an example being nature.³⁶ Quality contact is not easy in Zahm's model but involves an ongoing process that looks at contact in the sense of "making it" and not having "made" contact. This existential attitude is elaborated on by Zahm who stated that the only way that people can unite is through contact. He wrote that "though we are alone, through contact we can feel a unity - - absorbed - - tuned in, etc., to others or otherness itself."³⁷

Another element of Zahm's teaching is the importance of the therapist taking care of himself.³⁸ The therapist is a separate being, a whole within himself. If during the process of therapy the therapist

³⁴ Stephen Zahm, "Outlines of Main Concepts of Gestalt Therapy as a Growth Experience", (Vancouver, Washington: Unpublished Paper (mimeographed), 1974), p. 12.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Statement by Stephen Zahm, Ph.D., classroom lecture, September 8, 1977.

has a concern, a feeling of discomfort or confusion, the therapist is to openly discuss it. If the patient continually tries to avoid responsibility and instead tries to place it on the therapist, "taking care" of oneself for the therapist would be letting the patient know what is happening.

Pfeiffers. Steve Zahm has also been influenced by J. William and Judith A. Pfeiffer who stated that Gestalt "practitioners personally involve themselves and attempt to integrate humanistic values into their work."³⁹ They pointed out that contact involves a cycle or rhythm of withdrawal and contact for too much contact would "dull the senses and diminish awareness."⁴⁰ Withdrawal is necessary for a proper balance. An example would be the avoidance of contact with people in the morning until one has a cup of coffee.

CLIENT-CENTERED THERAPY

Carl Rogers has had a significant impact upon the field of psychotherapy. His best known contribution is the method of counseling known as Client-Centered Therapy. Rogers has been actively involved in the Association of Humanistic Psychology.

History of Client-Centered Therapy

Carl Rogers, the originator of Client-Centered Therapy was born in 1902 and holds a Ph.D. from Columbia University. He taught at Ohio

³⁹ J. William and Judith A. Pfeiffer, "A Gestalt Primer", Unpublished paper (mimeographed), p. 1.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

State University, the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin. In more recent years he has been associated with the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute in LaJolla, California. He has written many articles and several books, the most notable being Client-Centered Therapy in 1951.

Client-Centered Therapy has basic assumptions that man is essentially "rational, socialized, constructive and forward moving, and that each individual has the potential for growth and self-actualization."⁴¹

The maladjusted, or disturbed individual, is characterized by incongruence between his self and his experiences, which are threatening. This disturbed individual cannot accept experiences that are inconsistent with his self concept. He denies or distorts such experiences reacting in a defensive manner.⁴²

Rogers' theory of personality fits within a perceptual or phenomenological approach. Patterson described this concept:

Phenomenology assumes that although a real world may exist, its existence cannot be known or experienced directly. Its existence is inferred on the basis of perceptions of the world. These perceptions constitute the phenomenal field or the phenomenal world, never any real world. Therefore, he can only behave in terms of how he perceives things, or how they appear to him.⁴³

Thus in therapy it is not important to be concerned with what the environment actually is, but rather the perception of the client. Snygg and Combs are quoted by Rogers in a definition of therapy:

We might, therefore, define psychotherapy from a phenomenological point of view as: the provision of experience whereby the individual

⁴¹Patterson, Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy, p. 406.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid., p. 407.

is enabled to make more adequate differentiation of the phenomenal self and its relationship to external reality.⁴⁴

Rogers' Client-Centered position emphasizes the free agent in man and that he makes his own choices with the ability to change by himself without the "direction or manipulation" of the therapist.⁴⁵

The Therapeutic Relationship

Rogers has written extensively of the client-therapist relationship. The philosophical basis of the psychotherapist or counselor is an important aspect of Client-Centered therapy. The client is viewed with an attitude of respect by the counselor. The client has the capacity and right for self-direction and is a person of worth and significance.⁴⁶

From this basis Rogers wrote of his conclusion concerning the therapeutic relationship:

It is simply that in a wide variety of professional work involving relationships with people - whether as a psychotherapist, teacher, religious worker, guidance counselor, social worker, clinical psychologist - it is the quality of the interpersonal encounter with the client which is the most significant element in determining effectiveness.⁴⁷

Rogers stressed that this element of quality of the interpersonal relationship is more important than professional training, orientation or technique.⁴⁸ This relationship is not intellectual in nature. Rogers

⁴⁴Carl Rogers, On Becoming a Person, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961), p. 154.

⁴⁵Patterson, Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy, p. 407.

⁴⁶Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951), pp. 20-22.

⁴⁷Carl Rogers and Barry Stevens, Person to Person, (New York: Pocket Books, 1967), p. 85.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 86.

believes that relating the therapist's perceptions and advice on given problems will not help the client.

The relationship then is necessary for the process of therapy which is the facilitation of personal growth in the client. Rogers, over the years has described characteristics of the therapeutic relationships. Three volumes have been examined in chronological order to provide an outline of these characteristics.

Client-Centered Therapy (1951). Rogers presents a broad definition of the therapeutic relationship in a chapter devoted to the orientation and attitude of the therapist. A major portion of this chapter is based on research completed by Dr. Fred E. Fiedler for his Ph.D. dissertation by the University of Chicago. Fiedler was concerned with the description of the ideal therapeutic relationship. His research involved three therapists of analytical orientation, three of a Client-Centered orientation, one from an adlerian orientation and three laymen. Their task was to describe the ideal therapeutic relationship. Seventy five descriptive statements regarding aspects of relationship were rated by the ten participants in the project. Rogers summarized the results:

The results hold much of interest. All correlations were strongly positive, ranging from .43 to .84, indicating that all the therapists and even the nontherapists tended to describe the ideal relation in similar terms. When the correlations were factor analyzed, only one factor was found, indicating that there is basically but one relationship toward which all therapists strive. There was a higher correlation between experts who were regarded as good therapists, regardless of orientation, than between experts and nonexperts within the same orientation. The fact that even laymen can describe the ideal therapeutic relationship in terms which correlate highly with those of the experts suggests that the best therapeutic relationship may be related to good interpersonal

relationships in general.⁴⁹

Rogers placed a great deal of significance to this research project and the results. From the list of the seventy five descriptive items he lists the top two categories:

Most characteristic

The therapist is able to participate completely in the patient's communication.

Very characteristic

The therapist's comments are always right in line with what the patient is trying to convey.

The therapist sees the patient as a co-worker on a common problem.

The therapist treats the patient as an equal.

The therapist is well able to understand the patient's feelings.

The therapist really tries to understand the patient's feelings.

The therapist always follows the patient's line of thought.

The therapist's tone of voice conveys the complete ability to share the patient's feelings.⁵⁰

Rogers concludes that empathy and complete understanding by the therapist are extremely important.⁵¹

Rogers also draws upon Fiedler's research for conclusions regarding the therapeutic relationship as seen in different types of therapy.

Among Roger's conclusions were the following:

The most important factors differentiating experts from non-experts are related to the therapist's ability to understand, to communicate with, and to maintain rapport with the client. There is some indication that the expert is better able to maintain an appropriate emotional distance, seemingly best described as interested but emotionally uninvolved.

The most clearly apparent differences between schools related to the status which the therapist assumes toward the client. The Adlerians and some of the analytical therapists place themselves in a more tutorial, authoritarian role; client-centered therapists show up on the opposite extreme of this factor.⁵²

⁴⁹ Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, p. 53.

⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 53-54.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 54.

⁵² Ibid., p. 55.

Rogers concluded this section by stating that the research done by Fiedler is supportive of "the importance of the complete and sensitive understanding of the client's attitudes and feelings."⁵³

Thus using the relationship as a vehicle of therapy, the goal of the therapist is as follows:

In psychological terms, it is the counselor's aim to perceive as sensitively and accurately as possible all of the perceptual field as it is being experienced by the client, with the same figure and group relationships, to the full degree that the client is willing to communicate that perceptual field; and having thus perceived this internal frame of reference of the other as completely as possible, to indicate to the client the extent to which he is seeing through the client's eyes.⁵⁴

The counseling procedure utilizes the therapeutic relationship in which "incongruous experiences can be recognized, expressed, differentiated, and assimilated, or integrated into the self."⁵⁵ The counselor in Client-Centered therapy will have unconditional positive regard for the client, have empathetic understanding of the client and will communicate these attitudes to him. The relationship provides a safe atmosphere that is secure, free from threat and supporting but not supportive.⁵⁶

On Becoming a Person. This volume published in 1961 contains further elements of the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered therapy. He began a chapter on personal growth with a hypothesis regarding a helping relationship. "If I can provide a certain type of relationship, the other person will discover within himself the capacity to use

⁵³ Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, p. 55.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 34.

⁵⁵ Patterson, Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy, p. 406.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 396.

that relationship for growth, and change and personal development will occur."⁵⁷

Rogers then went on to describe components of such a relationship. The first is genuineness on the part of the therapist. This means that the therapist must be aware of his own feelings and that he not present a facade. Rogers also stated that another element of genuineness is being real. The second component is that of acceptance of the client. By acceptance Rogers meant a warm regard for this individual as a person of unconditional self-worth. He is of value. The final component is that of a deep empathic understanding of the client which allows the therapist to see "his private world through his eyes."⁵⁸ The therapist's feelings are open in this relationship. Rogers stated that "when these conditions are achieved, I become a companion to my client, accompanying him in the frightening search for himself which he now feels free to undertake."⁵⁹

Rogers also felt that an important condition of the relationship is freedom. He elaborated:

There is implied here a freedom to explore oneself at both conscious and unconscious levels, as rapidly as one can dare to embark on this dangerous quest. There is also a complete freedom from any type of moral or diagnostic evaluation since all such evaluations are, I believe, always threatening.⁶⁰

Rogers concluded this section by pointing out that such a relationship is not always achieved or that sometimes the client will be unable to respond. However, when the relationship is achieved "change

⁵⁷ Rogers, On Becoming a Person, p. 33.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 33.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 34.

⁶⁰ Ibid. p. 34.

and constructive personal development will invariably occur."⁶¹

Rogers summarized the elements of the relationship and the effects of such a relationship:

If I can create a relationship characterized on my part: by a genuineness and transparency, in which I am my real feelings;
by a warm acceptance of and a prizing of the other person as a separate individual;
by a sensitive ability to see his world and himself as he sees them;

Then the other individual relationship:

will experience and understand aspects of himself which previously he has repressed;
will find himself becoming better integrated, more able to function effectively;
will become more similar to the person he would like to be;
will become more of a person, more unique and more self-expressive;
will be more understanding, more acceptant of others;
will be able to cope with the problem more adequately and more comfortably.⁶²

In this volume Rogers devoted a separate chapter to the "Characteristics of a Helping Relationship." He began with the assumption that helpful relationships have different characteristics than unhelpful relationships. Rogers then gave a series of ten questions with which to guide one's behavior in the relationship. They are listed below.

The first question is: "Can I be in some way which will be perceived as trustworthy, as dependable or consistent in some deep

⁶¹Rogers, On Becoming a Person, p. 35.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 34-38.

sense?" Rogers stated that congruency was a term he liked to use in reference to this question. Congruency seems to encompass the elements of this question.⁶³

The second question is: "Can I be expressive enough as a person that what I am will be communicated unambiguously?"⁶⁴ Rogers felt that failures in the establishment of a helping relationship often come if these first two questions cannot be answered affirmatively.

Question number three is: "Can I let myself experience positive attitudes toward this other person - attitudes of warmth, caring, liking, interest, respect?"⁶⁵ It was important to Rogers to understand that it is safe to have these feelings for the client.

Question number four is: "Can I be strong enough as a person to be separate from the other?"⁶⁶

Question number five, closely related to four, is: "Am I secure enough within myself to permit him his separateness?"⁶⁷ Both number four and five give concern for the wholeness of each person.

The sixth question is: "Can I let myself enter fully into the world of his feelings and personal meanings and see these as he does?"⁶⁸

Question number seven is threefold: "Can I be acceptant of each facet of this person which he presents to me. Can I receive him as he

⁶³Rogers, On Becoming a Person, p. 50.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 51.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 52.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 53.

⁶⁸Ibid.

is? Can I communicate this attitude?"⁶⁹

Question number eight is: "Can I act with sufficient sensitivity in the relationship that my behavior will not be perceived as a threat?"⁷⁰

The ninth question is: "Can I free him from the threat of external evaluation?"⁷¹

Finally, the tenth question is: "Can I meet this other individual as a person who is in the process of becoming, or will I be bound by his past and my past?"⁷²

Rogers quoted Buber on this issue of "confirming the other" as Buber described it:

Confirming means . . . accepting the whole potentiality of the other . . . I can recognize in him, know in him, the person he has been . . . created to become . . . I confirm him in myself, and then in him, in relation to his potentiality that . . . can now be developed, can evolve."⁷³

Rogers commented on Buber's statement:

If I accept the other person as something fixed, already diagnosed and classified, already shaped by his past, then I am doing my part to confirm his limited hypothesis. If I accept him as a process of becoming, then I am doing what I can to confirm or make real his potentialities."⁷⁴

Rogers' conclusion to this chapter on helping relationship points out that if the individual can answer yes to these questions, then the relationship is a helpful one.

⁶⁹ Rogers, On Becoming a Person, p. 54.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid., p. 55.

⁷³ Martin Buber and Carl Rogers, Transcription of dialogue held April 18, 1957, Ann Arbor, Mich., Unpublished manuscript.

⁷⁴ Rogers, On Becoming a Person, p. 55.

Person to Person. Carl Rogers and Berry Stevens published this book in 1967. Rogers devoted a chapter to the interpersonal relationship which he calls the "core of guidance." He began with a conclusion and conviction he reached and which has already been quoted in this paper and that is that "it is the quality of the interpersonal encounter with the client which is the most significant element in determining effectiveness" in professional counseling work.⁷⁵ The quality of the relationship surpasses any training, knowledge or technique that the counselor may use. Rogers analyzed these attitudinal elements of the relationship and described them as follows.

Congruence. This term is used throughout Rogers' writings regarding the therapeutic relationship. He defined it as follows:

By this we mean the feelings the counselor is experiencing are available to him, available to his awareness, that he is able to live these feelings, be them in the relationship, and able to communicate them if appropriate. It means that he comes into a direct personal encounter with his client, meeting him on a person-to-person basis. It means he is being himself not denying himself.⁷⁶

Rogers pointed out that no one achieves the perfect state of congruence but that it is important for the therapist to be aware of himself and to try and reach the highest degree of congruence as possible.

The opposite end of the spectrum of congruence is composed of those who never seem to relate to others in a straightforward manner. They play a role and are not themselves. They avoid genuine relationships. Being genuine is an important part of congruence for the

⁷⁵ Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 86.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 87.

therapist even if it means revealing unpleasant feelings since the withholding of such feelings would be dishonest and the presentation of a facade. Being real can be painful at times but often can lead to a deeper relationship. Rogers wrote:

Being real involves the difficult task of being acquainted with the flow of experience going on within oneself, a flow marked especially by complexity and continuous change.⁷⁷

This experience of reality will hopefully lead to an openness on the part of the therapist who can then own his feelings. The dialogue that develops can then lead to a deeper relationship based on honesty. Rogers also used the term transparency to describe the depth of his term realness in congruence. He elaborated:

If everything going on in me which is relevant to the relationship can be seen by my client, if he can see "clear through me," and if I am willing for this realness to show through in the relationship, then I can be almost certain that this will be a meaningful encounter in which we both learn and develop.⁷⁸

Empathy. The second element in the relationship is empathy as experienced by the therapist. Again, this is difficult to achieve and involves risk. Rogers wrote of empathy:

The second essential condition in the relationship, as I see it, is that the counselor is experiencing an accurate empathic understanding of his client's private world, and is able to communicate some of the significant fragments of that understanding. To sense the client's inner world of private personal meanings as if it were your own, but without ever losing the "as if" quality, this is empathy, and this seems essential to a growth promoting relationship.⁷⁹

This element of separateness, the "as if" as Rogers described it is

⁷⁷Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 88.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 89.

⁷⁹Ibid.

vital to empathy. There are two separate entities in the relationship.

Rogers stated:

I believe that when the counselor can grasp the moment-to-moment experiencing occurring in the inner world of the client, as the client sees and feels it, without losing the separateness of his own identity in this empathic process, then change is likely to occur.⁸⁰

Rogers also pointed out that although language and verbal understanding is important, if the therapist is really trying to understand, the client will be aware of the intent to empathize. This process, according to Rogers, will reinforce the idea of the therapist valuing the client as an individual of worth.

Positive regard. The third condition in the relationship is positive regard by the therapist towards the client. Positive growth and change "are more likely to occur the more that the counselor is experiencing a warm, positive, acceptant attitude toward what is in the client."⁸¹ Rogers further described this positive regard as a kind of agape love that respects the client and does not possess him. Rogers elaborated:

It involves an open willingness for the client to be whatever feelings are real in him at the moment - hostility or tenderness, rebellion or submissiveness, assurance or self-depreciation.⁸²

Unconditionality of regard. Rogers began his discussion of this element by stating his uncertainty of its validity. He stated tentatively "the hypothesis that the relationship will be more effective

⁸⁰ Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 90.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ibid.

the more the positive regard is unconditional."⁸³ This regard by the therapist for the client is in a total and not conditional way. It involves the therapist not making judgments about the client and his being "non-evaluative."

The client's perception. Finally, Rogers pointed out that unless the elements he describes as being essential for the therapist in the relationship are actually experienced by the client the resultant effect is lack of growth. These attitudinal elements must be "communicated to the client and perceived by him." If not, "they do not exist in his perceptual world and thus cannot be effective."⁸⁴ Thus, all of these elements of the therapeutic relationship lead up to the necessity of the client's perceiving of them. Wrote Rogers:

It is that when the client perceives, to a minimal degree, the genuineness of the counselor and the acceptance and empathy which the counselor experiences for him, then development in personality and change in behavior is predicted.⁸⁵

Rogers' conclusion. Rogers concluded this discourse on the therapeutic relationship with a series of statements which he believed logically build on each other. He began by stating that the goal of the helping professions is to "enhance the personal development, the psychological growth toward a socialized maturity, of its clients."⁸⁶ A professional's effectiveness is measured in terms of to what extent

⁸³Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 91.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 93.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 101.

he reaches this goal. Knowledge within the helping professions is limited in regard to what causes constructive change. Rogers then presented a crucial thesis to his statements when he wrote:

Such factual knowledge as we currently possess indicates that a primary change-producing influence is the degree to which the client experiences certain qualities in his relationship with his counselor.⁸⁷

From the basis, Rogers stated that "certain qualities in the relationship are quite uniformly found to be associated with personal growth and change."⁸⁸ Rogers summarized these qualities:

They are personal human qualities - something the counselor experiences, not something he knows. Constructive personal growth is associated with the counselor's realness, with his genuine and unconditional liking for his client, with his sensitive understanding of his client's private world, and with his ability to communicate those qualities in himself to his client.⁸⁹

REALITY THERAPY

The History of Reality Therapy

A relatively new theory of psychotherapy is Reality Therapy as developed by William Glasser, a psychiatrist. Glasser's popular book of the same name was originally published in 1965 and has received enormous acceptance. Glasser's ideas and concepts have achieved an especially wide following by those members of helping professions who are involved with clients in situations where the courts have ordered treatment. Examples would be juvenile delinquents and their families, incarcerated juveniles and adults and child welfare related matters.

⁸⁷ Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 93.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 101.

Glasser became uncomfortable with traditional psychiatric training during the last stages of his medical education. He began to reassess his previously held assumptions of psychiatry which eventually led to the concepts presented in Reality Therapy.

Reality therapy differs from traditional models of psychiatry in a number of areas. Glasser rejected the medical model of mental health and mental illness. Glasser simplified his concept to either behavior that is responsible or irresponsible. Thus he does away with extensive diagnosis. Rather, a person is acting responsibly if he meets his needs without interfering with other people meeting theirs. If the person interferes, he is acting irresponsibly. The needs that Glasser discussed are twofold:

Psychiatry must be concerned with two basic psychological needs: the need to love and be loved and the need to feel that we are worthwhile to ourselves and to others. Helping patients fulfill these two needs is the basis of Reality Therapy.⁹⁰

Traditional psychoanalytic therapy places much emphasis on the past and its understanding. Reality Therapy is concerned with the here and now present. The past only influences behavior only to the degree that the person permits it. The concept of transferences is also rejected. Reality Therapy also rejects the concept of looking for unconscious motivation as it can be regarded as an excuse for irresponsible behavior. Finally, Reality Therapy emphasizes right and wrong in behavior and tries to teach the patient better ways of meeting one's needs. "Reality Therapy mobilizes its efforts toward helping a person accept reality and aims to help him meet his needs within its confines."⁹¹

⁹⁰William Glasser, Reality Therapy (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975), p. 9.

⁹¹Ibid.

The Therapeutic Relationship

Glasser described therapy as a "special kind of teaching or training which attempts, in a relatively short, intense period, what should have been established during normal growing up."⁹² Therapy is composed of three separate yet interwoven elements. The first and most difficult is involvement. Glasser wrote that the "therapist must become so involved with the patient that the patient can begin to face reality and see how his behavior is unrealistic."⁹³ The second element is the rejection of the unrealistic behavior of the patient, yet the acceptance of the patient himself. The final element is the teaching of better ways to fulfillment of needs to the patient within the confines of reality.⁹⁴ These elements are examined in detail.

Involvement. Glasser described the procedures necessary for the "firm emotional relationship with a patient who has failed to establish such relationships in the past."⁹⁵ The patient is seeking someone with whom he can develop a relationship and become emotionally involved. This is of aid to the therapist who is willing to provide such a relationship. However, as great as the need is for the relationship, a patient may resist because of his past disappointments and failures in establishing such relationships.⁹⁶

⁹²Glasser, Reality Therapy, p. 20.

⁹³Ibid., p. 21.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 21.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 25.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 22.

Glasser explained the basis of involvement by describing characteristics of the therapist that are necessary for the relationship to occur. First of all, the "therapist must be a very responsible person - tough, interested, human and sensitive."⁹⁷ The therapist must be able to fulfill his own needs in a responsible manner and then be able to discuss his experiences in this regard. The therapist is as human as the client and has his own struggles yet still is able to meet his needs in a responsible manner. He can thus become a model for the client. Glasser elaborated further on the therapist and the necessity for him to be a responsible person:

Neither aloof, superior, nor sacrosanct, he must never imply that what he does, what he stands for, or what he values is unimportant. He must have the strength to become involved, to have his values tested by the patient, and to withstand intense criticism by the person he is trying to help.⁹⁸

The therapist must also be strong and not expedient. He cannot accept pleas for sympathy and must not give his approval to irresponsible behavior. Glasser wrote:

Never condoning an irresponsible action on the patient's part, he must be willing to watch the patient suffer if that helps him toward responsibility. Therefore, to practice Reality Therapy takes strength, not only for the therapist to lead a responsible life himself, but also the added strength both to stand up steadfastly to patients who wish him to accede to their irresponsibility, and to continue to point out reality to them no matter how hard they struggle against it.⁹⁹

Glasser pointed out that most patients know their behavior is different sometimes being forcibly brought to their attention. The

⁹⁷ Glasser, Reality Therapy, p. 22.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid., pp. 22-23.

Reality Therapist "must have knowledge and understanding about the person who is isolated or different because he cannot properly fulfill his needs."¹⁰⁰ The therapist must accept the client as he is uncritically and must be able to understand his behavior. The therapist must be able to remain unafraid when confronted by irresponsible behavior which is often a test and indicative of the patient's true desire to develop a relationship.¹⁰¹

Finally, Glasser wrote that "the therapist must be able to become emotionally involved with each patient."¹⁰² This may involve personal pain on the part of the therapist as he suffers with the client. This involvement is a prerequisite to therapy and may take a long time to develop with more irresponsible people. Glasser stated that "attaining involvement is the essence of therapy."¹⁰³ Once the involvement is attained, the patient is able to face reality and treatment can begin.

Acceptance of client - rejection of irresponsible behavior.

Glasser's second element of therapy is the acceptance of the patient with the rejection of the irresponsible behavior manifested by him. It is closely tied to the first element of involvement. Glasser used the story of Annie Sullivan and Helen Keller as an example of this concept. Annie Sullivan was able to accept Helen Keller and become deeply involved with her. Yet she refused to accept Helen's irresponsible behavior and would not condone it as did Helen's family. With this

¹⁰⁰Glasser, Reality Therapy, p. 23.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²Ibid.

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 24.

concept as a basis, Annie Sullivan was able to teach Helen Keller how to fulfill her basic needs in a responsible manner.¹⁰⁴

Achievement of the therapeutic involvement is the first step in therapy. The second is the rejection of the irresponsible behavior and the therapist's insistence that the patient must face the reality of his behavior. The patient is not allowed to avoid the recognition of his behavior. He begins to face a "truth that he has spent his life trying to avoid: he is responsible for his behavior."¹⁰⁵ The therapist confronts the patient with the reality of his behavior and refuses to accept or condone it. This is vital to Glasser who pointed out the real goal of the client which is to "find a man who cares enough about him to reject behavior which will not help him to fulfill his needs."¹⁰⁶

Along with the rejection of irresponsible behavior the therapist also must give approval and recognition when the patient does act responsibly. The goal in this process is for the patient to accept responsibility for owning the problem. Glasser wrote that "the patient rather than the therapist must decide whether or not his behavior is irresponsible and whether he should change it."¹⁰⁷ If the patient thinks that he cannot help his irresponsible behavior, therapy will be unsuccessful. Glasser stated that "the skill of therapy is to put the responsibility upon the patient and, after involvement is established, to ask him why he remains in therapy if he is not dissatisfied with his

¹⁰⁴Glasser, Reality Therapy, p., 26.

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, p. 27.

¹⁰⁷*Ibid.*, p. 28.

behavior."¹⁰⁸ Part of Reality Therapy is the concept that the purpose of therapy is not to make the patient happy. The purpose is the achievement of responsible behavior and "happiness occurs most often when we are willing to take responsibility for our behavior."¹⁰⁹

Another part of the process is the broad range of subjects that may be discussed in therapy. Anything is permissible with the idea that, while relating such discussion to behavior, the client becomes more aware of his potential. The patient becomes aware that it is possible to have a responsible attitude toward all of life. He also develops increased self-worth in the discussion of these subjects with someone with whom he is involved and whom he respects. Glasser wrote that "when values, standards, and responsibility are in the background, all discussion is relevant to therapy."¹¹⁰ The therapist then begins to help the patient become aware of his strong points and shows how they can be expanded.

This process takes place in the here and now present. The past is unchangeable and it serves no purpose to become involved with a person as he was. The goal is to become involved with a person as he is and "the responsible person we know he can be."¹¹¹

Relearning. Glasser's last element of therapy is relearning which is part of the entire treatment process. The "patient must rely on the therapist's experience to help him learn better ways of behavior."¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ Glasser, Reality Therapy, p. 29.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 31.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 32.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 33.

Glasser elaborated on this concept:

When we do so, when the young delinquent learns the values of working and experiences the good feelings that accompany responsible action, therapy is approaching an end. It is only a matter of time until the patient, with his newly acquired responsible behavior, begins to fulfill his needs. He finds new relationships, more satisfying involvements; and needs the therapist less.¹¹³

This relearning process may be less necessary with some patients than others.

The Identity Society. A more recent book by William Glasser is entitled The Identity Society published in 1972. This volume is concerned with a broader application of Glasser's ideas and concepts and it contains the author's own summary of Reality Therapy.

Glasser divides Reality Therapy into seven separate principles. The first of these is involvement which is described in essentially the same manner as in Reality Therapy. He does make a specific mention of the "warm, intimate, emotional involvement" that needs to be established and states that involvement is the foundation of therapy.¹¹⁴ Talking about the patient's complaints is to be avoided and the emphasis is placed more on the options that are open to the client.

The second principle is the emphasis on current behavior. Behavior is stressed over feelings with the concept that significant changes in feeling follow change in behavior. The Reality Therapist wants to know what the patient is doing at the present and that he can choose to do otherwise if he so wishes.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Glasser, Reality Therapy, p. 33.

¹¹⁴ William Glasser, The Identity Society, (New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1972), p. 78.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p. 83.

The third principle is evaluating behavior. The patient must judge his behavior on the basis of whether or not it is his best choice. It is important to note that it is not the therapist who judges the behavior. The therapist leads the patient to evaluate his own behavior through their involvement and by bringing the actual behavior out in the open.¹¹⁶

Planning responsible behavior is the fourth principle. Once a value judgment is made, a realistic plan must be made for future action. The therapist is to help the client in the development of this plan.

Commitment is the fifth principle. This involves a verbal or written commitment to the plan that has been developed.

The non-acceptance of excuses and a policy of non-punishment on behalf of the therapist are the sixth and seventh principles.

Rachin. Richard L. Rachin of the Florida Division of Youth Services wrote an extensive article entitled "Reality Therapy: Helping People Help Themselves" which is included in G. Donald Polenz's book, Helping As a Humanistic Process: Perspectives and Viewpoints.¹¹⁷

Rachin, in summarizing Reality Therapy, placed special emphasis on the therapeutic relationship. He wrote that "Involvement, of course, means a great deal more than simply being with other people. It is a reciprocal relationship of care and concern."¹¹⁸ In therapy, the client

¹¹⁶ Glasser, The Identity Society, p. 89.

¹¹⁷ G. Donald Polenz, Ed., Helping As a Humanistic Process: Perspectives and Viewpoints, (Milburn, N.J., R.F. Publishing, Inc., 1975), p. 164.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 167.

is thus involved with someone "whom can both model and mirror reality."¹¹⁹ Rachin elaborated on involvement:

To help someone adopt a more successful life-style, the reality therapist must first become involved with him. Involvement is the reality therapist's expression of genuine care and concern. It is the key to his success in influencing behavior. Involvement does not come easily. The therapist must be patient and determined not to reject the person because of aberrance or misbehavior.¹²⁰

Rachin then described fourteen steps that the therapist follows in Reality Therapy. They provide further insight into the therapeutic relationship.

The first step is that of the personal involvement of the therapist. The therapist is a person who is genuinely concerned and emotionally involved. This is closely associated with the second step which is the therapist revealing himself. He has both strengths and weaknesses and does not have to try to hide either side.¹²¹

The third and fourth steps are also associated. The therapist concentrates on the "here and now" and emphasizes behavior. Behavior, not attitudes or motives, that is a current issue is the focus of therapy.¹²²

Step number five is the de-emphasis on asking why. The therapist is concerned with what the client is doing and to a much lesser degree why. Irresponsible behavior is not condoned no matter what the reason. Helping the client to then evaluate this irresponsible behavior is the

¹¹⁹Polenz, Helping As a Humanistic Process: Perspectives and Viewpoints, p. 168.

¹²⁰Polenz, Helping As a Humanistic Process, p. 161.

¹²¹Ibid., p. 170.

¹²²Ibid., p. 171.

sixth step. Rachin stated that the therapist "repeatedly asks the person what his current behavior is accomplishing and whether it is meeting his needs."¹²³

The seventh step is the therapist's help in the development of a better plan. This is accomplished by stressing the question of what the patient is doing and what he can do differently to more responsibly meet his needs. The therapist does not accept excuses for irresponsible behavior which is the eighth step. Nor does he offer sympathy which is the ninth step. Both the acceptance of excuses and sympathy hinder the progress of therapy and the client as he tries to avoid meeting his needs in a responsible manner.¹²⁴

Praising and approval of responsible behavior is the tenth step. Recognition of such behavior by the therapist is an important aspect of therapy.¹²⁵

The eleventh step is of a philosophical nature and that is the belief that people are capable of changing their behavior. The client is made aware of this and the positive expectations of the therapist.¹²⁶

The last three steps are as follows: (12) emphasis on work in in groups which brings peer influence to bear on the client, (13) the therapist does not allow past material or behavior to make him give up, and, (14) the therapist does not label people.¹²⁷

¹²³Polenz, Helping As a Humanistic Process, p. 171.

¹²⁴Ibid.

¹²⁵Ibid.

¹²⁶Ibid.

¹²⁷Ibid., p. 172.

Rachin concluded with the following statement: "The principles of reality therapy are common sense interwoven with a firm belief in the dignity of man and his ability to improve his lot."¹²⁸

¹²⁸Polenz, Helping As a Humanistic Process, p. 172.

CHAPTER 4

I-THOU IN THE THERAPEUTIC RELATIONSHIP

There are a number of elements in the I-Thou (I-You) concept that are utilized in the therapeutic relationship in humanistic psychotherapy. The three theories of Gestalt Therapy, Client-Centered Therapy and Reality Therapy, respectively, and their utilization of this concept are discussed in this chapter.

Gestalt Therapy and the I-Thou Concept

Gestalt Therapy, as practiced by Fritz Perls and others, presents several basic principles that are considered essential to the therapeutic relationship between client and therapist.

Here and Now

One of the first principles is that of the existential emphasis on the here and now.¹ This approach, as opposed to an emphasis on either past or future, is closely aligned with the here and now as discussed by Martin Buber. Buber described this element of the I-Thou relationship as the "actual and fulfilled present"² and, as Maurice Friedman pointed out, the pre-requisites for this element are present-ness, encounter and relation.³

¹Perls, The Gestalt Approach and Eyewitness to Therapy, p. 63.

²Buber, I and Thou, p. 63.

³Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 57.

Buber's "present" is not just a point that exists between past and future but the real "filled" present.⁴ Gary Yonteff provided a direct statement of Gestalt utilization of this element when he wrote regarding the emphasis on the existential aspects of the interpersonal encounter and quoted James Simkins' description of Gestalt Therapy as "I and Thou; Here and Now."⁵ Yonteff also quoted Walter Kempler's first commandment to pay "attention to the current interaction" in therapy.⁶ Yonteff went on to write that the therapist must "aggressively stay in the I and Thou; Here and Now framework."⁷ Here Yonteff relied directly on Martin Buber and the I-You concept in therapy.

Joan Fagan also spoke of the here and now principle when she wrote of the therapist's humanness and its "here and now awareness" in therapy.⁸ The Polsters also discussed this principle when they wrote of the "moment of union" between therapist and client. Steve Zahm discussed this element when he wrote of the process of "making" contact in therapy as opposed to "having made" contact between client and therapist.¹⁰

Gestalt Therapy thus places emphasis on the existential "now" which is also an element of the I-Thou concept described as the fulfilled present. Gestalt Therapy and Buber seem to share a concern for being

⁴Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 58.

⁵Yonteff, p. 10.

⁶Ibid., p. 11.

⁷Ibid., p. 15.

⁸Fagan and Shepherd, p. 103.

⁹Erving and Miriam Polster, p. 20.

¹⁰Zahm, p. 7.

fully in touch in the now, the present, that encompasses more than just the connection between past and future.

Wholeness. Wholeness is another of the principles of Gestalt Therapy that utilize I-You concepts. Fagan, in particular, emphasized this principle when she wrote of the difficulty of the necessary element of the therapist being a "whole and genuine person."¹¹ The Polsters also wrote in clear terms of the issue of wholeness when they stated:

Unless I am experienced in knowing full contact, when I meet you full-eyed, full bodied, and full minded, you may become irresistible and engulfing. In contacting you, I wager my independent existence, but only through the contact function can the realization of our identities fully develop.¹²

I-You relationships involve this wholeness and Buber stated that "I-You can only be spoken with one's whole being."¹³ Buber elaborated on this theme when he later wrote:

What, then, does one experience of the you? Nothing at all. For one does not experience it. What, then, does one know of the you? Only everything. For one no longer knows particulars.¹⁴

Wholeness then comprises another element of the I-You relationship that is utilized in the therapeutic relationship. Gestalt Therapists wrote directly of the concept and it also is one of the basic assumptions regarding the nature of man, held by humanistic psychology.

Reciprocity. Reciprocity of relationship is another principle of the therapeutic relationship. Perls described the process of the

¹¹Fagan and Shepherd, p. 103.

¹²Erving and Miriam Polster, p. 99.

¹³Buber, I and Thou, p. 54.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 61.

therapist being elevated to a human being and not just being a power figure.¹⁵ Both the client and the therapist assume reciprocal roles and are able to converse with each other and question each other. Perls also felt that communication is vital to both sender and receiver.¹⁶ It is not a one way process. Fagan added further elaboration when she described an aspect of humanness:

Humanness, as it is used here, includes a variety of involvements; the therapist's concern for and caring about his patient on a personal and emotional level; his willingness to share himself and bring to the patient his own direct emotional responses and/or pertinent accounts of his own experiences; his ability to recognize in the patient gropings toward deeper authenticity, which need support and recognition; and his continued openness to his own growth, which serves as a model for the patient.¹⁷

Fagan's emphasis on the therapist's willingness to share of himself is an important part of the client-therapist relationship.

The Polsters also wrote graphically of reciprocity in the relationship. They began by describing the therapist as his own instrument:

Naturally, just as the artist painting a tree has to be affected by that particular tree, so also must the psychotherapist be tuned in to the specific person with whom he is in touch. It is as if the therapist becomes a resonating chamber for what is going on between himself and the patient. He receives and reverberates to what happens in this interaction and he amplifies it so that it becomes part of the dynamic of the therapy.¹⁸

The terms "tuning in" to the client and becoming a "resonating chamber" and the receiving and amplification of what happens in the interaction of the element of reciprocity receive further elaboration. The Polsters

¹⁵Perls, The Gestalt Approach and Eyewitness to Therapy, p. 77.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Fagan and Shepherd, p. 96.

¹⁸Erving and Miriam Polster, p. 18.

wrote that the interaction between client and therapist of their experience exists in Gestalt and other therapies and that therapy is seen as a "two way street." Openness to this type of interaction in Gestalt Therapy leads to "contact" which is a "union" between two separate beings.¹⁹ Zahm also emphasized the union concept when he writes that "through contact we can feel a unity - - absorbed - - tuned in" to others.²⁰

Contact then in Gestalt terms is a reciprocal relationship where both participants share of themselves. This element was succinctly described by Buber when he wrote that "relation is reciprocity. My You acts on me as I act on it."²¹ Friedman commented on the concept of reciprocity and provides pertinent information especially in regard to what the Polsters say about the client and therapist being separate and independent beings. Wrote Friedman:

To be fully real the I-Thou relation must be mutual. This mutuality does not mean simple unity or identity, nor is it any form of empathy. Though I-Thou is the word of relation and togetherness, each of the members of the relation really remains himself, and that means really different from the other.²²

Reciprocity in the I-You relationship implies equality. Both participants in the therapeutic relationship must be equal. Buber used the terms subject and object in this regard. He wrote of this subject-to subject relationship:

¹⁹Erving and Miriam Polster, p. 20.

²⁰Zahm, p. 7.

²¹Buber, I and Thou, p. 67.

²²Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 61.

Whoever says you does not have something for his object. For wherever there is something there is also another something: every It borders on other Its; It is only by virtue of bordering on others. But where you is said there is no something. You has no borders. Whoever says You does not have something, he has nothing. But he stands in relation.²³

Reciprocity is an integral element of the I-You relationship. It is a relationship of equality, of subject to subject and such an element is utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy.

Openness. Openness in the sharing process is another element of the I-You relationship. Perls referred to this openness and willingness to share of oneself as an empathic relationship where the therapist is concerned with the client yet also feels free to share of himself and his feelings.²⁴ Fagan also emphasized this openness by the therapist who is first in tune with the patient.²⁵ The Polsters and Zahm used the term contact to describe the relationship between client and therapist. The contact is a relationship between beings and does not involve one being in control of the other. Buber's I-You concept and relationship is discussed in the following manner.

Neighborless and seamless, he is You and fills the firmament. Not as if there were nothing but he; but everything else lives in his light . . . The human being to whom I say You I do not experience. But I stand in relation to him in the sacred basic word (I-You).²⁶

Relationship between two individuals and not the experiencing of one over the other is the basis of an I-You relationship. This also applies

²³Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

²⁴Perls, The Gestalt Approach and Eyewitness to Therapy, p. 106.

²⁵Fagan and Shepherd, pp. 100, 101.

²⁶Buber, I and Thou, p. 59.

to Gestalt Therapy with its emphasis on equal humanness on the part of both participants. The therapist devotes his total energy and humanness to the client and is in relationship to him as one subject to another subject. There is no domination, control or utilization in the relationship just as there is none in the I-You relationship. Yonteff's quotation from Gestalt Therapist, Walter Kempler, spoke of this relationship. Kempler gave a commandment that there should be involvement of the "total therapist - person bringing overtly and richly his full personal impact on the families with whom he works."²⁷ This humanness is a vital part of therapy according to Fagan who wrote that the therapist must relate with "here and now awareness, pleasure excitement, deep emotional involvement and direct interaction "as opposed to computing."²⁸ Computing is of the I-It realm. The therapeutic relationship with the above listed characteristics is of the I-You realm.

Intimacy. Intimacy in the I-You relationship is also present in the Gestalt Therapeutic relationship. Buber disliked the term experience and described it as traveling over something. The I-You relationship is established through a prolonged dwelling with the other. Fagan's emphasis on deep emotional involvement and Perls' emphasis on sharing of the therapist's self also imply intimacy, especially in regard to the two-way process of therapy as described by the Polsters. The two-way process of communication and therapy occurs in the encounter between client and therapist.

²⁷Yonteff, p. 11.

²⁸Fagan and Shepherd, p. 103.

Each should regard his partner as the very one he is. I become aware of him, aware that he is different, essentially different from myself, in the definite, unique way which is peculiar to him, and I accept who I thus see, so that in full earnestness I can direct what I say to him as the person he is . . . I affirm the person I struggle with: I struggle with him as his partner, I confirm him as creature and as creation, I confirm him who is opposed to me as him who is over against me. It is true that it now depends on the other whether genuine dialogue, mutuality . . . arises between us. But if I thus give to the other who confronts me his legitimate standing as a man with whom I am ready to enter into dialogue, then I may trust him and suppose him to be also ready to deal with me as his partner.²⁹

Silence. Steve Zahm emphasized the possibility of contact occurring in silence. Communication and contact is not confined to language or words being exchanged. Contact is a process involving dialogue and dialogue is not totally dependent upon language. This process is closely aligned with Buber's writings who suggests that dialogue can transcend language. Buber wrote:

Just as the most eager speaking at one another does not make conversation . . . so for a conversation no sound is necessary, not even a gesture.³⁰

Language is only one dimension of communication and silence can be another. When the individual is open to communication, contact can occur through silence. Buber stated that "unreservedly, communication streams from him, and the silence bears it to his neighbor."³¹ In the therapeutic relationship, the ideal is for both participants to give their full attention. This giving full attention or unreservedness as Buber called it, is another element in the I-You relationship that is

²⁹Martin Buber, The Knowledge of Man (New York: Harper Torchbooks 1965), pp. 79-80.

³⁰Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 4.

³¹Ibid.

utilized in the therapeutic relationship. Buber concluded this discussion by stating that "where unreserve has ruled, even wordlessly, between men, the word of dialogue has happened sacramentally."

Awareness. Awareness is another characteristic of the participants in the therapeutic relationship that is similar in nature to the awareness that Buber discussed. Steve Zahm wrote that awareness is a "matter of focusing one's attention and that it is a selective process."³² This is comparable to Buber's statements that awareness is the perception of a deeper quality that opens the door to relation. Awareness is dependent upon the individual having a receptive attitude toward relationship or contact.³³ Awareness is the beginning of the contact cycle and is a pre-requisite to contact taking place. Awareness leads to contact and relation.

Contact rhythm. J. William and Judith Pfeiffer have pointed out that contact occurs in cycles or rhythms. Contact is followed by withdrawal as too much contact would "dull the senses and diminish awareness."³⁴ Proper balance requires withdrawal from contact. This is similar to Buber's discussion of how the You of an I-You relationship must ultimately become an It. He wrote:

Love itself cannot abide in direct relation: it endures, but in the alternation of actuality and latency, every You in the world is compelled by its nature to become a thing for us or at least to

³² Zahm, p. 12.

³³ Buber, Between Man and Man, p. 8.

³⁴ Pfeiffer and Pfeiffer, p. 1.

enter again and again into thinghood.³⁵

Thus the therapeutic relationship is destined to end or at least enter into thinghood again and again. Logically, if the relationship slips out of the I-You realm into an I-It relationship or thinghood again and again, then also the I-You relationship in therapy can be achieved again and again.

Client-Centered Therapy and the I-Thou Concept

Client-Centered Therapy, as conceived by Carl Rogers, has an extensive list of characteristic elements of the therapeutic relationship between therapist and client. These have been examined in chronological order as they are presented in Rogers' writings.

Complete communication. In Rogers' volume Client-Centered Therapy, an entire section is devoted to the therapeutic relationship. This section relies heavily upon research completed by Fred E. Fiedler for his Ph.D. dissertation which lists characteristic descriptive items of the ideal therapeutic relationship. The most characteristic element was the ability of the therapist to "participate completely in the patient's communication."³⁶ The relationship involves full attention and awareness. This concept of devoting one's full participation in communication is quite similar to Buber's description of the subject-to-subject relationship:

Whoever says You does not have something for his object. For wherever there is something there is also another something; every

³⁵ Buber, I and Thou, p. 147.

³⁶ Carl Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, p. 53.

It borders on other Its; It is only by virtue of bordering on others. But where You is said there is no something. You has no borders. Whoever says You does not have something; he has nothing. But he stands in relation.³⁷

Buber also wrote of the necessity of a "prolonged dwelling with the other" in order to establish an I-You relationship. The relationship is not a superficial one but rather is one of depth through full participation which received further elaboration in the following description of the I-You:

Neighborless and seamless, he is You and fills the firmament. Not as if there were nothing but he; but everything else lives in his light. . . . The human being to whom I say You I do not experience. But I stand in relation to him, in the sacred basic word (I-You).³⁸

Buber also wrote that one knows "everything" of the You.³⁹ Rogers also discussed the aspect of full participation in his book On Becoming A Person when he emphasized the importance of being clear and unambiguous in communication.⁴⁰

Equality. Rogers' use of Fiedler's research also pointed out the "very characteristic" aspect of the therapist treating the client as an equal.⁴¹ Equality in the I-You concept is exemplified by the writings regarding the subject-to-subject nature of the relationship including the passage previously quoted which stated that the "human being to whom I say You, I do not experience. But I stand in relation to him,

³⁷ Buber, I and Thou, p. 54.

³⁸ Buber, I and Thou, p. 59.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 61.

⁴⁰ Rogers, On Becoming A Person, p. 51.

⁴¹ Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, p. 54.

in the sacred basic word (I-You).⁴² Another example of similarity in regard to equality between patient and therapist is Buber's description of reciprocity. He wrote that "relation is reciprocity, My You acts on me and I act on It."⁴³ The relationship is reciprocal or mutual with both participants being equal. This equality and reciprocity is also similar to Rogers' emphasis on the therapist and client being "co-workers on a common problem."⁴⁴ Anything less than equality in the therapeutic relationship would involve an I-It relationship or one of subject-to-object. This is not characteristic of the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy. Rogers states that Client-Centered Therapists are on the opposite extreme of tutorial or authoritarian roles in their relationships to their clients.⁴⁵

Genuineness. Rogers wrote of the importance of genuineness in the helping relationship. By this he meant that the therapist must be aware of his own feelings, must not present a facade and must be real.⁴⁶ Buber addressed the issue of genuineness and the avoidance of presenting a facade when he wrote of the I-You relationship occurring only with the whole being.⁴⁷ Buber also wrote of the I-You relationship, in specific reference to marriage, that "two human beings reveal the You to one

⁴²Buber, I and Thou, p. 59.

⁴³Ibid., p. 67.

⁴⁴Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, p. 54.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 55.

⁴⁶Rogers, On Becoming A Person, p. 33.

⁴⁷Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

another."⁴⁸ Thus the I-You relationship involves the revealing of the You with all of its implication. A facade is not present in the I-You relationship. Another example of utilization is the description by Buber that the I-You relationship "has no borders."⁴⁹

Acceptance. Rogers also stressed the importance of acceptance of the client. By acceptance Rogers meant a warm regard for the individual as a person of unconditional self-worth. The concept of acceptance in the therapeutic relationship is also similar to Buber's comments regarding the I-You relationship. Again Buber's statement that "neighborless and seamless, he is You and fills the firmament"⁵⁰ presented elements of commonality. This acceptance of the individual involves the separateness of both participants. As Friedman pointed out, the I-You relationship is one where both members of the relation remains himself and is different from the other.⁵¹ Rogers stressed this idea of separateness again when he pointed out the necessity to remain separate from the other in a series of questions regarding the therapeutic relationship.⁵²

Totality and wholeness. The two elements of totality and wholeness are intrinsic to both the I-You relationship concept and to Rogerian Client-Centered Therapy. The two-way reciprocal nature of the

⁴⁸Buber, I and Thou, p. 95.

⁴⁹Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 59.

⁵¹Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 61.

⁵²Rogers, On Becoming a Person, p. 52.

relationship is explained in On Becoming A Person where Rogers asked two questions regarding the relationship:

Can I let myself enter fully into the world of his feelings and personal meanings and see these as he does?

Can I be acceptant of each facet of this person which he presents to me. Can I receive him as he is? Can I communicate this attitude.⁵³

The first question stresses the significance of fully entering his world. The term "fully" is important in the therapeutic relationship as it is in the I-You relationship. Several passages from I and Thou deal with this issue. Buber wrote:

Whoever says You does not have something for his object. For wherever there is something there is also another something; every It borders on other Its; It is only by virtue of bordering on others. But where You is said there is no something. You has no borders. Whoever says You does not have something; he has nothing. But he stands in relation.⁵⁴

Wood commented on this passage which was concerned with the "prolonged dwelling with the other" which leads to intimacy.⁵⁵ Buber's most succinct passage regarding totality stated:

What, then, does one experience of the You? Nothing at all. For one does not experience it. What, then, does one know of the You? Only everything. For one no longer knows particulars⁵⁶

Wood commented that the word "know" is of great depth and involves seeing the whole.⁵⁷

The equality and reciprocity of the I-You concept is also emphasized with the subject-to-subject nature of the relationship. As Rogers

⁵³ Rogers, On Becoming A Person, pp. 53, 54.

⁵⁴ Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

⁵⁵ Wood, p. 40.

⁵⁶ Buber, I and Thou, p. 61.

⁵⁷ Wood, p. 50.

pointed out, the relationship is reciprocal and involves the therapist entering fully into the world of the client and accepting each facet of what is presented to him. The wholeness and totality are present in both separate participants in the I-You and therapeutic relationship.

Freedom. Freedom is another element of the therapeutic relationship that is quite similar to aspects of the I-You relationship. Rogers wrote of this element in his volume On Becoming A Person. He stated:

There is implied here a freedom to explore oneself at both conscious and unconscious levels, as rapidly as one can dare to embark on this dangerous quest. There is also a complete freedom from any moral or diagnostic evaluation since all such evaluations are, I believe, always threatening.⁵⁸

This freedom to explore oneself and to be free from evaluation is important to Rogerian theory and was also spoken of by Buber. He wrote:

Every actual relationship to another being in the world is exclusive. Its you is freed and steps forth to confront us in its uniqueness. It fills the firmament - not as if there were nothing else, but everything else lives in its light.⁵⁹

Although this description dealt specifically with the perfect relationship to the Eternal You, it, nevertheless, is an element of utilization by Rogers. The You, in Rogers' theory, is freed to explore himself and be free from evaluation.

Immediacy. Rogerian Client-Centered theory is also concerned with the existential element of immediacy. Rogers wrote the following question: "Can I meet this other individual as a person who is in the

⁵⁸ Rogers, On Becoming A Person, p. 34.

⁵⁹ Buber, I and Thou, p. 126.

process of becoming, or will I be bound by his past and my past?',⁶⁰

Rogers was concerned with the importance of keeping the therapist's limitations of cognizance from distorting the relationship. At this point, Rogers quoted Buber to elaborate on this point.

Confirming means. . . accepting the whole potentiality of the other. . . I can recognize in him, know in him, the person he has been. . . created to become. . . I confirm him in myself, and then in him, in relation to his potentiality that. . . can now be developed, can evolve.⁶¹

Rogers then commented on Buber's statement:

If I accept the other person as something fixed, already diagnosed and classified, already shaped by his past, then I am doing my part to confirm his limited hypothesis. If I accept him as a process of becoming, then I am doing what I can to confirm or make real his potentialities.⁶²

Rogers' goal is to use the relationship to help the client in reaching all of his potentialities.

Maurice Friedman who is generally acclaimed as the most knowledgeable expert on Buber emphasized the concept of real life being encounter. He went on to point out the characteristics of the encounter, which are mutuality, directness, presentness, intensity and ineffability, as it forms the I-You relationship.⁶³ Buber discussed these characteristics in several asterisked sections as is his style. He began by stating:

The relation to the You is unmediated. Nothing conceptual intervenes between I and You, no prior knowledge and no imagination; and

⁶⁰Rogers, On Becoming A Person, p. 54.

⁶¹Martin Buber and Carl Rogers, Transcription of dialogue held April 18, 1957, Ann Arbor, Mich., Unpublished Manuscript.

⁶²Rogers, On Becoming A Person, p. 55.

⁶³Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 57.

memory is itself changed as it plunges from particularity into wholeness. No purpose intervenes between I and You, no greed and no anticipation; and longing itself is changed as it plunges from the dream into appearance. Every means is an obstacle, only where all means have disintegrated, encounters occur.⁶⁴

Buber expanded this theme when he listed the prerequisites for the "present" as it relates to immediacy. They are as Friedman indicated, presentness, encounter, and relation.⁶⁵ These must exist before the "actual and fulfilled present exists."⁶⁶ Thus, the "present of the I-Thou relation is not the abstract point between past and future that indicates that something has just happened but the real filled present."⁶⁷

The concept of immediacy is thus utilized by Rogers' Client-Centered Therapy.

Congruence. Carl Rogers and Barry Stevens wrote the volume Person to Person which also deals with the therapeutic relationship. Rogers stressed the importance of the quality of the interpersonal relationship and pointed out several integral elements of this relationship. The first is congruence which has previously been described. An important part of congruence is the encounter. Rogers wrote:

It means that he comes into a direct personal encounter with his client, meeting him on a person-to-person basis. It means he is being himself, not denying himself.⁶⁸

This type of relationship is similar to the I-You relationship as

⁶⁴Buber, I and Thou, pp. 62-63.

⁶⁵Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 57.

⁶⁶Buber, I and Thou, p. 63.

⁶⁷Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 58.

⁶⁸Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 87.

described by Buber and summarized by Herberg who wrote that "the 'primary word' I-Thou points to a relationship of person to person, of subject to subject, a relation of reciprocity involving 'meeting' or 'encounter'."⁶⁹ It is significant to note that both Rogers and Herberg use the terms "person-to-person" and "encounter."

The opposite end of the spectrum is composed of those who never seem to relate to others in a straightforward manner. They play a role and are not themselves. They avoid genuine relationships. This description is similar to Herberg's description of the I-It relationship. He wrote that "the 'primary word' I-It points to a relation of person to thing, of subject to object, involving some sort of utilization, domination, or control, even if it is only so-called 'objective' knowing."⁷⁰

The I-You relationship is utilized in the "quality," therapeutic relationship as described by Rogers. The I-It is similar to the relationship that is on the opposite extreme from congruence and the I-You concept.

Empathy. Carl Rogers' second element in the therapeutic relationship as stated in Person to Person is empathy. An important part of this element is the ability to remain separate in the relationship. Rogers wrote:

To sense the client's inner world of private personal meanings as if it were your own, but without ever losing the 'as if' quality, this is empathy, and this seems essential to a growth promoting

⁶⁹Herberg, p. 14.

⁷⁰Ibid.

relationship.⁷¹

This concept of separateness, the "as if" as Rogers described it, is vital to empathy. These are two separate entities in the relationship and Rogers wrote that the therapist must not lose his separateness and his own identity.⁷²

The separateness concept has already been discussed in this chapter under the heading of acceptance. Friedman stated that the I-You relationship did not involve empathy. He based that position on the idea that I-You involves separateness and that empathy does not.⁷³ However, Rogers specifically emphasizes that separateness is an integral part of his concept of empathy.

Positive regard. Rogers' third element in the relationship is positive regard by the therapist toward the client. This positive regard concept involves a "warm, positive, acceptant attitude" that respects but does not possess the client.⁷⁴ Buber's I-You concept calls for acceptance of the other to the point of "neighborless and seamless, he is You and fills the firmament" yet as pointed out in the preceding paragraph, he is a separate entity.⁷⁵

Unconditionality of regard. Closely related to positive regard is the concept of unconditional regard of which Rogers expressed some

⁷¹Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 79.

⁷²Ibid., p. 90.

⁷³Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 61.

⁷⁴Rogers and Stevens, Person to Person, p. 91.

⁷⁵Buber, I and Thou, p. 59.

doubt as to its validity. It involves a total and unconditional attitude by the therapist. Buber's passage regarding the perfect relationship to God is somewhat similar to this concept. Buber wrote:

Every actual relationship to another being in the world is exclusive. Its You is freed and steps forth to confront us in its uniqueness. It fills the firmament - not as if there were nothing else, but everything else lives in its light.⁷⁶

Buber also wrote of the unconditional nature of the relationship with God:

In the relation to God, unconditional exclusiveness and unconditional inclusiveness are one. For those who enter into the absolute relationship, nothing particular retains any importance - neither things nor beings, neither earth nor heaven - but everything is included in the relationship. For entering into the pure relationship does not involve ignoring everything but seeing everything in the you, not renouncing the world but placing it upon its proper ground.⁷⁷

There are similarities in Rogers' unconditional regard and Buber's passage describing the unconditional nature of the relationship to God and it would appear that Rogers' Client-Centered Therapy does utilize this concept. However, from Buber's theistic position, question of appropriateness might be raised regarding the relationship between man and man.

The client's perception. The final aspect of the relationship is the concept of how the client perceives the attitudes previously listed as communicated by the therapist. The client must be able to perceive what the therapist communicates in the relationship. This relationship then reverts back to the person-to-person encounter where both participants are equal and reciprocally communicate and relate to

⁷⁶Buber, I and Thou, p. 126.

⁷⁷Buber, I and Thou, p. 127.

each other.

In conclusion, Rogers discussed the I-You concept in 1952 when he wrote the following:

When there is this complete unity, singleness, fullness of experiencing in the relationship, then it acquires the 'out-of-this-world' quality which therapists have remarked upon, a sort of trance-like feeling in the relationship from which both client and therapist emerge at the end of the hour, as if from a deep well or tunnel. In these moments there is, to borrow Buber's phrase, a real 'I-Thou' relationship, a timeless living in the experience which is between client and therapist. It is at the opposite pole from seeing the client, or oneself, as an object.⁷⁸

Reality Therapy and the I-Thou Concept

Reality Therapy, as originated and developed by William Glasser, presents a number of elements that occur within the therapeutic relationship that are similar to concepts in the I-You relationship.

Involvement. The first component of the therapeutic relationship is the involvement by the therapist with the patient. The patient who has failed to establish involvement in the past may be seeking such a relationship when he enters therapy. The therapist must be "responsible, tough, interested, human and sensitive."⁷⁹ Glasser described it as being a "warm, intimate, emotional involvement."⁸⁰ Richard L. Rachin described this involvement as a "reciprocal relationship of care and concern which is tied to the necessity of the therapist revealing himself."⁸¹

⁷⁸Carl R. Rogers, "Persons or Science? - A Philosophical Question.", (Unpublished paper, 1952, Chicago, Illinois).

⁷⁹Glasser, Reality Therapy, p. 22.

⁸⁰Polenz, Helping As A Humanistic Process, p. 161.

⁸¹Ibid.

The therapist does not present a facade by trying to hide his weakness.

These components of the therapeutic relationship are similar to elements of the I-You concept. The terms "interested," "human and sensitive," "warm and intimate," point to the depth of the relationship and are comparable to the following passage by Buber:

Whoever says You does not have something for his object. For wherever there is something there is also another something; every It borders on other Its; It is only by virtue of bordering on others. But where You is said there is no something. You has no borders. Whoever says you does not have something; he has nothing. But he stands in relation.⁸²

Again, as in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt and Client-Centered therapies, this is not an objective knowing of the client. It is a direct relationship of subject-to-subject and of person-to-person.

Glasser pointed out that the therapist is not aloof or superior but must have the strength to become involved. The client is a person of value with whom the therapist becomes emotionally involved. This person is "no thing among things nor does he consist of things." He is a person with whom the therapist becomes involved as a person. Buber wrote:

Man wishes to be confirmed in his being by man, and wishes to have a presence in the being of another. The human person needs confirmation because man as man needs it . . . It is different with man: sent forth from the natural domain of species into solitary category, surrounded by the air of chaos which came into being with him, secretly and bashfully he watches for a yes which allows him to be and which can come to him only from one human person to another. It is from one man to another that the heavenly bread of self-being is passed.⁸³

Reciprocity. Reciprocity is an integral part of the I-You concept. Rachin described the therapeutic relationship of involvement

⁸²Polenz, Helping As A Humanistic Process, p. 161.

⁸³Buber, The Knowledge of Man, p. 71.

as being a reciprocal relationship which is quite similar to Buber's statement that "relation is reciprocity. My You acts on me as I act on it."⁸⁴ This reciprocity is further revealed in the therapeutic relationship with the Reality Therapy emphasis on the therapist being open and revealing himself. Buber wrote of this principal in describing marriage, but it would appear that it is utilized by the therapeutic relationship as well, when he spoke of "two human beings revealing the You to one another."⁸⁵

Here and now. Rachin placed emphasis on the here and now aspects of the relationship. Past history and failure on the part of the client is not acceptable and is discouraged. Rather, the emphasis is on the present. As has been pointed out previously, the I-You relationship is also within the realm of the here and now. Buber wrote of the "actual and fulfilled present."⁸⁶ Friedman added clarification when he wrote that the "I-Thou relationship is not the abstract point between past and future that indicates something has just happened but the real filled present."⁸⁷

Acceptance. Glasser also wrote of the acceptance of the client by the therapist. This means that although the irresponsible behavior is rejected, the person is accepted. The client has someone with whom he can become intimately and emotionally involved. The totality of the

⁸⁴Buber, I and Thou, p. 67.

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 95.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 63.

⁸⁷Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 58.

person is accepted but his behavior, if irresponsible, is rejected. Irresponsible behavior is not condoned.

Separateness. As in Client-Centered Therapy, Reality Therapy's concept of the therapeutic relationship involves two separate beings. The emotional, intimate involvement takes place between two separate persons. Friedman wrote that the I-You relationship is one where each member of the relation remains himself and is different from the other.⁸⁸

Genuineness. In the therapeutic relationship, Glasser and Rachin also presented the concept of the therapist being genuine. He reveals himself and is a model for his client. Buber's writings of the I-You concept repeatedly refer both directly and indirectly to the whole being in the relationship.⁸⁹ If the whole being is involved and revealed, there can be no facade. Genuineness is a natural part of the relationship.

⁸⁸ Friedman, Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue, p. 61.

⁸⁹ Buber, I and Thou, p. 55.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It was the problem of this study to determine if, and to what extent, elements of the I-Thou relationship as described by Martin Buber, are utilized in the client-therapist relationship in the selected theories of Gestalt, Client-Centered and Reality Therapies viewed as being within the theoretical framework of humanistic psychotherapy.

Humanistic psychotherapy, sometimes referred to as the third force in psychotherapy and psychology, differs from psychoanalytic and behavioristic theories in its philosophy and basic assumptions of mankind. Humanistic psychotherapy assumes that man is an autonomous experiencing whole, that he deserves a distinct and higher place in the scheme of life and that he is the only being to construct a concept of the self. Dysfunction in man involves painful or unacceptable behavior, thoughts and feelings and the changing of dysfunctional behavior requires insight. There is an emphasis upon human dignity, choice and self-realization with a corresponding de-emphasis upon thinking of man in mechanical or reductionistic terms or as a being who merely responds to stimuli. The objectives of therapy are seen as a means to help man overcome obstacles to personal growth and to help the achievement of human potential.

Chapter two was concerned with Martin Buber's I and Thou which is a volume that is concerned with the essence of relationships. The method of procedure involved research into the basic I-Thou or I-You

framework, the It-world and the Eternal Thou. Buber's ontological basis is man's whole situation where he is faced with the possibility of many different relationships. Buber's position stated that real life occurs in "meeting" or "encounter" in the relation. This meeting can occur with nature, with man or with spiritual beings. Through the relation with the Thou or the other, man himself becomes an 'I'. The I is always associated with either You or It which signify the type of relation. I-You is a relation of the highest and purest quality and is characterized by wholeness and totality and involves true, direct, reciprocal relationship between subject and subject as opposed to subject and object. The relation takes place in the actual filled present as described by Buber. The I-You relationship is also one that can occur without the use of language as silence can be a portal to relation. The I-You relation is primary in and of itself and it stresses wholeness and trust.

The It-world is a world without I-You relations. It is a world of "things" and relationships that use, dominate, or control one another. Buber defined evil as the predominance of the It-world and he pointed out that cultures progressively increase their It-worlds by absorbing It-like qualities from previous cultures.

In part three of I and Thou Buber addressed what was his most essential concern, the significance of the close association of the relation to God with the relation to fellow man. All relationships extended intersect in the Eternal You. It is an I-You relationship with God that Buber saw as the perfect relationship. God in the I-You relationship is the only You who can never become an It.

Chapter three was concerned with the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt, Client-Centered and Reality therapies. These three theories of psychotherapy have all received wide acceptance and use by professional counselors, psychologists, and social workers.

Gestalt Therapy. Gestalt Therapy is generally associated with Frederick S. (Fritz) Perls. Perls wrote extensively in the field and felt that man is a whole that is more than just the sum of its parts. Man is a whole organism who is a feeling, thinking and acting being. A primary goal of therapy is awareness which is achieved through a growth process leading to the individual being fully in touch with himself and reality. More recent Gestalt Therapists whose writings were examined were Gary Yonteff, Joen Fagan, Erving and Miriam Polster, Steve Zahm and J. William and Judith Pfeiffer.

There are a number of specific elements in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy that relate to the I-Thou concept. They are:

- (1) the emphasis on the here and now present with a corresponding de-emphasis on the past and future,
- (2) the emphasis on the wholeness of both the therapist and client and the full contact that occurs during therapy,
- (3) reciprocity in relationship involving equality, and unity between client and therapist,
- (4) openness in the sharing process of therapy,
- (5) intimacy of relationship between client and therapist,
- (6) the therapeutic relationship's character that allows it to occur in silence as an avenue of contact that is beyond the dimension of language,
- (7) awareness or the focusing of attention as a necessary element for the relationship to occur, and

- (8) the rhythmic or cyclical nature of the relationship that does not allow it to continue indefinitely.

Client-Centered Therapy. Client-Centered Therapy was originated and developed by Carl Rogers. Client-Centered Therapy assumes that man is essentially rational and forward moving, and that the individual has the potential for growth and self-actualization. The maladjusted individual is characterized by incongruence between his self and his experiences, which are threatening. He is unable to accept experiences that are inconsistent with his self concept.

There are a number of specific elements in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy that relate to the I-Thou concept. They are:

- (1) complete communication between client and therapist which involves full attention and awareness,
- (2) equality between the client and therapist,
- (3) genuineness in the helping relationship where the therapist is aware of his own feeling and is real,
- (4) acceptance of the client by the therapist,
- (5) totality and wholeness of both participants in the therapy process,
- (6) freedom to explore the self and to be free from evaluation,
- (7) immediacy in regard to seeing the individual as being in the process of becoming,
- (8) congruence involving direct personal contact with the therapist being himself, experiencing his feelings and communicating himself to the client on a person to person basis,
- (9) empathy which involves understanding yet seperateness from the client's inner world,
- (10) positive regard by the therapist for the client,
- (11) unconditionality of regard by the therapist for the client, and

- (12) the client's accurate perception of the therapist's communication of the previously listed characteristics.

Reality Therapy. Reality Therapy is a comparatively new theory of psychotherapy and was developed by William Glasser. Reality Therapy differs from traditional models of psychotherapy in a number of areas. The medical model of mental health and mental illness is rejected much in the way Thomas S. Szasz describes it is a myth. Glasser simplifies his concept to either behavior that is responsible or irresponsible. There is no extensive diagnosis. A person is acting responsibly if he meets his needs without interfering with other people meeting theirs. Man needs to be loved and to love and he needs to feel worthwhile to others and to himself. Reality Therapy helps patients fulfill these two needs.

There are a number of specific elements in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy that relate to the I-Thou concept. They are:

- (1) involvement of the therapist with the client in an open, interested, human and sensitive, warm and intimate manner,
- (2) reciprocity of relationship between client and therapist,
- (3) emphasis on the here and now present with a de-emphasis on past history,
- (4) acceptance of the client by the therapist with rejection of irresponsible behavior,
- (5) separateness of client and therapist as different beings, and
- (6) genuineness on the part of the therapist which involves the revealing of himself.

CONCLUSIONS

Research into and chapter four's discussion of Martin Buber's I-Thou concept of relationships and the therapeutic relationship of the

respective theories of humanistic psychotherapy with the purpose of determining if and to what extent Buber's theory is utilized led to the following conclusions.

Gestalt Therapy. The I-Thou relationship is used extensively in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy. Investigation of specific elements of the relationships resulted in the following conclusions:

- (1) The here and now existential emphasis is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy.
- (2) Wholeness on the part of both the I and the Thou is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy.
- (3) Reciprocity of relationship is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy.
- (4) Openness is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy.
- (5) Intimacy is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy.
- (6) The I-Thou relationship can occur in silence. The therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy can also occur in silence.
- (7) Awareness is necessary on the part of the individual in order for an I-Thou relationship to occur. Awareness is also necessary before contact and the therapeutic relationship can occur in Gestalt Therapy.
- (8) The I-Thou relationship between men ultimately returns to an I-It relationship with potentiality for further I-Thou relationship. The contact in the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy occurs in a cyclical or rhythmic manner.

Investigation of the therapeutic relationship in Gestalt Therapy and the I-Thou concept led to an extensive list of utilized elements.

Several Gestalt writers specifically stated that the therapeutic relationship is an I-Thou relationship.

Client-Centered Therapy. The I-Thou relationship is used extensively in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy. Investigation of specific elements of the relationships resulted in the following conclusions:

- (1) Full and complete communication between the I and the Thou is an integral part of the I-Thou relation and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (2) Equality of both participants in the relationship is an integral part of the I-Thou relation and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (3) Genuineness on the part of both the I and the Thou is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (4) Acceptance is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (5) Totality and wholeness on the part of both the I and the Thou are integral parts of the I-Thou relationship and are fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (6) Freedom is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship between man and the Eternal Thou and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (7) Immediacy is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (8) Congruence is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (9) Separateness is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is utilized in the Rogerian concept of empathy in Client-Centered Therapy.
- (10) Unconditionality in the I-Thou relationship between man and the Eternal Thou is utilized in the therapeutic relationship between

man and man in Client-Centered Therapy.

- (11) Reciprocity is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is utilized in the therapeutic relationship with the necessity of the client to accurately perceive communication by the therapist and relate accordingly.

Investigation of the therapeutic relationship in Client-Centered Therapy and the I-Thou concept led to an extensive list of utilized elements. Carl Rogers specifically stressed the similarity between his theory and the I-Thou relationship.

Reality Therapy. Several elements of the I-Thou relationship are utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy. Investigation of specific elements of the relationships resulted in the following conclusions:

- (1) Deep involvement is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy.
- (2) Reciprocity of relationship is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the specific relationships in Reality Therapy.
- (3) The here and now existential emphasis is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy.
- (4) Acceptance is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy.
- (5) Separateness is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy.
- (6) Genuineness on the part of both the I and the Thou is an integral part of the I-Thou relationship and is fully utilized in the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy.

Investigation of the therapeutic relationship in Reality Therapy and its utilization of I-Thou elements proved to be more difficult in comparison to Gestalt and Client-Centered therapies. Glasser's concept

as described in his various publications, does not receive the extensive coverage that Gestalt writers and Rogers presented in their articles and books. Glasser's succinct description does, nevertheless, utilize the previously listed elements of the I-Thou relationship.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Martin Buber's I-Thou concept is of value in the study of human relationships particularly relationships as viewed from a humanistic psychotherapy framework. Further study in the area could focus upon other theories of humanistic psychotherapy. The Harvey Jackins concept of Re-evaluation Therapy and Co-counseling would be of particular interest.

Buber's essential concern in I and Thou is the similarity between man's relationships with men and man's relationship with God, the Eternal Thou. Further study could also focus entirely upon man's relationship with God and spiritual beings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. THE I-THOU CONCEPT

- Buber, Martin. Between Man and Man, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.
- _____. Daniel: Gespräche von der Verwirklichung. Leipzig: Insel, Verlag, 1913.
- _____. Daniel, trans. Maurice Friedman. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- _____. Good and Evil, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953.
- _____. Hasidism and Modern Man, trans. Maurice Friedman. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
- _____. I and Thou, trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
- _____. I and Thou, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937.
- _____. I and Thou, trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- _____. The Knowledge of Man, trans. Maurice Friedman and Ronald Gregor Smith. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.
- _____. The Legend of Baal-Shem, trans. Maurice Friedman. New York: Schocken Books, 1969.
- _____, and Carl R. Rogers. Transcription of dialogue. Unpublished manuscript. Ann Arbor, Michigan, April 18, 1957.
- Friedman, Maurice. Martin Buber, The Life of Dialogue. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1955.
- Herberg, Will. The Writings of Martin Buber. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.
- Howe, Ruel L. The Miracle of Dialogue. New York: Seabury Press, 1963.

Smith, Ronald Gregor. Martin Buber. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.

Wood, Robert E. Martin Buber's Ontology. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

B. PSYCHOTHERAPY

1. Books

Bugental, James E., ed. Challenges to Humanistic Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

Buhler, Charlotte, and Melanie Allen. Introduction to Humanistic Psychology. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1972.

Ellis, Albert. Humanistic Psychotherapy. New York: McGraw Hill, 1973.

Fagan, Joen, and Irma Lee Shepherd, eds. Gestalt Therapy Now. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1971.

Frankle, Victor M. From Death Camp to Existentialism. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

_____. Man's Search for Meaning. New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Glasser, William. The Identity Society. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975.

_____. Reality Therapy. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1975.

Goble, Frank. The Third Force. New York: Pocket Books, 1971.

Jackins, Harvey. The Human Side of Human Beings. Seattle: Rational Island Publishers, 1965.

Maslow, Abraham H. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: Penguin Books, 1976.

_____. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1961.

May, Rollo. Love and Will. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1969.

_____. The Meaning of Anxiety. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1977.

Ofman, William V. Affirmation and Reality: Fundamentals of Humanistic Existential Therapy and Counseling. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1976.

- Ofman, William V. Psychotherapy as a Humanistic Existential Encounter.
Los Angeles: Psychological Affiliate Press, 1970.
- Patterson, C.H. Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy. 2d ed.
New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Perls, Frederick S. Ego, Hunger and Aggression. San Francisco:
Orbit Graphic Arts, 1966.
- _____. The Gestalt Approach and Eye Witness to Therapy. New York:
Bantam Books, 1976.
- _____. Gestalt Therapy Verbatim. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.
- _____, Ralph E. Hefferline and Paul Goodman. Gestalt Therapy.
New York: Bantam Books, 1977.
- Polenz, G. Donald, ed. Helping as a Humanistic Process: Perspectives
and Viewpoints. Milburn, New Jersey: R.F. Publishing, 1975.
- Polster, Erving, and Miriam Polster. Gestalt Therapy Integrated.
New York: Vintage Books, 1974.
- Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
Company, 1951.
- _____. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.
- _____, and Barry Stevens. Person to Person. New York: Pocket Books,
1971.
- Satir, Virginia. Conjoint Family Therapy. Palo Alto, California:
Science and Behavior Books, 1967.
- Szasz, Thomas. The Myth of Mental Illness. New York: Harper and
Brothers, 1961.
- Yonteff, Gary M. A Review of the Practice of Gestalt Therapy.
Los Angeles: California State University - Los Angeles, 1976.

2. Periodicals

- American Psychological Association. Division of Counseling Psychology.
Committee on Definition. Counseling Psychology as a Speciality.
American Psychologist, (1956).
- Kempler, Walter. "The Experiential Therapeutic Encounter," Psycho-
therapy: Theory, Research and Practice, IV (1967), 166-172.
- Saleebey, Dennis. "A Proposal to Merge Humanist and Behaviorist
Perspectives," Social Casework, LVI, 8 (October, 1975), 469-471.

Tillich, Paul. "Existentialism and Psychotherapy," Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry, I (1961), 8-16.

3. Unpublished Sources

Ebner, Michael J. "It's All In The Family." Portland, Oregon:
Preliminary Findings on the Case Management Project, 1975.

Pfeiffer, J. William, and Judith Pfeiffer. "A Gestalt Primer."
Unpublished paper. (Mimeographed.)

Rogers, Carl R. "Persons or Science? - A Philosophical Question."
Chicago, Illinois: Unpublished paper, 1952.

Simkin, James. "Introduction to Gestalt Therapy." Unpublished
Manuscript, Esalen Institute.

Zahm, Stephen. "Outlines of Main Concepts of Gestalt Therapy as a
Growth Experience." Vancouver, Washington: Unpublished paper,
1974. (Mimeographed.)

_____. Classroom lecture. Portland, Oregon, January 12, 1977.

_____. Classroom lecture. Portland, Oregon, May 25, 1977.

_____. Classroom lecture. Portland, Oregon, September 8, 1977.