73-19,274

MALLENBAUM, Victor, 1934-
TOWARD A VALUE ORIENTATION IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.

Georgia State University, Ph.D., 1972
Psychology, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

TOWARD A VALUE ORIENTATION IN THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION

A DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of Graduate
Studies, School of Arts and Sciences,
Georgia State University
1972

by

Victor Mallenbaum

Arthur M. Cohen
Director

Committee:

Bernhard Kempler

Dean of Graduate Studies

In presenting this dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree from Georgia State University, I agree that the Library of the University shall make it available for inspection and circulation in accordance with its regulations governing materials of this type. I agree that permission to quote from, to copy from, or to publish this dissertation may be granted by the author or, in his absence, by the Dean of the Graduate Division. Such quoting, copying, or publication must be solely for scholarly purposes and does not involve potential financial gain. It is understood that any copying from or publication of this dissertation which involves potential financial gain will not be allowed without written permission of the author.

Victor Fred Thompson

Signature of Author

Acknowledgements

It is difficult to say only "thank you," to Dr. Arthur M. Cohen who has been not only my professor and guide, but friend, helper and spiritual father; and who always knew when to be each. His counsel and devotion to this task has made its completion possible. He will always be a part of my life. I also wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Ray A. Craddick whose perpetual optimism and sage advice have been of great encouragement to me. My thanks are also extended to Dr. Bernhard Kempler who has been the most human of humanists in all of his ways.

Dedicated to

E V A

Who shared with me the

Peak experience of living

And whose memory gives me

The courage to be and the

Certainty that I will know that peak

Again

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prologue

The purpose of this study is to examine the religious tradition of Western Civilization from a psychological point of view. It is well recognized that there has been much work done in the psychology of religion, but unfortunately, the impact of those labors has been slight. My intention is to examine parts of the Old Testament, concentrating on the Ten Commandments, using the concept of values as the basic point of departure.

As is adumbrated in the body of the text, the field of values is one of complexity and confusion in itself. There are possibly as many definitions for the term "value" as there are social scientists engaged in the study of them. It is my belief that this confusion stems from two sources: one is that values are extremely important to mankind, probably essential to its functioning, and that in the search for values men become enmeshed in many questions of right and wrong, good and bad, functional and dysfunctional, ad infinitum. The other source is the social scientist's understandable desire to operationally define values and reduce them to workable

segments, almost in the way a physicist splits an atom.

My attempt has been not to reduce values or even to define them. I have found this task probably as difficult as the task of reduction and definition. It will be noted that at the beginning of this essay, the term "value" is used in a way that it is hoped will be commonly understood. As the essay progresses, I limit the use of the word to that which I believe would be the irreducible values.

In another sense, this study is circular in nature. The Old Testament was researched and I came out with the two basic values I believe inhere in it. I then went back and approached the psychological study of the Old Testament with those values as my key of entrance to it. Although I recognize that this is not what is usually considered the scientific method, my attempt is to study the Bible on its own grounds. I also freely admit that I do not take myself out of the study. Existentialism, existential psychology and humanistic psychology are very much a part of me, as is the ground from which I spring which is Judaism.

With these influences working upon me, I found that the basic values in the Old Testament are "life" and "death,"

and believe that the Old Testament is teaching that both of these values are a part of each man and must be recognized as such in order for us to be able to live fully in not only a physical, but a psychological and spiritual sense. I also found that within the three components of the Old Testament, myth, ritual, and law are embodied what I termed "value-paths" which lead to the basic values. These value-paths are not such nebulous things as "justice," "love," "truth," etc. for which the philosophers have been searching for millenia. They may better be termed as behavioral components that lead to, but do not ever reach the values adumbrated.

Because of the complexity and possible confusion which would result in a single study embracing both these values, I limited myself to the value-paths leading toward life, but of necessity dealt with death, albeit in a cursory manner.

I am presenting in these pages a way of approaching the psychological study of religion by use of religion's own documents. It is not to be construed as the only way of approaching the study. It is my hope that this method may open some doors that had been closed and that the reader will find enough of importance in it to follow Hillel's frequently neglected dictum, "Now go and learn."

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Galileo faced excommunication from the Church. His sin was that he postulated a scientific truth which was contrary to the dogma that prevailed in the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Today, in Israel there is an ongoing struggle between the medical profession and the religious authorities. The question involved in this struggle is that of autopsy. The religious authorities believe that the body must be returned to God in the same condition it was received. They further believe that all the organs and appendages of the body should remain intact so that at the time of resurrection the individual will be whole. These same authorities however, do not object to an operation which may remove a kidney, the appendix, an arm, or any portion of the anatomy providing an operation will help to preserve life or restore health. Seemingly, there is a contradiction. Why should mutilation of the body of a living man be permitted, but not that of the body of a dead man?

It is conceivable that the scientist would shrug his

shoulders and perhaps remark about the irrationality of religion. The religious authority might bemoan the fact that the scientist, because of his lack of religious education is just insensitive to the complexities of religious law. What is lacking as a bridge to this gap is an understanding of the value framework of both medical science and religion in this conflict. In Judaism, there is an important value concept of "respect for the dead." In the Shulkhan Aruch (Code of Jewish Law, Golding, 1927) can be found an entire section on how a corpse must be handled, washed, dressed and lain so as to show it the utmost respect. An autopsy is not considered respectful. However, there is an even greater value on the sanctity of life. Therefore, anything that is done that may save a life is not only permitted, but is obligatory. Medical science shares this value of the sanctity of life and indeed claims that the purpose of the autopsy is to learn more about the disease so that other lives may be saved. There are some medical scientists and religious leaders in Israel who understand this basic value and do cooperate in allowing autopsies to be performed.

This is just one instance in which is found a basic struggle between science and religion which persists to this day. Maslow (1970) pointed out that there has been a traditional dichotomy between these powers. This dichotomy is based not only on the sometimes different value systems, and sometimes the same but misunderstood value systems of science and religion, but also on a long history of struggle between these two very important forces in Western Civilization. Injecting serum from a diseased animal into a human being was fought by religion. Delving into the secrets of the unconscious was considered a devilish scheme in Freud's day. Today, there are religious sects that will not allow blood transfusions on the grounds that the Bible prohibits the drinking of blood. Each force steadfastly stood its ground in these battles until it was forced to give in and shift to another battlefield. It is little wonder that science and religion now appear to be at opposite poles and look upon one another with suspicion and, at least at present, somewhat sophisticated hostility. The two groups can almost fit into the paradigm of the "Robbers Cave Experiment" (Sherif, 1961).

On a more theoretical level, the issue of the dichotomy between science and religion is attributed to the fact that science has insisted upon the objectivity of its data (Polanyi, 1958, Bakan, 1967), while religion or the religious experience is quite subjective in its nature (James, 1970, Buber, 1958, Royce, 1967). Unquestionably, this is the case and has been the case for many centuries, but I cannot help but feel that the enmity between science and religion rests not alone on theoretical grounds, but also on the ground of the very real and very alive battles that have been taking place for centuries. For one who has remained unscarred from the fray, it is a source of amazement that the two most influential factors in the intellectual development of Western Civilization, Freud (1964) notwithstanding, remain at opposite poles and appear to be loath to come to terms with one another. But, as must be recognized, this is a more sophisticated age and it is quite probable that the theoretical differences noted have become functionally autonomous and are the real issues which must be dealt with at this juncture.

At this point in history, science steadfastly maintains that data from the religious experience is not admissable

to its realms. It is the same point of view that has caused much of what is uniquely human to be eschewed by science on the grounds that it is completely subjective and non-verifiable (van Kaam, 1969). Only recently has James' (1970) classic on religious experience become an open book to some scientists. The physical sciences have unquestionably been enriched by insisting upon maintaining an objective stance toward its data, but the question must be asked as to whether the human sciences can be objective about their data (Frankl, 1966). Can I be objective in studying myself? The answer is that it is not possible for me to be truly objective about myself and therefore a large school of psychologists (Maslow, 1967, Rogers, 1964, Bakan, 1967) presently believe that science has been diminished as well as enriched by its "closed door" policy toward much that needs scientific investigation. As far as science has been concerned, the religious experience may just as well have never existed. Science has not only been unable to find a meaningful way of studying religion, but also, for the most part, has refused to study religion at all.

It must be understood that the religious experience

is not only a problem for science, but also for religion. Certainly, all of the great religions were founded on the basis of a religious experience, but religion, once formalized, has found it difficult to deal with continuing religious experiences. These experiences shake the foundations of religion and so religion has had to find a way of dealing with these experiences. Maslow (1964) has pointed out that a common thread running through most religions is that they are based upon the revelations, or insights, or peak experiences of a single or several great seers. Most people do not have revelations, but it is of value that in some way the masses get the benefits of these experiences. However, according to the mystics, it is the nature of the religious experience to be personal and therefore non-communicable. As I read James (1970), I found the experiences he quotes quite difficult to understand. I also sensed the fervent desire of the relator of his experience to have me understand, even to share this experience with him. I also felt a frustration within he himself, as he knows that the fullness of his experience is not getting through to me. I found myself able to share

only a small fragment of the experience that was so meaningful to him. I also shared all of his frustration for as much as he wishes this understood, I did not. Tevye, in "Fiddler on the Roof" has arguments with God and television comics joke about this "fool who yells at the sky". My religious tradition tells me that I stood at Mount Sinai and heard the voice of God thunder the Decalogue, but I do not feel the majesty of the incident that must have occurred. How then do I share in these experiences, some that were life engendering for the individual who experienced them and some that literally made our world? Tevye's answer to this question was one word, "tradition". That was the answer found by Western religion. "Hallakhah." The Hebrew word "Hallakhah" is usually translated to mean law, but it means far more than just law. The root of the word is "Hallakh" which is the verb to go or to walk. "Hallakhah" is therefore a path upon which to walk, or a tradition.

How, then do I experience being at the foot of Mount Sinai? It took another kind of religious genius to transmit to me some of the feelings that were present at that time. So this religious genius took an ancient, pagan agricultural festival and transformed its meaning into the "time of the

giving of the Torah". The synagogue is to be decorated in a certain manner on that day. When the Decalogue is read, I am to stand just as if I were at Mount Sinai. My grandmother would weep at that point in the service. When, as a child I asked her why she wept, her response was that when they read the "Ten Commandments a person is supposed to cry." It was only much later in my life I realized that these religious geniuses ordained that she weep in order to give her the feeling of awe and reverence at the sound of "God's voice." She did not know this, but she felt it. These geniuses became the priests or the codifiers. It was their task to interpret the great insights of the seers to the best of their abilities, and then to communicate these experiences to others through symbolically meaningful codes and rituals. The value of these priests and their spiritual acumen should not be overlooked. Their task was a seemingly impossible one. It was their duty to live almost literally with one foot planted firmly on the ground and the other foot before the heavens. The fact that they succeeded so well is to their credit and lends support to the theory that religion has had something of value to state not only to the seers,

but to the population at large. It also lends support to the theory that these highly personalized religious experiences can be communicated to others, if not by the seer himself, then by another uniquely qualified to do so; if not in all of its splendor, at least in a way that is meaningful and does convey some of its insights.

The success of the priests, however, has become a double edged sword to a great extent. So beautiful are the rituals and codes they devised that they have become functionally autonomous, and just as my grandmother did not know why she wept, the original purposes for these rituals and codes are no longer known. They now have a life of their own and people adhere to them as if they alone were the values for which religion stands. Religion, then, instead of being a source of wonder, amazement, and aliveness (Heschel, 1959) has become a system of codes and rituals to be rigidly adhered to. The great seers and mystics to which Maslow refers would be abhorred by such a turn of events. I believe that the priests (and here I insist upon the definition of that unique individual who lives both on earth and in heaven) would shout that their

work is becoming defiled. The Sabbath may be broken, say the priests, to alleviate human suffering. "The Sabbath was created for the sake of man and not man for the sake of the Sabbath," is the dictum of Jesus, in the Talmudic spirit. Yet, many of these creations of the priests which are no longer understood are still maintained with a rigidity that has caused them to become just what Biblical religion fought so hard to abolish, idolatry (Oden, 1969).

The history of religion shows very dramatically how the work of the priests can become destructive of just that which it attempted to establish. There is a value underpinning to every law or ritual in religion. The law or the ritual contains so much art or poetry that it survives, yet the connecting link with the underlying value is often time and culture bound. Therefore, these are lost and society is soon polarized into those who maintain the laws and rituals in a manner that verges on idolatry, on one side, and those who are completely divorced from all laws and rituals on the other. It is therefore very tempting to wish to abolish the priest and perhaps join the seer.

Such was the tendency that was exhibited in the earlier

Maslow. Rather late, Maslow (1970) recognized that the mystical or the peak experience alone can be turned into something quite destructive if it is not controlled in some way. Maslow was able to recognize that the mystical experience is a source of wonder and of amazement, and is very attractive. There is a feeling of oneness with the universe. It is described as a merging of oneself with the "world soul." It is a trip of beauty. Probably, for the non-mystic it can be compared only with the moment of sexual fulfillment. May (1969) so beautifully describes this experience of merging with the loved one, and in that moment of the two becoming one, each one becomes more emphatically himself. It is no mystery why the rabbis (priests) have steadfastly maintained that the "Song of Songs," which can be read as a hymn to the love relationship between man and woman should be understood as portraying the love between man and God. Perhaps only one who knows love can understand the beauty of the "oceanic" feeling of being at one with the universe. May also recognizes the importance of limits. "Not only with libido and eros, but other forms of love as well: full satisfaction means the death of the human being (May, 1969, p. 320)." Likewise,

complete adherence to mysticism, or a worship of mysticism would lead to the death of the human being. The person who seeks only the mystical experience or the peak experience is therefore willing to forfeit his life. He sees only one supreme good in life which is the full satisfaction of his craving for the peak experience, and he becomes very much like the sophomores who spend so much time discussing the meaning of life that they never have the opportunity to live it. The true meaning of life is found in the world and not in the individual organism (Frankl, 1966).

The mystical experience is not in the world; it is in the universe. If we attempt to exist solely in the universe we become too big for the world, too big for life and it is impossible for us to respond to life's call to us; and living is responding to life's call. It is being responsive and responsible. There is as much danger of missing life's call to us by becoming too big for life as there is by wrapping ourselves in a cacoon of ritualism and law. Ideally, there should be a way in which we are able to experience the grandeur of the mystical and still maintain our relationship with the solid earth of which we are forever a part.

It was with the above in mind that Maslow developed a different outlook toward the codifiers and the ritualizers. He recognized the dangers inherent in joining the ritualizers or the mystics entirely, and even the temptation of switching back and forth in allegiance from one to the other. The two poles are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Earlier, I had occasion to refer to the priests as people which lived in both spheres, the mystical and the mundane. Is it not possible for most of us, even if we cannot inhabit both spheres, at least to appreciate them? The history of religion answers this question emphatically in the affirmative. My grandmother and countless others did stand and weep at the recitation of the Decalogue. They lived their appreciation of both spheres. What more powerful tests of significance are necessary? Maslow's answer to the question of appreciating both sides is also an affirmative one. He (Maslow, 1970) describes this as a "plateau" type of being.

At the present this plateau type of being is a very rare thing. It is obvious to any observer of religion or science that in both fields there is a priest versus prophet orientation. In the sphere of religion, the priest

orientation has been ascendant for many centuries. Recently, with the emergeance of such phenomena as the "Jesus Children," it appears that a rebellion is taking place among those who are seeking something more than just ritual in religion. However, at first glance, it would appear that the rebellion is in full swing to the "prophet" side of the spectrum and plateau being is completely by-passed.

In science, it can also be said that the priest versus prophet dichotomy exists with the priest as the hard-nosed empiricist and the prophet as the not too common dreamer. Again, in science it can be said that the priest has been ascendant for centuries. In both fields, science and religion, all the dangers of the priestly work atrophying and becoming dogma has come about. Thus, science has had the sobering experience of laughing at a Semmelweiss, neglecting a Freud, writing off as irrelevant a James, even refusing to examine seriously the claims of the followers of Edgar Cayce. In science, too, the backlash is being felt. We now have the word "scientism" to describe the dogma of logical positivism, which has

been so powerful a tool for the benefit of science. Some of our best minds are rejecting science and seeking their values elsewhere, some in self-destructive ways, but very few finding a value framework they can live with in comfort (May, 1969, Frankl, 1966).

It can be postulated that the "nothing but" hypothesis of men leaves a great deal lacking (Frankl, 1966). The positivists and the reductionists in psychology too frequently create a model in which man is nothing but a computer, a set of habits, a group of behaviors, an impulse driven organism or nothing but anything the model requires (van Kaam, 1969). The fact that there is such a thing as religion, whether or not it is an objective reality, whether or not God exists; the mere fact that religion does exist and that the idea of God exists supports the notion that man also has spiritual aspirations. But he is not "nothing" but spiritual aspirations. The term spiritual aspiration requires some defining. By spiritual aspiration, I mean that man aspires to something that is beyond himself, but this something is not material. It must be abstract and it must be capable of eliciting a

great deal of loyalty from him, and it must be something that he would want to model himself after. Whether or not man can achieve this ideal is very important. My conviction is that that which he aspires to cannot be reached. If it could, man would come close to being "nothing but" spiritual.

This conclusion is clearly untenable. Man is unquestionably physical and spiritual and it would be an error for me to attempt to study myself without considering both the physical and the spiritual aspects of my being. It should be understood that I am not trying to revive the old mind versus body or soul versus body debate. That should have been put to rest long ago. What I am saying is that man is a unique whole made of perhaps an infinite number of interlocking pieces, and if one of these pieces is left out, the whole becomes a false picture. One of these pieces with which I am presently concerned is being called the spiritual or the holy. The force of the word "holy" in the Hebrew, is that which exists in the mundane but gives the mundane its link with God, who is the symbol of all holiness or perfect holiness. It

is only recently being rediscovered that in both science and religion, the holy exists in the mundane (Heschel, 1959). This is not a statement of some type of pantheism which is an idea that is rejected for the most part by the Western religions. What it means is that there is a link between the worldly or the physical, if one prefers, and that which is considered the source of holiness, God.

In the Hebrew prayer book (Hertz, 1961) can be found blessings for various occasions. Some of the occasions are "on putting on new clothes,""before eating a morsel of food," and "after the act of elimination." These particular examples were chosen to sharpen our awareness that the most mundane or the most physical acts and occasions have a blessing attached to them. Heschel (1959) implies that these blessings were not attached to our physical acts just for the sake of having blessings, but that the true meaning behind them is to keep us ever aware that there is an element of holiness in every act we perform and in every thing that exists. The holy does exist in the profane; that is the profane can be elevated to holiness. This is what the great seers saw and still

do see when they report their visions of a "unity" in the universe. Judaism has sought to translate this type of experience to all men by way of the blessings which are to be recited on all the various occasions, as one method.

Science does not speak of God; at least the physical sciences do not, but the scientist who spends his day in the godlike posture of looking down into a microscope could not help but be amazed by the construction of the nucleus of the atom. He could not find words tiny enough in meaning to describe it and so he spoke of the "solar system" construction of the atom. He described the infinitesimal by use of terms that verge on the infinite. Or the physicists who are presently talking about a theory of anti-matter which seems to work in just the opposite manner from matter itself, seem to be getting into a sphere that may have been considered by some as mystical. There are some who believe that for every particle of matter there exists somewhere in the universe its antiparticle. Some would find the statement, "The fact is we must admit we have no conclusive proof that any object in the heavens is composed of matter rather than antimatter (Alfven, 1967, p. 112.) to be quite appealing, while others might consider

it on the same plane as astral projection, a field with which I would also be willing to temper my skepticism with tolerance. However, if one is willing to risk stretching his imagination to a minute degree, the similarity between the symmetrical theory of matter and antimatter bears a most striking resemblance to the Platonic theory of the true or ideal prototype of everything existing somewhere in "heaven."

Thus, it can be stated that the purpose of the codifiers in religion is to bring to those who have not experienced the mystical a vehicle by which to glimpse the unity of the universe that has been seen by the mystic (Stace, 1960). Likewise it is the purpose of the empiricist in science to translate the ideas and hypotheses of the visionaries into workable technologies. The empiricist, therefore, must also be able to live in both worlds. He must understand the visionary and his visions and he must also have the ability to operationally define the visions, reduce them, and develop a technology which would give humanity a share of these visions. It is obvious that the empiricist, akin to the priest, plays no secondary role. His task is a formidable one, indeed, and rare is the man who has such

an ability. May (1967) implies these same qualities, although he seems to place himself in greater kinship with the visionaries. In either case, it is a sad mistake to perceive the prophet and priest in opposition to one another because the ideal cooperation between these two forces would result in giving mankind, in the case of religion, the ability to perceive the wonder and awe of the magnificent order of the universe through the laws and rituals set down by the priests in their understanding of the prophets. In the case of science it would give mankind the benefits of the wonders seen by the visionaries and given utilitarian function through the technology of the empiricists. It is my contention that one of the main obstacles in the path of this desired end has been a misunderstanding of the concept of values and a misplacement of values by western society and reflected in the problems of both religion and the behavioral sciences.

In keeping with that belief, despite the fact that I am a scientist and identify as such, I do not refrain from making "value judgments" in this study. As will be seen, there are value underpinnings in the various systems and theories of psychology. These are identifiable

but seldom made explicit by the theorist. These underlying values have served as a hidden agenda in many instances causing schisms and fractionalizations in various schools, yet they are rarely referred to as causes. By proclaiming the values that I hold and making them part of the "hidden agenda", it is my hope that both admirers and critics of this study will evaluate it in those terms and that we may all reach a more complete understanding of the tasks in which we are engaged.

Chapter II

The Problem of Science

In order to achieve the ends which are so fervently desired by science, to build a world,

> "in which people live together without quarreling, maintain themselves by producing the food, shelter, and clothing they need, enjoy themselves and contribute to the enjoyment of others in art, music, literature, and games, consume only a reasonable part of the resources of the world and add as little as possible to its pollution, bear no more children than can be raised decently, continue to explore the world around them and discover better ways of dealing with it, and come to know themselves accurately, and, therefore, manage themselves effectively (Skinner, 1971, p. 214),"

science must be willing to take a long, hard look at itself. There can be no question that the scientific advances in the last century have been staggering to the imagination. The advances in medicine have given us longer lives, utilization of nuclear energy and solar energy promise unlimited power sources, the advances in the behavioral sciences enable people to live fuller existences. It therefore

becomes all the more difficult to suggest that the scientific establishment change. But it must also be recognized that each advance in science has desired effects and undesired effects. The fact that people are living longer has given rise to the problems of what are we to do with our senior citizens and how are physicians and behavioral scientists to treat the problems that accompany old age. Nuclear energy can be used to provide power for an entire city or to destroy that same municipality. Teaching various types of mentally or emotionally damaged people to function also improves their chances to reproduce and unbalance the process of natural selection. In all of these areas the question of values comes to the fore. It is in this area that a science must reconsider its stance.

Polanyi (1958) suggested that all of science re-examine itself and change in various ways. In this study I am concerned primarily with the behavioral sciences, particularly, psychology. Bakan (1967), Maslow (1964), and others have called for changes in both the methodology of psychology and the admissability of data into psychology.

By calling for a change in methodology, a value is being expressed. It is argued that most of the statistical methodology used tends to wash out individual differences and individual functioning. These are precisely the data that we do not want to lose, yet psychology has been losing this data for many years. The value is shifting from a data orientation to an individual orientation. This can be compared to the shift in literature that occurred with Death of a Salesman (Miller, 1958), in which the hero of a tragedy was not a king or nobleman but rather an ordinary man. Literature recognized that the common man is important enough to be a "hero." That art is frequently a generation ahead of science is implied by May (1969). By arguing for the expansion of the admissability of data into psychology, another value is being expressed which is very closely related to the value just discussed. People do have personal experiences, it is argued. These experiences should be studied whether they are mystical in nature, perceptual, cognitive, religious, or anything else. Allport (1950) argued that each member of a given religion had his own personal in-

terpretation of that religion and a thousand people gathered together under the same roof and praying the same prayer, each had his own individual experience in praying. This type of highly personal experience should be made admissable as valid data for psychology to study. One reason for which this has been resisted is that it would take us deeply into the area of personal and individual values. Psychology, as a science, has understandably wished to maintain a value-free stance.

The point of view expressed here is that science loses much by insisting upon maintaining its value-free or amoral status. My contention is that although the gains made by science have been great, the losses it has sustained has also been great. By remaining value-free, many scientists seem to take a position of science being value-less. By "value-less", I do not mean to imply that science has no value, rather what is meant is that science is thought to be a system in which value judgments have no place. It is the admission of values and value judgments to the area of science with which I am concerned. I must also take the point of view that the process of remaining "value-free" is in itself a value on the part of

science. For science to have adopted this particular stance was very important for the advancement of this field. As was already noted ecclestical authorities have in the past, and still do, hamper the progress of science. Also secular authorities, such as government and business frequently control the purse strings in scientific research. The scientist as an individual certainly has opinions and convictions in both religious and secular matters, but he is dedicated to his scientific work. Their work is a cause or calling beyond themselves and it is through their work that they become self-actualizing in Maslow's (1966) terms, or it is the scientist's way of fulfilling a "will to meaning" in Frankl's (1966) terms. In any case the scientist and the scientific establishment has made a value choice for which, if we accept Maslow and Frankl, the scientist cannot be faulted. He has chosen to live with a meaning, and perhaps the easiest and most parsimonious path open to him was to proclaim his discipline as value-free.

Following this "value-free" value to what is admittedly an extreme, but an extreme which is well within the memory span of most of us, we can recall the relative

ease with which a scientist who was producing his best for Nazi Germany could then turn and continue his work for Communist Russia or Democratic America, depending upon who was the captor. We can also remember the frightening scenes of world renowned scientists cowering before Senator Joseph McCarthy's Committee on Unamerican Activities, for fear they would no longer be allowed to work. While there are glowing examples of scientists who refused to be cajoled and intimidated, it seems that on the whole, the scientific world is more concerned with being able to work and produce than it is with the matter of how the fruits of its labors are to be utilized. As was stated earlier, this choice is a value choice, and one which is difficult to argue against, for who would wish to take from a man his meaning in life, but it must also be recognized that it is a onesided value. It is the value of the priest which is to establish a practice, and has become corrupted to fully neglect the value of the prophet which seeks to be a unifying principle, and is more idealistic, and therefore vague.

In the twentieth century, the scientist has been the

priest for Western Civilization. As such he has led the way for much of society to consider value judgments as somehwat naive and unsophisticated. It is now difficult to find an educated person willing to make a strong value judgment publicly. Despite the fact that the world is seeking some value system upon which to base its existence, society has largely adopted the one-sided value system of the priest and neglected the prophetic purposes beyond the rituals laid down for it. Now, people become confused as to what avail are even the rituals, for the meanings behind them have been forgotten, and they are in a state of valuelessness.*

Examples of this can be seen in our educational system. This too has fallen prey to reductionalism. The concept seems to be that a man is "nothing but" a doctor, a lawyer, a psychologist, etc. ad infinitum. My personal

---

*Here, I must admit that my use of the word valuelessness is a value judgment on my part. As will be seen, there are values by which people act, but it is my belief that these are sub-values, or perhaps D-Cognitions (Maslow, 1968). My argument is for universal values that transcend the individual both temporally and spatially.

experience has shown me that too many of my younger colleagues know almost nothing of literature, of the classics, of philosophy, of physics. Universities seem to have become compartmentalized professional trade schools. May (1965) implies that Europe is more productive of new theories than the United States because their students are given more education in philosophy, history, mythology, etc. He further believes that it is from such stretching of the mind that produces rich and original theory. Here we encounter the clashing of two value systems; on one hand, the American value system emphasizing action or technology, and on the other hand, a value system emphasizing more leisurely study, contemplation, and comparison of many different fields of knowledge and wisdom. In May's view, the American system falls short. However, it is not the educational differences alone that must bear the burden of the value vacuum today, as can be seen in Frankl (1963), who sees the same problem of lack of values in Europe as well as in the United States.

In another context, May (1969) discusses this state of valuelessness in the sexual sphere of life. Despite the rather blase' attitude toward sex which is rampant

in the Western world today, sex remains a most important part of the human make-up and an entity that demands society's concern. Inherent to sexuality is the power to give life and the power to take life. The power to give life and all the responsibility and commitment involved is obvious and need not be discussed. The power to take life is somewhat more complex, but it is there nevertheless. Because of the dramatic, active quality of the sex act, its importance of giving oneself fully to the partner is saliently realized. If one does not give himself fully to his partner, if he does not "let himself go," the beauty of the sex act pales and becomes only a physical release, if release is found at all under those circumstances. As such, the sex act does take life for at the moment of fulfillment, one is no longer in control of himself; he has given himself up, and as the French say, "the little death" has occurred. For these reasons, the potential constructiveness and destructiveness which inhere in the sex act, societies from the beginning of history (Campbell, 1970) to the present have attempted to put some controls on human sexuality. Sex has been valued and society has recognized

its values, both positively and negatively.

However, as May (1969) describes, the pervading value of today in the sexual sphere is that of the priest or technologist. The concept of making love with somebody, which implies a one to one relationship in which the prevalent feeling is that of love or unity with the loved one, is presently devalued. Instead, the emphasis is placed upon technique. We are instructed in the cookbooks of love that are flooding the market today, just which button to press at which time in order to achieve the best response. It can be argued that using the best technique is an act of love because through these techniques we are giving our partner the most pleasure. But I cannot help but feel that there is a hollow ring to that argument. Skinner (1938) has cogently pointed out and made us very aware that the response we get from another is reinforcement for ourselves. It seems to me, from my personal value orientation, that the person who consciously attempts to elicit various responses from his mate during the act of love is reinforcing himself, and in reality is giving way to a "Don Juan" complex, repeatingly proving to

himself what a capable lover he is. As a technician of love, I can never "lose myself" in the act of love. I must remain ever conscious of the responses my manipulations are eliciting. But the peak experience in that of fusing oneself also finding oneself (May, 1969), which would seem to be impossible if I must be aware at all times of my button-pushing behavior. Following this model of cookbook lovemaking, I would tend to depersonalize my partner and not have the love experience that is ideally possible in the love relationship. The gloomy fact that we are left with is that even so personal an experience as the act of love has become reduced to a "nothing but" stimulus and response type situation. Sex has, in many ways, become just another ritualized technology.

The above does not imply an anti-intellectual or anti-scientific attitude, nor is it an attempt to diminish the work of so many of our scientists such as Kinsey(1965) or Masters and Johnson (1966). Certainly, the knowledge they have given us is important and can help free us from unrealistic fears, and result in our lives becoming fuller and richer. Knowing the systems of meter in poetry need

not diminish my love of poetry. When I read or recite a poem that has great personal meaning to me, I let myself go with the poem and my feelings carry me. I am not aware of the alliterations or metaphors, or meter of the verse, I simply feel the flow of the poem. Yet, I do desire to have the technical knowledge of poetic construction within my grasp for I am not "nothing but" feeling either. What would destroy my love of poetry would be pausing at the end of each line and analyzing it scientifically. If I were to do that I could not become one with the poem and could not become part of the meaning. Entering the act of love with a ritualized technology of love does just that, and it is this devaluation of the fusion and unity of the love partners that I see as dehumanizing the relationship.

The scientific establishment has, and I believe not by design, but by the very fact of its success, been a leading force in the confusion of values and the corruption of values in the minds of much of the Western society. Science has proven itself to be a most potent force in the world of today. The scientist is in a position to recognize his

potency and utilize it in the service of mankind. The need is felt for science to again lead the way for man by adopting a moral system of values. I fully recognize that the scientist by inclincation and by training deals in facts which are made operational and measurable. I also recognize the fact that values have not been operationally defined, and indeed, may never be. But one can measure the number of divorces that take place each year. One can measure the number of suicides, homicides, school drop-outs, unemployed and unemployable, emotional and mental breakdowns, runaways and a myriad of other factors which point to social disorganization in the Western world.

The question that faces us as scientists and as members of this community is shall we just measure these things because they are measurable and leave a record for future scientists to put into textbooks saying, "this is what society was like in the year 1972." There is a value judgment that must be made concerning this situation. The judgment is whether or not we choose to do something about the status quo. To me, and it is my value, the answer must be that something should be done and the underlying

issue at stake here is that the value vacuum plays no small part in the situation as it now stands. It is also fully recognized that the conscious transmission of values has been a function of religion and not a function of science, however if science has the tools and the technology to be of service to religion in this respect, I believe that it is our responsibility to do so.

It is noted that Maslow (1964) who was greatly interested in the subject of values and in religion, argues for completely abandoning the term "religion" as it has been too greatly sullied, minunderstood and mininterpreted. Buber (1952) records a similar discussion about the use of the word, "God." I would utilize Buber's argument for the use of the word "God" in opposing Maslow's suggestion. The very reason that the word "religion" is so misused and misunderstood is reason for our not abandoning it. It is true that it makes religion more difficult to deal with in a scientific manner, because there are so many meanings attached to it, but it also gives religion the richness and the depth of experience that thousands of years of history have bequeathed it. It would be an injustice to lose all the richness involved in the word, and it would

in the final analysis, present a false picture. Unfortunately, for science, religion presents a garbled, confusing picture, but that is the existential reality of how religion presents itself. Goodenough (1965) recognized this when he stated, "the business of the psychology of religion is not to fit religious experiences into the pigeonholes of Freud or Jung or into the categories of Gestalt, or stimulus-response or any other, but rather to see what the data of religious experiences themselves, suggest (p. XI)."

It is my intention to meet the religious experiences, themselves, as they appear in their existential reality and try to discover what value they are suggesting, transmitting or ordaining. I am entering this project with the admittedly preconceived notion that religion presents to us a value system and that those values are not limited temporally or spatially, but are universal and eternal. I will repeat that the values are couched in laws, commandments, rituals and myths that are time bound, but as a scientist it is my duty to search out the underlying value and as a member of the family of man, to transmit these values to others.

Much has been said about the individual religious

experience (James, 1970, Allport, 1950), I will be concerned with the value concepts which are found in the most public of the public documents of religious experiences, "The Bible." In doing this, I am complying with a suggestion of Pruyser (1969) that the psychology of religion must come to grips with such public phenomena as theoretical treatises and liturgical processes. It is my belief that values are a meaning that we find in our lives. They are not something that we import into our lives but are revealed through life. A similar view is taken by Baillie (1926). I trust that by combining science and the value underpinnings found in the religious treatises, the scientific quest for knowledge will be enriched and will find even greater direction, its technology will be strengthened, but not at the expense of the human being, and the human condition will be enhanced. The enhancement of the human condition will result from the fact that values will become respectable again and will be understood in a way relevant to today, and also by a science that unashamedly cares and is willing to show its care by a greater awareness of human needs and a greater aliveness on its own part.

Chapter III

Existentialism, Death, and Life

Religion has been a subject of great interest to psychologists from Freud and before, right up to Skinner (1971). However, as pointed out by Hiltner (1947), there has been a great deal of emphasis on attacking it or defending it, and very little upon understanding it. He implies that in analyzing religion, the tendency has been to analyze it away. Analysis for understanding would be a much more fruitful pursuit. He also points out that after the psychologist has analyzed his religion to his satisfaction, it appears as if he does not know what to do with the analysis and so leaves the field presumably for greener pastures. He also points out that work in the psychology of religion has been largely a Protestant undertaking. This study is undertaken with a decidedly Jewish point of view, although I fervently believe that the values with which I am concerned underlie a fuller life for a man of any creed. On this point I am in agreement with Aldous Huxley (1944) who spoke of the "Perennial Philosophy," a highest common factor in all religions.

Today there seems to be a renewed interest in the psychological study of religion. Within psychology there seems to be the desire to take up the mantle and fill the void that Pratt (1908) spoke of so long ago. "If the old authoritative foundations be shaken, is there really any other base to which religion may safely turn? These are, after all, the important questions, and upon them the psychology of religion can speak with authority and with no uncertain voice (p. 22)."

It is not strange that those in psychology who are presently most concerned with religion and with values are the ones who identify with the Third Force, or humanistic psychology. Humanism in psychology or elsewhere has been interested in a search for human values. At one time, it would have been logical for humanistic psychologists to be antagonistic toward organized religion because it appeared that organized religion was a force hindering the growth of the full potential of the human being. Today, it is the positivist influence in science that possibly appears as a hindering force and the answer seems to lie in a search for values that the positivists have negated, but

religion apparently welcomes. The humanistic psychologist is concerned with the whole man, and many (May, 1969, Frankl, 1963) believe that this includes values which transcend man in time and space. This search is still centered upon the human being, but it now includes a second look at ancient values that may have been worthwhile. The attempt in dealing with all of life is its objective. As Royce (1967) put it,

> "The humanistic psychological study of religion would deal in whatever way it could with the subjective meaning of life--with that which is existentially valid... The traditional scientific approach to the psychological study of religion, one of the most important and ubiquitous characteristics of mankind has not yet penetrated very deeply. It seems to me that the humanistic approach is more likely to probe the inner man because of its greater willingness to deal with the fullness of subjective experience via an all encompassing phenomenology as opposed to a narrow, albeit more rigorous empiricism (p.26)."

Before we traverse the territory of humanistic psychology, values, and religion any more deeply, it is important to understand the kinship between humanistic psychology,

existentialism, life and death. Many who consider themselves humanists in psychology would also fall into the existentialistic camp: May, Bugental, Frankl, Royce, possibly even Fromm, to name just a few. I do not believe that it is accidental that such a relationship exists in psychology between humanism and existentialism. Indeed, it would appear that the humanist movement in psychology has very deep existentialistic roots.

The phrase "here and now" is very familiar to all humanists in psychology. From individual psychotherapy, to groups, to families, the therapist or facilitator tries to focus his clients' attention on the here and now. To some, the analytic method of focusing on the past only gives the client an escape route in order to avoid the problems he is facing in the present. Temporally, the humanist and the existentialist is focused on the present with strong attention also being given to the future (Frankl, 1966, May, 1969, Maslow, 1966). The past is sometimes utilized to fill in gaps or to emphasize a style that is continuing in the present, but it is the present that is the main point of attention. Sometimes, I catch myself being almost glib about my use of the phrase "here and now"

and forget the pain and anxiety it may mean to my client or my group. Heidegger (1963), the existentialist philosopher recognized the importance of the "here and now" and all that it implies. He used the term "Dasein" to refer to what we call the "here and now." To him it posed a great problem. By "Dasein" is meant the fact of being here and not there. This implies a question of why should I be here and not there? It also implies that since I am here and not there, it is conceivable that I could not be at all, since a positive implies a negative, and a negative implies a positive (May, 1969). Therefore, being here for me, is not a must; my existence is not essential and indeed, existence is grounded in nothing outside of itself. In the final analysis, the "Dasein" has no existence because it is purely present and the purely present is too fleeting for me to respond to at the moment of its existence. I always respond to an event that has taken place or that I anticipate will take place in the future. But the question of "Dasein," being here and not there at this moment remains to plague Heidegger or others like himself.

Much of this philosophy has been taken over and accepted as part of the modus-operendi by T Groups, Encounter Groups, etc. in which the emphasis is placed upon the "here and now" almost as if the participant were bringing no past to the group with him and looked forward to no future after the group's termination. Every qualified group leader recognizes that his participants certainly bring a past with them and also have future aspirations and hopes. One of the reasons for insisting upon focusing in the "here and now" is quite congruent with Heidegger's thought.

Heidegger may be quite correct in stating the the "Dasein" is grounded in nothing and transcends to nothing, as he continues, "For the nothing to which Dasein transcends is not at Dasein's disposal, but comes upon Dasein in anxiety, which is not a fear of something specific, but rather a vague dread, simply being afraid of nothing (p. 12)." This may be the same type of anxiety observed so frequently at the first session of a group meeting (Bennis, 1967), when there seems to be no reason why the participants should be here and not there. The group leader is aware of this anxiety and does nothing to alleviate it in most cases. He

can depend upon the participants to attempt to rid themselves of this anxiety by finding a reason for being there, and in some way affirming their existence at that time and place. We will find that also in the religious ethos the theme of self-affirmation or affirmation of life is the basic value.

On a deeper level, we can see that the nothing to which Dasein transcends may be the nothing of death. Indeed, if our analysis is correct and the group participants are affirming their existence at that place and time, they are affirming their existence against non-existence, which is death. Murchland (1968) remarked, "Existential analyses, it may fairly be said, have contributed to modern man's obsession with the subject of death (p. IX)." This statement would have to be considered very carefully and it may be necessary to reverse his statement to read that modern man's obsession with death has contributed to existential analysis. May (1969) points out that just as a century ago, sex was a taboo subject, today it is death which is taboo. Just as in Victorian days, sex was covered up with long dresses and buttoned

collars, today death is concealed behind lavish funerals, caskets rather than coffins, memorial parks replace cemeteries. It appears that just the thing that concerns society the most, is that which we attempt to repress most. But there always seems to be a movement afoot that refuses to allow that which is repressed to remain repressed. Freud played that role concerning sex in his day and the existentialists and humanistic psychologists are playing that role in our day.

In our analysis, Heidegger would then be saying that our being is grounded in and transcends to nothing but death. But there is an ancient belief that is found both in Eastern and Western religions and philosophies, which while couched in different ways always has the force of meaning that one of the things a man cannot conceive is his own death. Man will not conceive of his own death because death is an extremely anxiety producing subject and the one thing that man wishes to avoid almost at any cost, is the feeling of anxiety. If the human condition truly is that our being is grounded in and transcends to nothing but death, then the anxiety of death would be very great, indeed, if not the foremost anxiety, and death as an integral

part of life would have to be dealt with very honestly and very directly.

Sartre (1953) offered more of interest in his existentialist doctrines. "The only being which can be called free is the being which annihilates its being (p. 43)." Of course, annihilation is precisely the lack of being or non-being. Sartre then continues in his analysis to prove that freedom is only found in choosing and in the moment of choice we are dreadfully alone. As shall be shown, loneliness ultimately means death and so once again, the theme of being and death is found to be intimately intertwined. Since Sartre relates freedom to being so intimately, he poses another problem involving being and not being. In speaking of possessions, and Sartre believes that one of the only two basic desires that exist is the desire <u>to have</u>, he says that creating is possessing, and if I possess something, it becomes me. "As the object rises up in my world, it must simultaneously be wholly me and wholly independent of me (p. 96)." So there is a relationship between that which I can create (or possess) and me, but creation exists only through its

movement, says Sartre. If it is fully accepted, it is annihilated. Here, may be found the future orientation of Sartre, just as we find it in May and Frankl. If something, even the self is fully accepted, it has no where to go. Intentionality is gone, a pull toward a goal is gone; for all intents and purposes the entity is annihilated.

Now I must ask myself, what happens to my "here and now"? If, according to Sartre, I possess my "here and now" and fully accept it, then I successfully annihilate it. So, by accepting that which is at the moment, I destroy it and by so doing render it meaningless. I must conclude that I do not fully accept the "here and now," but make it meaningful by relating it to a goal, albeit a goal which may never be achieved. But a goal or goals there must be or all of my life would be meaningless, which would produce a feeling of dread that I could not accept. Therefore, man has a project which Sartre expresses in the following way: "The best way to conceive of the fundamental project of human reality is to say that man is the being whose project is to become God (p. 40)."

Despite the fact that Sartre considers himself to be an atheist and despite the fact that his existentialism is considered to be extremely pessimistic, it is evident that he does have hopes for a future of man and does believe that man can exist meaningfully, even if this is in relation to a myth. Although Sartre would see life as absurd, very much like Frankl (1963), life becomes worthwhile if there is something in the future for which to live, even if that something is unattainable, like becoming God.

In the final analysis, it seems that Sartre sees being as ultimately meaningless, which means death, but will not accept death as a choice. He therefore assigns to man a project which will make his life meaningful, the project of becoming God which is admittedly impossible. He also sees man in relation to an object which then becomes part of the man (when he possesses or creates it), thereby making the object into a subject. It is of great interest to me that Sartre, the atheist, finds that he has to put God into the picture in order to attain purpose in existence, the dedicated realist par excellence, resorts to the almost mystical concept of making an object into a

subject by possessing it in order to give life to his second category of concrete human existence, the desire "to have". Without the appearance of God and the mystical in his philosophy, the force of Sartre's logic concerning existence would render it without significance and leave man totally alienated. In either case, the logical conclusion would be death.

Tillich (1948) is also in the existentialist tradition, but his is a religious existentialism. Like Heidegger, Tillich's point of departure is the human being himself. He is also concerned with the question of why am I here and not there, but to him our being does not come upon us from nothing and transcend to nothing. To Tillich, God is the ground of our being, thereby removing the anxiety inherent in Heidegger's thought. Yet, there is for Tillich, existential dread or anxiety which comes to us from four sources (Tillich, 1952). There is the fear of nothingness, the fear of meaninglessness, the fear of alienation, and the fear of guilt. I believe that all four of these existential fears are reducible to the fear of non-being or the fear of death and ultimately, it is the fear of non-being which is the source of anxiety. It can be readily

seen how the fear of nothingness, meaninglessness, and alienation are linked to the fear of non-being. The fear of guilt, however, may present a problem since guilt relates to something in the past, that which already transpired, and obviously, we are still here. I would interpret the fear of guilt to mean not a fear of the action that has occurred, but a fear of the retribution for that action which we know we deserve. In the unconscious, I believe that the ultimate retribution is the death penalty, and it is that which we fear, and that which makes guilt one of the sources of existential anxiety. To Tillich, too, existence is the fact we are faced with; and being faced with the fact that we do exist, we immediately confront its counterpart, the possibility, indeed, the inevitability, that we will not exist. It is recognized that such a realization does not come upon us lightly, but comes with fear and anxiety. However, our being is grounded not in nothingness, but in God who is the ultimate existence and it is at that point that optimism and hope becomes a part of Tillich's existentialism.

A Jewish thinker, not well known in the United States, Franz Rosenzweig, begins his thought on a note which coincides

with existential thought (Glatzer, 1953). It must first be noted that Rosenzweig, although a friend and colleague of Martin Buber, would probably have disclaimed any connection with existentialism and would have insisted that he was a Jewish thinker with no other adjectives involved. However, it is my conviction that Judaism seen not as an anthropological exercise, but as a living, dynamic civilization is existentialism in practice and I am certain that much of this study will reveal that interpretation. Rosenzweig's approach starts with man alone and very conscious of his mortality. This consciousness of his own existence and mortality as prepotent over thought and positivistic reasoning.

It must now become obvious that the existentialists being so concerned with existence have no choice but to take strong note of that which is most diametrically opposed to existence, the lack of existence which is death. A parallel can be drawn here between the existentialists who of necessity concern themselves with non-existence and the physicists whose study of matter ultimately brought them to a study of antimatter. However,

the existentialists are speaking of the question of life and death with which religion is concerned and likewise are many thoughtful psychologists. It can now be seen why there is an existentialist movement in psychology and why humanistic psychology is also concerned with these questions of life, death, and religion.

It would be impossible to leave a discussion of religion, life, and death without some notice of the contributions of Sigmund Freud. It is true that the present trend in psychology is to try very hard to disregard the writings of Freud, but I feel it would be an injustice to neglect the work of one who contributed so much to our understanding by opening new channels of thought for all of society. Freud was certainly not an existentialist; there are times, however, when he appears to have been one. He was much concerned with the questions of religion, life and death. "If you would endure life, be prepared for death (Freud, 1915)." Such a statement has the ring of a Paul Tillich, but Freud was not satisfied to look toward God for an explanation of life and death. Indeed, Freud considered himself a great antagonist of

religion and at one time wrote of himself as a "godless Jew" (Freud-Pfister, 1963). However, many of his other writings (Moses and Monotheism, Future of Illusion, the Moses of Michelangelo, Civilization and its Discontents, portions of his New Introductory Lectures) show him to have been keenly interested in religion and even very respectful of it (Freud, 1964). He wrote, "Religion, morality, and a social sense-the chief elements in the higher side of man-were originally one and the same thing (Freud, 1961, p. 37)."

However, it is Freud's postulation of the two basic instincts in the human being which is the greatest interest to us in this study. Here, it is important to note that when Freud used the term "instinct" he took it to mean any drive which originates from within the organism. Writing in 1922, Freud postulates an "antithesis between the 'ego instincts' and sexual instincts, the former impelling towards death and the latter towards the preservation of life (Freud, 1961, p.54)." Freud seemed to have taken as gospel the concept that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny and claims that the goal of all life is death. "The inanimate was there before the animate (p. 47)."

Later, in other works, Freud seems to have given the two instincts life of their own and dubbed them "Eros" and "Thanatos." However, he did not seem to have changed his mind about them as is evidenced by his famous correspondence with Albert Einstein (Freud, 1932) in which he repeats that there are two kinds of instincts, one to preserve and unite, and the other to destroy or kill. He goes on to say that neither instinct is any less essential than the other. The phenomena of life arise from the operation of both of them together. He emphasizes that both of them must be working together. In this letter, in which Freud is explaining his theory of war, he postulates that the death instinct turns destructive if it is turned outward toward objects, but the origin of conscience is the diversion inward of aggresiveness. This conscience, or superego, though, may become a gathering place for the death instinct.

With the introduction of the life instinct and the death instinct into psychoanalysis, the subject was transformed from what Freud called a science to a full philosophy. This is especially true since Freud mentioned

that the instrument of the death instinct seems to be in the muscular apparatus. This apparatus is much more greatly developed in men and it is also mentioned that the super ego is more strongly developed in men that it is in women. Thus, we find that the death instinct would manifest itself to a larger extent in males than it would in females. This is supported by mortality and longevity statistics. It would therefore seem that since both instincts are necessary for survival and progress and males have an overabundance of thanatos while females possess more than their share of eros, uniting the two sexes is essential for the progress of civilization and not only to insure the survival of the species through propogation.

Such an idea has been formulated and expanded by Bakan (1966) who postulates "agency" as a male, aggressive type of instinct and "communion" as female, unifying type of instinct. He too is concerned about the ultimate issues of life and death, and utilizes Freud as a starting point in studying them. He also believes that the Judeo-Christian heritage can help us face the crisis of death and affirms that is has in the past. Bakan believes that Freud's cancer

was behind his postulation of the death instinct despite the fact that Freud developed the cancer (or at least it was so diagnosed) after he had already formulated the idea of a death instinct.

What is of interest to us in both Freud and Bakan's view is that they see death coming to us not from the outside of the organism, but from within. The wording used by our existentialists, such as the Dasein comes to us in anxiety, or existential dread is the fear of death, or man sees himself as mortal, all have the force of making death an outsider. Freud and Bakan see death as an insider. It is part of the organism. The organism cannot live without it, yet it is the cause of the annihilation of the organism. Also, I get the impression very strongly from both Freud and Bakan, that they do not glibly attempt to make friends with death. The courage in the face of death shown by the other works cited seems too courageous to be real. Freud and Bakan are facing death in their works, and facing it realistically, but the impression comes through that they hate it, and if they could, would abolish it. Such a desire seems highly unrealistic, but it must be remembered that the entire art of medicine is

devoted to that unrealistic end, that religion looks forward to the coming of a time when that end will become accomplished, and ultimately, all of us live our lives with the fiction that we are going to be here tomorrow, or in a year from now, or a decade from now.

From the moment that Freud introduced his concepts of eros and thanatos into psychoanalysis, psychoanalysis of necessity became interested in the ultimate questions of life and death. There was then, no choice but for psychoanalysis to delve into the subject of religion, and although Freud was interested in the subject even earlier in his career, he was obliged to deal with it more directly and deeply than ever before. His Moses and Monotheism (Freud, 1964) is evidence of this deep concern with religion. It is to be remembered that this work was published very late in Freud's life and we must assume that the ideas presented had been formulated and reformulated many times during his career. Although scholars of the Old Testament have universally criticized this book as being unscholarly, full of too much conjecture, being historically inaccurate in places, and full of other scholastic errors, I read the work with awe and respect. Freud was not a scholar

of the Old Testament. It is not even known for certain that his knowledge of Hebrew was sufficient for him to have read the Old Testament in the original, yet he did go back to antiquity for his material, and his knowledge of the field was greater than that possessed by just an ordinary layman. I read the book from the point of view that it tells more about Freud than it does about Moses, and what it relates about Freud is not only his deep respect for religion, but his respect for the intellect of Moses and the people who followed him. The conception of an "invisible god results in the intellectual over the sensual which checks brutality and the tendency to violence (Vol. XXIII, p. 116)."

Since brutality and violence are manifestations of the death instinct turned outward, it can be said that Freud saw the advent of the concept of an invisible god as a step in the direction of rendering the death instinct less potent. This would tend to be another example of how Freud not only recognized death as a part of life, but had the desire to do something about it. In this respect, he is not different from the point of view expressed

many times in the Old Testament and which will be dealt with later in this essay.

In his New Introductory Lectures (Freud, 1964), he praises religion as being far above science in its ability to bring comfort to humanity. This would indicate that as late as 1933, when these lectures were first published, Freud was able to see some very important values in religion. It also contradicts the sentiments expressed in his Future of an Illusion (Freud, 1961), first published in 1927, where Freud argues that the values of religion have served their purpose in the past and must now be replaced by the values of science. It would seem from an examination of these two works that in the years between 1927 and 1933, Freud's point of view about the contribution religion is able to make had changed very markedly, from the opinion that science must now give the values to the world that religion no longer can, to the opinion that religion can contribute much to humanity that science cannot. At any rate, it is difficult to be certain that Freud ever believed everything he wrote in Future of an Illusion, as is evidenced by an unclear letter he wrote to Ferenczi

shortly after it was published in which he stated that now much of the book seems childish (Jones, 1957).

It should also be noted that after the death of Freud, religion continued to enjoy a prominent place in psychoanalytic writings and theories. Erich Fromm (1966), as just one example of these, points to the fact that psychoanalysis, as conceived by Freud, considered religion as a very vital part of man's existence.

In summary, we are able to understand that those in psychology who are consciously aware of, and sensitive to the issues of being and non-being, and life and death, whether they are existentialists, humanists or psychoanalysts, are also drawn to the subject of religion, and out of this a renewed vigor in the study of the psychology of religion is emerging. One method of looking at religion and at the man whom it influences is by way of values and value concepts expounded by religion. It is to this that our attention is now turned.

Chapter IV

THE THIRD FORCE - DEATH, RELIGION, AND VALUES

Schneidman (1970) states, "In the Western world, we are probably more death oriented today than we have been since the days of the Black Plague in the Fourteenth Century." I think that we would all have to agree with Schneidman's statement. This would be based not only on the personal, experiential grounds that wherever we go we seem to find people who are members of Edgar Cayce study groups, book shops seem to be filled with works on the occult, the names of Bishop James Pike and Arthur Ford seem to be on many lips, and the subject of life after death seems to be cropping up at more and more cocktail parties. But it would seem logical also, that we are living in a generation that was raised with the knowledge that at the push of a few buttons, the entire history of mankind can come to a very abrupt end. We are living in a generation that knows that genocide, which seemed inconceivable thirty-five years ago, is not only conceivable, but is a fact of life, and happened very recently in man's history. We are living in

a generation that can tune on a television set and witness the slaughter in Viet Nam or Belfast and know that the people falling, broken, bleeding and crushed are not actors who will get up and be ready to star in another episode tomorrow or the next day, but are real people who are really dying. We are living in a generation that can see the kid next door get beaten or killed in a rally in Chicago or on a college campus. Death is no longer something that happens to people far away or to people who are very old and worn out. Like in the day of the Black Plague, death happens to our friends and neighbors, and we have no choice but to recognize that it can happen to us.

What I am dealing with here is a very emotional subject, a very anxiety provoking subject, and I will attempt to deal with it in a dispassionate, scientific manner. I must confess that by so doing, I will be erecting a facade. When one speaks of death dispassionately, it is very much akin to the cook book approach to love that was spoken of earlier. When I speak of love, I am thinking of my loved one, of the tenderness I feel toward her, the concern I

feel toward her, the feel of her body, the feel of her lips, the intimate moments we know together. It is dehumanizing to attempt to be analytical about these feelings which cannot really be conveyed to one who has not felt them, at any rate. Likewise, when I speak of death, I am speaking of my children playing on the living room floor and I am not there, I am speaking of myself no longer loving, hating, touching, feeling, speaking, hearing, eating, awakening, doing any of the things I enjoy. I am speaking of myself not-being. This can be done in a dispassionate manner, but I would be rendering myself and my readers a disservice if I did not recognize that beneath the cool and dispassionate exterior, there rages an incalculable amount of passion and feeling.

Bugental (1965) in a humanistic-existentialist frame-work remarks, "...the fact of contingency means that I never can predict with complete assurance. The experience of contingency means that I live with anxiety (p.22)." What Bugental is referring to is the anxiety of the unknown and the examples he presents can be summed up as the anxiety of the possibility of nothingness or death. Bugental

is discussing experientially what the behaviorists in psychology have been working on experimentally (Skinner, 1938). The outcome of our behavior is in a causal relationship to some result. Thus, if a rat depresses a lever and a pellet of food appears, the rat is likely to depress the lever again because his action resulted in reinforcement. The appearance of food in this case was contingent upon the rat's behavior of depressing the lever. If I write a poem and people whom I respect tell me the poem is good, I would find this praise reinforcing and it is likely that I will write another piece. In this case, my respect for them and willingness to show them the fruits of my labors is contingent upon my acceptance of their praise. But, what if I have it on even greater authority that my poem is the work of a hack and is worthless? Then, if my friends praise it I may consider them as philistines, and would not bother seeking their opinions in the future. In the extreme, I may not even want to continue my relationship with them at all. It is obvious that a new aspect, or dimension to the contingency was added and that was the opinion of the greater authority. My friends were unaware

of this aspect of the contingecy and possibly, fully expected me to be pleased by their praise. But just the opposite is what occurred.

This is what Bugental means when he states, "the fact of contingency means that I never can predict with complete assurance" because I can never be sure that I know all facets involved with the contingencies. When he states that, "the experience of contingency means that I live with anxiety," what he is saying is that if I am aware that I do not know all of the contingencies relevant to my behavior, I can never predict the outcome, and therefore, I must live with a great deal of uncertainty about the future. In a more serious situation than the poetry writing example, I must be aware that my choices may bring about situations that border on nothingness or death. It is this knowing that I am always facing the unknown that produces so much anxiety for the unknown is equated with death.

Lepp seems to take a more positive view of death. He claims (Lepp, 1968), "...modern theologians attribute only the painful, harrowing aspect of death to Adam's sin (p. 27)."

Again he states, "the authentically alive can readily see that death is not the end but the fulfillment of life (p. 39)." He goes on to say that the "love of life is the best and perhaps the only effective antidote against the fear of death (p. 65)."

One can accept Lepp's statement that death is not the end but the fulfillment of living on various levels. On one level it can be seen that one must die in order to live. This would be in keeping with Sartre's idea that the only truly free being is the being which annihilates its being. In religious terms the concept of being reborn suggests itself. The idea of baptism has the same force, that one symbolically drowns his old, inadequate life and emerges fresh, ready to begin a true life. Among the Orthodox Jews, before a wedding, the bride and bridegroom visit a ritualarium in which they undergo (separately) a kind of baptism symbolizing that they are killing their imcomplete lives, (before marriage, life in Judaism, is considered as incomplete) and are now ready to fulfill their lives.

Psychologically, it is said that one can be fully aware only if he becomes unselfconscious. This seems almost

contradictory, but the force of it is that we cannot be fully aware of all that is going on around us and within us if we are too conscious of ourselves. We would then be taken up in assuring ourselves that we are presenting ourselves in the best possible light to allow ourselves the ability to perceive truly (Goffman, 1967). Not being fully aware of the situation in which we are is a type of death to the situation. We are not living it. Repressing a memory is another type of death to a situation. We are literally "killing it" because we cannot bear to live with it. Not recognizing or denying parts of ourselves is a type of death to the self. The extreme of this type of death in psychological terms would be catatonia.

The very abstract idea of a new life pattern emerging from that which is dead may be seen in concrete terms in some forms of lower life. Thus, there are insects that die right after fertilizing eggs of their mates. There is a type of grasshopper, the female of which snaps off its mate's head directly following copulation. Here, in a very real sense, a new life emerges from the death of an old one. In the behaviorally oriented psychotherapies,

the "extinction" of old, inappropriate, and dysfunctional behavior patterns is sought, in order to replace them with new, more functional ones. This is the same idea as killing off an old life, or an old way of life and replacing it with something new and, we always hope, something better. In the psychotherapies that consider themselves more closely allied with the humanistic school of thought, the hope is that the client will learn to grow and in that way, replace his old life style with a new and more functional one. It is to be remembered that one of the major conditions in the biological definition of "life" is that the organism grows.

The argument presented here is partly in agreement with that of Lepp, that the love of life is essential as an antidote to the fear of death. Put in slightly different terms, it is that the one who can accept death as a necessary part of life no longer must strive against it, but can get about the business of living and enjoying it. But, taken to an extreme, this latter argument would become highly dysfunctional and anti-progressive. One might "accept" death as a necessary part of life and then be free of fear which might have served as a hindering force to his full

pleasure in life. He might live very fully until the very real prospect of death becomes present in him or a loved one. Then, I fear the existential dread and anxiety would be very much upon him. In a sense, it would be like accepting war or poverty as a necessary part of life. We can then ignore them until we are faced with them. I believe our attitude of acceptance would change very rapidly in such a case. I do not believe that "accepting" death would have led to so many of the life-preserving advances found in medical science. The acceptance of death may come as a temporary palliative in the life of an individual, but in the long run would be dysfunctional both for him and for the species. Here, I must admit to expressing a personal value, but I believe it is also the force of the argument in The Courage To Be (Tillich, 1952). Tillich's use of the word, "courage" in the title, means not that we "accept" death, but that we face it and all the anxiety and fear it brings with it, and despite the anxiety and fear, we still live.

The view presented here is in opposition to that of the modern theologians, Lepp (1968) makes reference to

and is more in sympathy with the point made in Schneidman's (1970) title to his article on death in Psychology Today, "The Enemy." Perhaps the argument presented here will be construed as in accord with Freud's concept of eros versus thanatos or the view implied by Bakan (1966) of the agentic and the communal. Both present a negative view of death. But, I believe, the negative view of death presented here is in accord with the basic religious value of the sanctity of life, from which it is possible that both Freud's and Bakan's views stem (Bakan, 1958).

In the earlier development of the Western religions as seen in the Bible, death is regarded as a punishment (Genesis, 3:3, Psalms, 16:10) and something to be avoided. Although it is not something that man can avoid by his own efforts, the hope is expressed that in the future, death will no longer exist. "He will swallow up death forever; And the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces (Isaiah 25:8)," and in the New Testament is found the sentiment that "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death (I Corrinthians 15:26)." As shall be expressed throughout this essay, the basic value in Biblical religion is the

value of human life. If that is so, and life is the entity to be affirmed, it is logically impossible to affirm its antithesis which is death. Thus, a negative valuation of death is found in the Scriptures. As the religions developed further, the concepts of physical ressurection and the immortality of the soul received greater emphasis. This was a manner in which religion attempted to come to terms with the reality of death and from these ideas came the three storied picture of the structure of the universe with the underworld at the bottom, the earth in the middle and the heavens above. It is this mythological picture which modern theologians reject (Bultmann, 1960).

However, death was still feared and hated by the religious, and indeed still is to this day (Chasin, 1968). In earlier times, the rationale for the hatred and fear of death was that in death one was capable no longer of atonement for mistakes made during his life. The Talmud, therefore, advises each man to live every day as if it were to be his last, and so live atonement all the days of his life. Indeed, here we have in religious writings the very same advice that humanistic psychologists offer

in the emphasis on living in the "here and now." Perls (1951) has said that if we concentrate on the past, we are living in a state of rehashing "unfinished business," and if our concentration is on the future, then all our energy is directed to "rehearsing" for events that may never take place. Either one of these is indicative of a neurosis, and indeed, the only way to live fully and joyfully is to live in the "here and now." Recently, I heard a preacher advise a young couple on their wedding day to forget the past, as it is gone, never to be recovered, not to worry about the future because that is in the hands of God, but to live in and enjoy today for that belongs to them. How similar his words were to those of Perls. Yet, each of them, and most humanistic psychologists today also, I fear, miss the importance of the Talmudic statement alluded to the above. Perls, the preacher, and the humanistic psychologists are advising a type of modern day hedonism. It rings as a philosophy of "eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow You may die." The Talmudic statement is just the opposite. It may die and it is incumbent upon you to live properly at this time which will serve as your preparation for that possibility, today. The Talmud dictum mentioned

is not telling man to live a life of gloom because the possibility of death faces him, but to live a life full of meaning, and as Tillich seems to have caught the spirit of the dictum, a life of courage in awareness of the inevitability of death.

However, the anxiety of the awareness of death is still very much with us. Modern writers on the subject of death do not seem to answer the ultimate questions to the greater satisfaction of existential man, than did the ancients. Bugental (1965), says that death really presents an existential anxiety and can be countered by "faith", which would represent authentic being. By using the word "faith," Bugental does not necessarily mean a specific faith, but a generalized type of faith in life or being, itself. He says that is the type of faith that affirms, "I am I (p. 329)." Here, it seems that Bugental becomes most unpsychological. I am I when? Am I the same I sitting here, attempting to discover answers, or more specifically questions that may some day be answered for my own and others' benefits as the I who lectures to a class of undergraduates and appears somewhat omniscient in their sight? Am I the same

I that works with a troubled, hurting person in psychotherapy and attempts to help him overcome that specific hurt as the I who goes to my friends and colleagues with my own personal hurts? In short, can I or Bugental really affirm that I am the same I that will be in five minutes from now or that was five minutes earlier? Yet, Bugental's affirmation is quite similar to the Biblical summation of God as "I am that I am." Since I am not satisfied with that well known statement about God and contend that it is a terribly misleading mistranslation, I will take the liberty of going back to the Hebrew text and rendering my own translation of the passage and interpret it according to scholars who have also been troubled by it, and advance my own translation for this very basic and important concept in all of the higher religions. First I will quote the more usual translation of the text which is found in most Bibles (The Holy Scriptures, 1955). This quotation is part of the story of Moses' confrontation with God at the burning bush when God tells Moses to go to Egypt and bring the Hebrew slaves to freedom.

"And Moses said unto God: 'Behold, when I come unto

> the children of Israel and say unto them: the God of your fathers hath sent me unto you and they shall say to me: What is His name? What shall I say unto them?' And God said unto Moses: 'I Am That I Am'; and He said; 'thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel: I Am hath sent me unto you. (Exodus III: 13, 14)."

The following is my translation of the same texts taken from the Hebrew (Mikraot G'dolot, 1951):

> "And Moses said to God, 'Now, when I come to the members of Israel and I shall say to them, the God of your fathers sent me to you, and they shall say to me: What is His name? What should I say to them?' And God said to Moses, 'I shall be that which I shall be:' And He said, 'So shall you say to the members of Israel, I shall be sent me to you (Exodus III: 13, 14)."

The latest Jewish Publication Society translation does not translate the confusing text and allows it to remain in a transliterated form of the Hebrew (The Torah, 1962). In a footnote, both the traditional and my translations are given.

Two very important points are to be made here, one in connection with the Tetragrammaton itself (Albright, 1957), the four lettered name of God used in the Old Testament, and the second is the fact of the differences in tenses in the verses quoted above about the name of God. It is universally recognized tha the Tetregrammaton, YHWH, is associated with the Hebrew verb, HYH, which means, "to be" or "being." Thus, the name of God, usually misrendered into English as "Jehovah" is a God of being, or at least the implication of the name is one of being. This, in itself, is very meaningful in any discussion of religion and existentialism. The implication is a God of Existence. Such an interpretation plays havoc with the three storied picture of the universe and puts God right back in the world as an existing part of the world. But what is even more revolutionary to some would be the future tense in which God's answer to Moses' question was written. There can be little question of the tense being in the future since the medieval commentators on the Bible who did not have the benefit of the English translation at their disposal and worked entirely on the basis of the Hebrew text also

explained it as future tense, thus Rashi* explained the verse as meaning, "I shall be with them in this problem as I shall be with them in other captivities and other exiles."

We are confronted here with various future tenses for the name of God. The Tetragrammaton, itself, if seen in the form of a verb, would be in the third person, singular imperfect tense; the answer Moses received is in the first person, singular imperfect tense. It can be said that it is possible that at least to some of the writers of the Old Testament, God could have been seen as a "becoming God." Thus, not only has man a project, according to Sartre, of becoming God, but from this point of view, God would also have a project of becoming God. The concept of major importance which is presented here is that the future orientation both in man and God is essential and was perhaps intuitively recognized before we had such sophisticated fields of endeavor as philosophy and science. Without

---

*Rashi; Abbreviation of Rabbi Shlomo (son of Isaac, the leading and most widely accepted Jewish expounder and interpreter of the Old Testament and Talmud. Born in Troyes, France, 1040; died Troyes, 1105.

this future orientation, existence would become not only shallow, but also absurd.

Perhaps, it is at this point of realization of the importance of the future that our problems begin, as Bugental intimates, he cannot be sure whether existential anxiety can ever be anything but present. As was mentioned earlier, he asserts that since we can never know all of the contingencies connected with our choices and actions, "thus is born the sense of being subject to fate, which in its ultimate form is the anticipation of death (Bugental, 1965, p. 36)." It should be noticed that when Bugental speaks of contingencies, he is speaking of the possibility of future events, just as when he speaks of the anticipation of death, it is a future event we are anticipating, and it is this future which is at the root of our anxiety.

Before returning to Bugental it is interesting to note that we are dealing with a group of opposites at this point, which while contradicting one another, also complement one another. In an age in which the cry of "God is dead" is so often heard, this essay is dealing with a God of existence (Fromm's (1966) very cogent statement that the real question

is whether or not man is dead, should not be overlooked). While we are dealing with existence, it was found that the subject could not be dealt with unless we took into account the fact of non-existence, or death. And in recognizing that without placing great importance upon the future, life becomes absurd, it is also recognized that this future orientation may be the cause of much anxiety and pain in human life. This speculation can be compared to the physicists' early speculation about antimatter, which has been proven and today is being considered as a potential energy source. One of the points being made in this paper is that things which seem contradictory may not necessarily be so, and psychology may have much to gain by being open to contradictions in the phenomena it chooses to admit to its domain of subject matter.

While recognizing that death is a part of life, it does not seem that Bugental would make the statement, as did Lepp, that death is the fulfillment of life. On the contrary, Bugental recognizes the tragic in life, and indeed, the supreme tragedy is death. He (Bugental, 1965) tells of a patient who "As she finally recognized how much she feared

the deaths of herself and her children...could enjoy life with them (p. 17)." Death, as the fulfillment of life seems like a very positive point of view, almost that death is something devoutly to be wished. It seems like something we should take to our hearts and almost look forward to, then fear of it would vanish, and we would be able to then go about enjoying life. Bugental does not speak of the fear of death vanishing. He speaks of the fear of death being recognized. It is something that is going to happen to all of us. We must not repress it, but face it, and not necessarily like it. In fact, if Bugental is congruent with Tillich's (1952) point of view, which I believe he is, then death is something we not only do not like, but we hate. This would be the whole point of Tillich's title, The Courage To Be. Courage is not necessary in confronting that which is not fear provoking to us; just the opposite is true, we need courage to face that which arouses in us the most anxiety. It is Tillich's thesis, and I believe Bugental is stating the same argument, that life cannot be faced fully or courageously until the fear of death or non-being is recognized and accepted. The important thing here is that

it be recognized and accepted, not explained away. Religion and philosophy have attempted those tactics without success. We should very cautiously guard against falling into the same trap. Fear of death cannot be explained away. It is difficult, if not impossible to conceive of death as being anything but an anxiety provoking topic, especially so when one is contemplating his own finitude or that of those he loves.

On a superficial level, it appears that many of the points of view presented above have as a common denominator the effect of desensitizing oneself to the anxiety of death in a Wolpean (1966) manner, by speaking so freely and courageously about it, or repressing the entire matter and sublimating with a love for life. The point of view expressed in this essay is that death is something all fairly normal people fear and hate. Religion, philosophy, and finally psychology all have to deal with it because it is primary to the human condition, and it is the human condition which we conceive of as central to our interests and studies. Recognizing the anxiety attached to the notion of death is where psychology can make its greatest contribution

because this anxiety can be potentially immobilizing to both the individual and the species.

Here, at the psychology of death is one point at which religion, existentialism, and humanistic psychology converge. Religion is here because it attempts to answer the basic questions of life, "Where did I come from? What am I doing here? And where am I going? (Talmud)." Phrased another way, the basic question is, "What is this all about, anyway?" The answer to this question must be that it is absurdity. Ecclesiastes answered in another word, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity (Ecclesiastes I:2)." The force of the entire book of Ecclesiastes is that all is vanity or in the more modern word, "absurdity." No works a man does profits him for the end is death. Is it any wonder that the last verses of the work are: "The end of the matter, all having been heard: fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is the whole man. For God shall bring every work into the judgment concerning every hidden thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil. (Ecclesiastes XII: 13, 14)." Some scholars conclude that the last passages of the book are the work of an editor "who was both fascinated and troubled by

its contents (Gordis, 1955)." The purpose of the "editor" making this addition to the book is simply that we cannot live with the realization that it is all vanity or absurdity and that there must be a purpose to our labors. His answer was that the purpose is that God will judge us some day for our works. Note, the orientation, here too is a future orientation. It is my belief also, that the Bible begins as it does for the very same reason, that of establishing a God as the purpose behind the confusion of the world. If God is indeed the architect behind the world, then it is not absurd and men can live. There will be more said on the subject of God, The Creator as we reach the discussion of the primary value concept in religion which does not seem to find the answer of life in death, but rather, the answer to the question of death in life.

Existentialism is at this point because of its concern with existence and being, and the logical opposite of being is non-being, a concept which can be equated only with death (Heidegger, 1963, Sartre, 1962, Tillich, 1952, Bugental, 1965). Here again, the point must be made that

in order to study a subject fully, its opposite in nature must be studied as well. It is perhaps, for this very reason that so many see existentialism as a very pessimistic philosophy. The same observation can be made about Freud, who is also accused frequently of being extremely pessimistic. May (1969) points out that just as in Freud's day, the subject of sex was taboo, today it is the subject of death which is taboo. Existentialism and Freud investigating the depths of life both come to the point of investigating death as an essential, albeit unhappy aspect of life.

Humanistic psychology (Bugental, 1965) has had to come to this point of consideration of death, because its concern is a holistic approach (Maslow, 1967) to the study of the human being. This holistic approach includes not only a study of death, but also a deep consideration of values which impel the individual to action. In this sense, humanistic psychology is concerned with the very same questions of values that religion has been struggling with for millenia. The basic difference is that while religion has attempted to give answers to the questions,

psychology only attempts to calculate and clarify the questions and then discover the meaning of them.

Another point at which these forces converge is the point of unity or at-one-ness. The existentialists, as represented by Sartre (1962), point out that "To be... means to be unified in the world (p. 28-29)." Or phrased another way, "Human reality is the pure effort to become God (Sartre, 1962, p. 61)." The project of the human being, in this thought is to be God who is the one who is at one with the universe. The very same idea appears in May (1969), in Frankl (1963), almost everywhere in Fromm, where the basic problem confronting western civilization today is said to be that of alienation. By alienation is meant alienation from the self and alienation from the universe at large. As has been intimated throughout this essay, things and movements do not happen accidentally. The fantastic growth of the encounter group movement, I believe, is in rebellion against this pervading feeling of alienation. At least for a time, in these groups, people share their intimate selves with others and can

feel close to others. May (1969) intimates that the sexual revolution or the new morality is another way of temporarily escaping from the terrible feeling of alienation. I would also venture to say that at the other "extreme" in the world of psychology, the great interest in Behavior Modification is in conformity with the pervasive feeling of alienation. Skinner (1971) emphasizes that it is the environment which reinforces or punishes our behavior. It is not the personal, but the impersonal environment that we must deal with in order to help mankind realize the level of potential capable of attainment. In a sense, Skinner is almost speaking as a representative of primitive religion (which our worship of technology can be compared to fairly), wherein the environment takes the place of the gods who reward and punish. Man must then manipulate the environment (or gods) in such a way that more reinforcement and less punishment will be forthcoming. It has been my experience in conversation with one of the more prominent behavior modifiers in this country, to ask if, in fact, I would not become "reinforcement" to the person I was helping. He told me I was missing the entire point, but I had the

feeling that he was refusing to recognize that the person of the behavior modifier could become involved. Admittedly, the above is an over simplification of Skinner, who remains one of the geniuses of American psychology, and a much more complex person than many of his detractors care to admit. But I believe that the above gives a fairly true picture of those whom Skinner, himself terms "behavioralists" (Skinner, 1971).

In either case, the analysis presented here is that alienation is a problem and people respond to it in different ways, but there is no escape from the fact that they do respond. Thus, it is the aim of the high religions for man to be at one with God or with the universe. It is also recognized that man cannot be at one with God until he is able to be at one with himself. In different ways, which are at heart quite similar, religion attempts to give man the wherewithal to accomplish this unity with himself, God, and the universe. Such is the force of Heschel's (1959) writings, that by raising the profane to the holy, we become closer to unity with God. It was pointed out earlier that the many benedictions found in Judaism are for that purpose.

In the Roman Catholic Mass, actually eating the host, and it is insisted that this is not symbolic, but the wafer becomes the body of Christ in reality and the wine his blood, has the force of making Christ a part of the physical organism of the participant in the man. Thus, in our analysis, the process is reversed and God becomes part of the human being in the Roman Catholic Ritual, but when two entities become one, what is the difference which has become part of which? Such too, is the force of Buber's I-Thou relationship, the relationship in which both the I and the Thou become part of one another, and each part is a subject to itself and to the other. Here the word "subject" can be understood in its grammatical sense as the one who is active and does the acting. According to Buber, both parties in the I-Thou relationship do the acting and are not merely acted upon. An I-it relationship objectifies a person and makes the "it" party into a depersonalized entity.

Perhaps the first religious example of the I-Thou relationship is that found in Genesis. Once again I will quote the usual translation (1955) and follow it with my own translation directly from the Hebrew Text.

> And the Lord God said: 'It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him.' And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them; and whatsoever the man would call every living creature, that was to be the name thereof. And man gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found a help meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the place with flesh instead thereof. And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from the man, made He a woman and brought her to the man. And the man said: 'This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh (Genesis II: 18-24).

The translation from Mikraot G'dolot (1951) follows:

And the Lord God said: 'The man being by himself is not good; I will make a similar helper for him. And the Lord God formed from the earth all the beasts of the field and all the fowl of the heavens, and He brought them to the man to see what he would call them; and whatever the man called each living soul, that is its name. And the man gave names to all the cattle, and the fowl of the heavens, and to all the beasts of the field, but for Adam he didn't find a similar helper. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man and he slept, and He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh there. And the Lord God built the rib which he took from the man into a woman, and He brought her to the man. And the man said, 'This is the time.' Bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh, this one shall be called woman because she was taken from man.' For this reason a man shall leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife and they shall be as one flesh.

These particular segments in the Bible have so much to say about the I-Thou relationship that it is with humility that one approaches the subject. First, it is important to explain my translation of a "similar helper" which is suggested by the Hebrew Text itself and is supported by medieval commentaries which read, "The helper should be almost similar to him in feature." But more important to the I-Thou relationship is the concept given in the Bible that both the man and wife had to be the subjects. This is suggested by the myth of the woman being formed from part of the man. The woman and the man are one. It is to be remembered from the verses that all of the other animals were formed of the earth, not of the man, himself. The normal man does not objectify himself or become alienated from himself. He perceives himself as a subject. The Bible is saying that the woman was and had to be a subject to the man because she was a part of him. Likewise, he had to be a subject to her because they were one and the same. This is recognized by Adam in his exclamation, "Bone from my bones, etc."

Another important concept is hidden in the translation

of Adam's words, "This is the time." It is translated as such simply because I cannot understand from the Hebrew Text how it can be translated otherwise. The phrase simply means, "This is the time." Again, support for this translation is found both in the medieval commentaries and in the Talmud where this verse is interpreted to mean, "This teaches that Adam had intercourse with all the cattle and beasts, but only Eve cooled his passion." Here then, is found the I-Thou relationship between a man and woman given mythological clothing or spoken in mythological terms. They begin as one, one is taken from the other and they become two individuals. Through the act of sexual intercourse, they are again joined and it is recognized by the beautiful exclamation, "Bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh," and then the summary is that a man shall cleave unto his wife and they shall be as one flesh. The word "as" is of utmost importance here. It is once again in the Hebrew Text but not usually translated. If the text stated, "They shall be one flesh," each would lose his identity and individuality in becoming one. But the myth is wiser than the translators. They shall interact as if they were one, but never lose their own

individual personhood. It is that of which Buber speaks concerning the I-Thou relationship.

Several times I have used the word myth in reference to Biblical accounts. It should be emphasized that the word is used with the utmost respect. A myth is not a fairy tale but a story which may or may not be true, but the importance of it lies in the values that are its underpinnings. I fully concur with Campbell (1970) in his evaluation of mythology. "Mythology is not invented rationally; mythology cannot be rationally understood. Theological interpreters render it ridiculous (p. 42)." And again, "Whenever a myth has been taken literally its sense has been perverted; but also, reciprocally, that whenever it has been dismissed as a mere priestly fraud or a sign of inferior intelligence, truth has slipped out the other door (p. 27)."

It is because I have such great respect for the mythology of the Bible that I attempt to translate it as truly as one can possibly translate from one language to another, and because I believe that the myth has something

of value to teach us that I am not concerned with the fact that a man's wife is not in reality taken from his rib. That is the language of the myth. The value it is teaching is that the I-Thou relationship can exist and does exist. It can exist if no sexual intercourse is involved and it can exist between members of the same sex. Taking the myth literally would make the above cases impossible; ignoring the myth would be to ignore a very fulfilling type of relationship.

Indeed, according to Buber, the highest form of the I-Thou relationship is one which can exist between man and God. The myth does not speak of this, at least not this particular myth, but the door is left open for such a relationship which would have the force of unifying or making the human being at one with God or the Universe. This is implied by Fromm (1966) who distinguishes the one who loves God as the one who cares about man. In this sense, he is coming close to the I-Thou relationship in saying that the love of man must exist first and be displayed by action, then we can imply a love of God as existing too. The love of God is experienced as the feeling of at-one-ness with the universe or put negatively, a lack of alienation

toward oneself and toward the universe. This experience of unification with the universe is described as the common thread which runs through the visions of the mystics of all the great religions (Maslow, 1964, Stace, 1960).

The humanistic psychologist has arrived at this point of interest in the religious and the mystical experience because although it is not frequently recognized, true mysticism is true humanism and true humanism is true mysticism. Again we find, as was mentioned earlier in this essay, an apparent contradiction in terms and science has not frequently taken kindly to contradiction. However, the humanist has a vision which I will consider a value underpinning to his system of psychology. That vision is the oneness of humanity. He sees the human being as an individual, as unique in many of his personal attributes, but nevertheless, he sees humanity as one. He sees the human being as the embodiment of goals, needs and drives which are universal. He speaks of a universal drive toward health and toward growth (Rogers, 1961). He sees the human being as the container of the same fears and anxieties (Bugental, 1965), but he also sees the human being as the

container of great strength, and his vision is for humanity to become one, to make a unified whole of the many diversified parts which is each individual. The mystic, in his mystical experience, sees the universe as a unified whole and feels himself as part of the unity which is the universe. Describing this phenomenon is a difficult, if not an impossible task. As Campbell (1970) puts it, "the chronical of our species...has been...a history of the pouring of blazing visions into the minds of seers and efforts of earthly communities to incarnate unearthly covenants (p. 3)."

One founder of the Third Force in psychology, Maslow (1962), reports that peak experiences tend to have the same or similar characteristics which are ascribed to religious experiences the world over. Perhaps, if Maslow's "peakers" had lived several centuries ago, their experiences would not be described as "peak experiences", but would have been considered visions from God. Among the descriptions of peak experiences, he found that the universe was described as not only perceived with greater clarity, but there was also a description of the unifying aspects of reality. Here again, is found the concept of unity in an experience, which

while we do not feel able to consider as mystical, can be said to parallel the mystical experience in many ways. Maslow asks, "Is it not meaningful also that the mystic experience has been described in almost identical words by people in every religion, and every culture?" It is always a sense of merging with "God," "nature," or "beauty," but in the merging the "me" or the self does not seem to be lost. On the contrary, it seems to be enlarged and enhanced. Freud, it should be noted, who claimed to reject religion, described this kind of experience as an oceanic feeling.

It is at these points that existentialism, humanistic psychology and religion share a common ground and it is at these points where these disciplines can well work together in piecing togetner a part of human life so universally important, and yet so universally little understood. However, it has finally come about that humanistic psychology is forcing these phenomena, usually relegated to religion into the spectrum of psychological research.

However important the questions of death and unity

are in both religion and humanistic psychology, there remains another point with which religion has attempted to answer these questions and which psychology is only recently admitting into its domain. This is the question of values. It was pointed out earlier that science has traditionally considered values as almost antithetical to scientific knowledge. Maslow (1962) makes this point very strongly in stating that among intellectuals, fact and value have almost always been considered to be antonyms and mutually exclusive. It therefore should not be surprising that those psychologists who have accepted the challenge to deal with values are not clear as to what they mean, and are often even self-contradictory in their writings concerning values (Rogers, 1964, Maslow, 1964).

One of the greatest problems has been in deciding what is meant by values. Are values different from attitudes? Are they the same as opinions? Are they invented, discovered or introjected? How are they to be operationally defined, and, of course, this is the bugaboo. All the other questions can be answered in one way or another and it may even be acceptable to use some learned double-talk to back off from

them. But when the question of an operational definition is broached, the scientist feels that here is the place that his mettle must show and he becomes all business, perhaps a value in itself. Perhaps the best known work on values is that of Allport, Vernon & Lindzey (1960) in which they attempt to assess personality through a study of values. The values are lumped under six different umbrellas; the theoretical, the economic, the aesthetic, the social, the political, and the religious. These are the six ideal value types, although a combination of types could be considered as existing in a single personality. Much work has been done with this Study of Values, from Zusne (1965) who traces it from Spranger to oriental and religious antecedents to Whitely (1933) who found statistical reliability, to Bender (1958) who shows changes in value scores after fifteen years, to Dukes (1955) who finds that while the instruments measure individual differences, they tend to neglect the individual, to Arsenian (1943, 1970) who finds differences between college freshmen and college seniors, and then some changes and some stability in values after twenty-five years. He suggests that there are ongoing changes within the personality of each individual which cause their

patterns of values to change during their lifetimes.

It is seen that with this scale, the emphasis is placed upon a measure of personality and that the route chosen to delve into the personality is through his value system. Many questions can be asked at this point, for instance, do people go into medicine because they have a theoretical value system or do they develop a theoretical system because they are in medical school? Indeed, the whole area of trait theory in personality is one that is not nearly settled and much work is still being done within it. The major objection raised in this essay is that the Study of Values implicitly considers religion a value. With this I do not concur. I consider religion as above values, and indeed, as will be expounded at greater length later, the source of the most important values that are found in Western Civilization. This is stated in full recognition of the fact that Allport would have considered me as scoring very high on the religious dimension of his scale. Whether or not the other five dimensions on the scale are in fact values, is seriously doubted, but will not be discussed in this essay.

At the present, there is much being written about such

concepts as terminal values and instrumental values (Rokeach, 1968), which are two broader umbrellas under which values are lumped, and going in hierarchical form, attitudes are then found within them. More will be said about umbrella concepts and the work being done with them as this essay progresses. At the present, it becomes apparent that the psychologists who concern themselves with the entire area of values are in a state of flux and appear to be working toward something, but they do not seem to be sure exactly what it is that they are approaching. It is also not surprising that their concept of values changes and grows as greater amounts of work and thought are poured into the endeavor. It must also be realized that while many psychologists are at the point of recognizing the importance of values and that it is precisely value concepts that are responsible for attitude formation, confusion still remains, and the amount of work done on attitudes, outnumbers that on values by a six to one ratio (Rokeach, 1968). However, I believe it is a sign of growth and health that despite the current confusion over values, the work continues and psychologists seem willing to accept changes in their own notions about the subject.

There abound several different umbrella categories for values and several different definitions of values in the literature. It is my belief that despite the existential-humanistic approach taken by many of these psychologists, they still show signs of being bound to the positivistic approach and their definitions of values are in the reductionist model. In other words, many of them seem to be saying that a value is "nothing but" something or other. On the one hand, there is an implicit admission that values are a ubiquitous, all pervasive part of human life, and then there is the attempt to find a pigeonhole in which the concept of value can be placed and examined scientifically. It is at this point that I think the mistake is being made. It is almost like trying to define God, which according to Oden (1969) is the only true value. Such an attempt is doomed to failure as the history of religious thought proves very dramatically.

In an earlier section, I discussed the priest and prophet dichotomies and the differences in their functions. Campbell (1968) gives us a clue as to what may happen when priest becomes prophet or when the part of him that has been

living on earth may lose its importance to him. Thomas Aquinas might be thought of as the priest extraordinary of Roman Catholicism. Indeed, he did attempt to define God and used various terms in which to couch his definitions. He referred to God as "Being," and "The First Cause," as a "Personality," as "Immutable," etc. But Campbell reports, Aquinas, while saying Mass one morning in Naples, he had some sort of mystical experience. From that point on, he never wrote nor dictated anything more. He went on to confess to a friend, "Everything that I have written seems to me worthless in comparison with the things I have seen and which have been revealed to me (p. 579)." This type of experience and response to it can fit well with Maslow's (1968) warnings about peak experiences, in that the "peaker" becomes disenchanted with this world and lives only for his moments of rapture.

I also infer from the above account that having confronted the eternal, Aquinas, the giant intellectual that he was; came to believe that his former writings were wrong, or at the very least somewhat misleading. It is perhaps for this very reason that normative Judaism does not extol mysticism.

Indeed, there is a mystical heritage in Judaism (Scholem, 1954), but it was never in the mainstream of Jewish life. Moses was the only man to see God face to face and that happened only shortly before his death. Even more dramatic, perhaps, is the Jewish Law that God is not to be defined in positive terms. It is permitted to say what God is not, but it is not permitted to say what the Diety is. I have never found a satisfactory reason for this law, but I believe it was made because by its very nature, any definition imposes a limitation. The object defined must exist within the circumference of the definition which enfolds it. This is not true of a negative definition which imposes only a very small limitation on what is defined. Thus, if I were to say that God is Justice, then God is not injustice, nor is He love, or mercy, or kindness, ad infinitum. If I were to say that God is not injustice, He can be anything or everything else, with the exception of injustice. A positive definition, then, is saying that God is "nothing but" whatever term we may utilize. Some may agree that this bears the heavy weight of reductionism. Can it be that Judaism has been historically antireductionistic

in its philosophy? Possibly, this also has a bearing on why the Talmud relies so heavily on deductive reasoning.

All of this is not to infer that religion has not had a problem with values, but religion's problem with values has been of a different nature from the problems faced by science on the nature of values. Values, or sub-values have been an accepted part of the religious framework for thousands of years. Values have inhered in religion and religion would have been unthinkable without its value laden contents. Furthermore, the values of religion have been qualitatively different from the values of science. The value concepts of religion have been able to move men and mountains (Kadushin, 1952), which implies that the value concepts must be not only cognitive and sensible enough for man to accept, but must also contain great emotional affect. The history of the world and the history of religion bears ample proof that this has been the case. But religion's problem has been that of a stagnation of the means by which the viability of the values can be maintained. As will be discussed in this essay, the values of religion are perhaps only two in number, and that which we are accustomed to terming as values are merely the means of the paths

(Hallakhah, as mentioned previously) for protecting these basic values.

This situation in religion of religion's loss of the viable paths to its ends has existed for perhaps only little more than a century and has come about as a type of entrenching that all psychologists have seen or studied. It is fairly common phenomenon that when one is threatened, or better yet, in psychodynamic terms, when the ego is threatened, the human being will frequently entrench himself more firmly upon the ground on which he stands in order to ward off the threat. In the case of religion, the entrenching was in reaction to the threat of science which seemed to be negating everything that religion held sacred. Religion took the path that is so well described in When Prophecy Fails (Festinger, Riecken & Schachter, 1956), and held ever more strongly to practices and rituals which were becoming ever more meaningless for western society. That these rituals are now meaningless may be taken as a positive step in the history of mankind, as Campbell (1970) states, "Hence, not only the ritual arts and the development from them of the archaic civilizations, but also-and even more richly-the

later shattering of those arts by the modern arrows of man's flight beyond his own highest dreams, would perhaps best be interpreted psychologically, as a history of the super-normal sign stimuli that have released-to our own fright, joy, and amazement-the deepest secrets of our being (p. 44)." Thus, Campbell is stating that by way of ritual, men have confronted the deepest secrets of their own being. He also states that in ritual, which he consideres a type of play that, "In playing the game of the gods we take a step towards that reality-which is ultimately the reality of ourselves. (p. 25-26)." It is apparent that Campbell considers ritual as a vehicle for the human being to approach his ultimate project, that of becoming God. He also appears to be saying that as mankind does advance, and does become almost as gods, the rituals are no longer needed and are so discarded. What is also implied is that we did not recognize the purpose of the ritual and so we do not really understand why we are discarding it, except by saying that it no longer has any meaning to us.

In accepting Campbell's point of view, I would also have to come back to my initial consideration of those of

the more traditional types of religion insisting upon the maintenance of the rituals. Perhaps, it is with great priestly insight that they recognize that despite all of our advances, nuclear energy, flights to the moon, etc. we still remain in a value vacuum and are in need of ritual to give ultimate meaning to our lives. Unable to compete with science, the religious have insisted upon maintaining the old rituals. A glance at Orthodox Judaism would be very revealing in this context. It had been an alive, everchanging, open system, as witnessed by the lively and stimulating discussions of the "Responsa Literature," until the advent of Reform Judaism caused orthodoxy to choose to become a closed, locked in, system which almost meant its own demise. Current signs are that the pendulum seems to be swinging back in this area with additions being made to various rituals in an attempt to bring them more up to date in our world.

Despite these efforts in Judaism and also in Roman Catholicism, Maslow's (1964) observation that religious values have lost their hold over contemporary man and that he is left in a state of valuelessness must still be considered

as cogent and valid. For this reason, Maslow and others of the humanistic school of psychology perceive it as important for them to take a hand in replacing those values which are no longer effective and would add the lost dimension of meaning to the lives of people. Such would be the type of value that men would be willing to live and to die for. I see this as a possibility, and in fact, a responsibility for psychology, along with other disciplines to attempt that which in recent years, religion has not been able to do; provide a value framework for mankind. However, I would be inclined to go along with Spranger (1925), and instead of attempting to reduce religion and ritual to small fragments that may yield very clear pictures of each tiny fragment, take a more holistic approach and view religion as a quest for the central and total meaning of life and personality in its deeper relations with the world. The possibility exists that this can be accomplished, and indeed much time and effort is presently being expended upon it, but the problem remains that while we, in psychology, may be able to do that which religion alone cannot, we would also have to be willing to do that which religion was able to do so

easily; that is we must be able to decide what "values" are, and once that is decided, discover which values or value vehicles are capable of being at least partial solutions to the problems of western society.

We shall see that this in in no way a simple task. It is also freely stated at this point that I disagree with many who have been working on this problem, mainly in that I take a psycho-theological point of view, which is my own bias and the bias upon which this entire essay is based.

The first problem for us, as scientists, would be to find an appropriate definition for the term "values." Earlier, this problem was touched upon, but with no indication of all the complications inherent in such an endeavor. It is interesting to note that this problem did not phase religion, which in what was perhaps great wisdom, assumed that everyone knew what a value was, and considered its responsibility to communicate the values to the people. The underlying assumption seemed to be that once the value was communicated, all would understand the importance of it and would act upon that understanding. In science, at least under the spell of the positivistic approach beneath which

we have been laboring, such an approach would appear as too simplistic and would not be acceptable. It is therefore necessary for us first to define that which we may not even have, such as values, rather than get and give to the world that which it needs, no matter whether it is defined or even definable. Some definitions of values will be examined but the reader is cautioned that as Maslow (1966) said, the advancement of science starts with simple, exploratory beginnings and goes through stages to the controlled and pre-designed experiment as the highest step in the progression. I firmly believe that in the area of the value orientation of religion, we are in the simple, exploratory beginnings, and the theory to be outlined below will reflect that state of development.

Rogers (1964) draws upon some definitions and distinctions by Charles Morris (1956) concerning value.

> "Values is a term we employ in different ways. We use it to refer to the tendency of any living beings to show preference, in their actions for one kind of object or objective rather than another. This preferential behavior he calls 'operative values'...It is

simply the value of choice which is indicated behaviorally when the organism selects one object, rejects another.

"A second use of the term might be called conceived values. This is the preference of the individual for a symbolized object. Usually in such a preference there is anticipation or foresight of the outcome of behavior directed toward such a symbolized object. A choice such as 'Honesty is the best policy' is such a conceived value.

"A final use of the term might be called 'objective value.' People use the word in this way when they wish to speak of what is objectively preferable, whether or not it is in fact sensed or conceived of as desirable..."

Rogers states that his concern is with the first two of these three definitions. It is understandable why Rogers made this choice, but it also appears that the definitions presented above are infused with the relativistic quality that Maslow (1964) finds as the basis for present day western society's lack of values of a worthwhile nature. Rogers is

also not unaware of this contradiction to his own beliefs about valuelessness as he mentions in the first paragraph of the quoted essay.

Above is one definition of values. Others have stated different definitions. To Allport (1968), values are "simply meanings perceived as related to self (p. 164)."

Smith (1969) defines personal values "as general and hierarchically important attitudes, as components of a personal philosophy of life...In this framework of analysis, values are inherently supraordinate to the attitudes under study...(p. 101)."

Kluckhohn (1951) states, "A value is a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action (p. 395)."

Rokeach (1969) distinguishes between attitudes and values. An attitude is an "enduring organization of several beliefs focused on a specific object...predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner." Values, however, transcend attitudes. They have to do with "modes of conduct and the

end states of existence." It is to say one "has an enduring belief that a particular mode of conduct or that a particular end state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct and end states of existence (p.550)." He also speaks about terminal values and instrumental values which are the umbrellas under which fall those values which have to do with conduct and these which have to do with end states of existence.

Lowe (1959) has developed four broad categories or umbrellas under which the various values can be listed. They are naturalism, culturalism, humanism, and theism. Those people who come under one of these umbrellas would consider as good, that which applies to or enhances their particular umbrella.

For Frankl (1966), meaning would seem to be the greatest value. For Bugental (1965), it would seem to be freedom and choice.

It is certainly important and encouraging to be able to note that psychologists and other social scientists are taking a very serious second look at values and that there is a recognition that values are an indispensable quality in the

human being. However, it appears to me that we are getting bogged down again. We are not seeing the forest for the trees and our very understandable desire to remain within the framework of science may be playing havoc with our ability to contribute something so desperately needed in our civilization at this time. Rogers, Maslow, May, Frankl, and others seem to sense, as did Plato in his day, that we are playing for keeps. We are struggling not just for an intellectually appealing set of values that may grace the pages of a scientific journal. The struggle is for the life of western civilization and without that civilization becoming infused with values that can capture the spirits of all men, the struggle soon will be lost.

I believe that Rogers (1959) has hit the core of the value dilemma in his discussion of human development. He lists several points concerning the human infant. Two of those points are of major interest to us in this essay. The human infant:

> "5. engages in an organismic valuing process, valuing experience with reference to the actualizing tendency as a criterion. Experiences which are perceived as

maintaining or enhancing the organism are valued positively. Those which are perceived as negating such maintenance or enhancement are valued negatively.

"6. He behaves with adience toward positively valued experiences and avoidance toward those negatively valued (p. 222)."

The point that hits with such force and cogency in Rogers' statement is one that is so simple, it becomes almost embarrassing to state. The fact is that the value is life, or to term it a bit differently, the supraordinate value is life and those things which maintain or enhance life are the value-paths. Those things which do not maintain or enhance life are not value-paths and are to be eschewed. And when a value-path is so central to the human being, and it must be central because it means life, there is no room for compromise. Long definitions are not necessary. Experimental validation, while desirable, is not indispensable. Intellectural and philosophical arguments are not to the point. The question is one of life.

From this point of view, it is understandable to urge humanistic psychologists to disavow relativism and become

somewhat dogmatic. Of course, dogmatism is a term that scientists disapprove of, and rightly so, but when it is understood that the value is life and the value-paths lead to life, dogmatism does not appear to be so harsh a word, after all. And a value-path is dogmatic whether it leads to life itself, or to the only kind of meaningful life an individual could tolerate, or even if it leads to death, because death is preferable to an alternative type of life that the organism will not accept. The value-paths then become dogmatic. Martin Luther understood this when he exclaimed, "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise." Jesus understood this when he was willing to go to the cross for the sake of his beliefs. Rabbi Akiva understood this when he chose to die rather than desist from teaching the law he believed was the "Tree of Life."

There is no attempt here to operationally define values. I believe that in the spirit of the Old Testament, the one value is life for it is life which is derived from God. Paradoxically, death becomes a value that is unified with but separated from life. Earlier, there was a discussion concerning the possible meaning of God's name in the Old Testament in which we concluded that there was certainly a relationship between God's

name and existence. Of course, it is possible to say that the one value is really God, and from a theological point of view that is probably the belief that would prevail, but in trying to understand the mythology and the "Hallakhah" of the Old Testament, I would conclude that human life is the central value expressed. There are very few things for which a man may willingly give up his life, so while respecting the view that theology must conclude that God is the value, from what I call a psycho-theological point of view, I would change that emphasis to life being the one central value.

Again, it is emphasized that a value is not a scientific entity, nor is a value-path, yet without them, science becomes worthless, because without the value and the value-paths, life becomes worthless. In short, the value is that part of the universal law which is the essence of man himself, and being life it is part and parcel of the human being, so that if that value is threatened, choice is no longer an option for the person. His choice has already been made. He has chosen his own life with meaning. That is his value. He either lives with it or dies for it.

It is hoped that the concept presented here will be expanded. Cases have been cited in this very essay in which men gave up their lives for what I have chosen to call "value-paths" and utilized Rogers' definition as that which the organism perceives as life maintaining or life enhancing. Much empirical work can be done investigating the extent to which these value-paths are introjected and internalized in the human being. Do they become so much a part of the self, that the self cannot conceive of continuing its own existence without them? Must they be given authority? Can they be discovered? Can they be invented? In scanning Rokeach's (1968) value scale, it impresses me that I would not be willing to give up my life for even those that fall under the rubric of "terminal values." Can it be said that what I term value-paths are more basic to the human being and to the value of life? These are only a few of the questions that can be asked about values and value-paths as I glean them from the Old Testament. I believe these are important questions that must be asked and it is one of the purposes of this essay to raise questions. Hopefully, it will raise more questions than it answers.

It may be stated that values or value-paths are not logically ordered because they do not result from cold logic. This will become more clearly stated when some of the myths of the Old Testament are examined. On the contrary, they are alive, dynamic concepts that can and do actually function in the varied day to day experiences of human life. That this is being recognized is shown very dramatically in all the work that is presently being undertaken in the field of values. The very fact that the concept itself is so difficult to define also lends support to the notion that value-paths are alive and are very much functional. They are at work even in the face of cold scientific fact. Most behavioral scientists hold the genetic equality of all human beings as what they would consider one of their higher values. Actually, from my point of view, this would be more an attitude. But let us take note of the furor caused by Jensen (1969) for even suggesting that this may not be true. I would also suggest that even if Jensen were proved correct, it would do little to alter that attitude, at least for the present and possibly for many years to come. Thus, if I am correct, that the one value of life is at the top of the hierarchy,

then come the value-paths and finally attitudes, and we find that changing an attitude, as the literature bears out, is no simple task, then it is with a sense of awe and reverence that we even approach the subject of value-paths and value.

Value-paths are then, finally, far from simplistic, but they are common and familiar. They are in the domain of the folk and influence the interior as well as the life of social relations (Kadushin, 1952). Kadushin uses the term "value concepts," but I believe that value-paths has more of a dynamic quality and gives the feeling of movement and action which is in the final analysis what they are all about. An example of a value path, as I see it can be given from an incident which occurred with my grandfather some years ago. On the Sabbath, Orthodox Jews are not permitted to do many types of work. Included in one category of work is starting an electrical motor. My grandfather lived on the fourth floor of an apartment building and would walk the four flights of stairs when going to and returning from the synagogue on the Sabbath. In his later years, he suffered a stroke which made walking difficult for him and walking stairs, impossible. When I found out he was no longer

attending services on the Sabbath, I told him that he is permitted to do so. He promptly answered that I was no authority on Judaism. Since I recognized my status as his grandson, I accepted that and the following conversation ensued:

"Have you ever heard of Rabbi X?" (a world renowned scholar of my acquaintance).

"Yes."

"Do you think he is an authority on Judaism?"

"Yes."

"Would you like his opinion on whether or not you may take the elevator on the Sabbath?"

"It would be a great honor for me to hear from a rabbi like him."

At this I was becoming a bit suspicious because my grandfather was generally quite direct.

"If he told you that you could take the elevator on the Sabbath, would you?"

"No, of course not."

The value-path of observing every ritual of the Sabbath (active) was so much a part of my grandfather, that nothing

could shake him from that path. Such is the force of the value path and such is its influence. It has the quality about it that once a word symbolizing a value-path is uttered, and they are often embedded in a single word, the person becomes aware of the objective situation as it is, while at the very same time, he undergoes a very subjective experience. In the case of my grandfather, I am sure that the value-path word was Sabbath. The imagery that came to his mind was that of the creation of the world, his home town in Poland on Friday evening, a great rabbi making a decision that could be taken as binding, his father donning a white robe for the Sabbath meal, his standing at the Torah in the synagogue, his praying at his accustomed place, his riding on the Sabbath for the first time in his life. He did not have to think about making a choice. His choice was made. There was no conflict. He had chosen a value-path and he knew it was right. There was no force in the world that would make him change it except if his life were in danger, for there is another value-path that takes precedence in such a case. I believe that is so because it is closer to the one value, life.

The point that is being made here is that one cannot become too "heady" about the concept of values. I believe that basically that is what is holding up significant results in the work on values cited above. It is being treated as too intellectual a matter. The subject of values impresses me as very much the same as was once said about religion, "It is danced out, not thought out." I believe that is true about religion, or what Allport (1968) calls "intrinsic religion." Evidence of this can be found in the sterility of the liberal, intellectual Jewish and Christian sects. A value-path is felt, not conceived. It should now be clear why humanistic psychology is literally struggling with the concept of values. It should also be clear why society at large finds itself in a "value vacuum," no longer trusting its feelings and looking to the scientific community to provide a direction which is not forthcoming.

Relativity, logical positivism, and intellectuality such as insisting upon operational definitions and tests of significance relegate feelings and folk wisdom to second class citizenship. Folk wisdom, mythology, and rituals of the Old Testament which are all infused with feelings are the subject matter that is going to be of concern to us at this point.

Chapter V

VALUE-PATHS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

This study is mainly concerned with the value-paths as found in the Old Testament mythology, rituals, and laws. In it, the attempt will be made to enter the psychology of religion through the vehicle of the value-paths. It was established earlier that a valid way of studying the psychology of religion is through the documents of religion and the most widely accepted document of religion in Western civilization is the Old Testament. It is deemed sacred literature by both the Jewish and the Christian communities. Indeed, the basic religious structure of Western civilization is often referred to as the Judeo-Christian heritage and the documents accepted by both groups, albeit in different ways, is the Old Testament. To the Jews, it is the Scriptures containing the way a man should live, and to the Christians, it is the basis of the word fulfilled by the New Testament; but not yet completely fulfilled until the time of the Second Coming of Christ.

It is necessary to emphasize that much of the mythology

of the Old Testament stems from more ancient Egyptian and Mesopatamian sources, and that in turn, some of the mythology is softened in the New Testament and reinterpreted in later Rabbinic literature. There then exists a tendency to consider the teachings of the New Testament as different from those of the Old, and for some scholars to consider Rabbinic or Talmudic Judaism as differing from Old Testament teachings. I believe this is a mistake simply because those scholars are not entering those works by the vehicle of value-paths. While still a student at a rabbinical seminary, I served as a weekend rabbi to a small congregation. One of my congregants once asked me a question which involved an apparent contradiction between the Bible and Talmud. As I had no answer for him, I asked my Talmud professor. His response is marked indelibly upon my mind. "Did you tell him," he said, "that it is no longer his Bible? It is not even your Bible or my Bible any longer. Tell him that." I am quoting a man who was a great scholar and whose words I echoed for many years. No wonder the Talmud issues the warning to scholars to beware of their words lest they lead their students to poisoned waters which they drink of, and die. Today, I

could show how the underlying value of both the Biblical myth and the Talmudic law was the same, the value of life, and in that case even the value-paths underlying them were very similar, although on the surface, apparently contradictory.

It is the point of view expressed here, that despite the fact that life is the ultimate value, upon analysis as our existentialists showed, it is absurd. But, as was stated before, the value is felt, not conceived. In this sense, there is an apparent conflict here. On the one hand, we feel that life is the supreme value, but if we take the time to think about it and analyze it, it is absurd. I believe that the mythology of the Old Testament recognized this conflict and from the very beginning attempts to deal with it.

The very first myth of the Bible is the Creation myth. In it there is an immediate postulation of God. And indeed, there had to be a God, for as Sartre pointed out, man's project is to become God. The Old Testament, then, very much like the existentialists, makes no attempt to find a proof for the existence of God. There He is. He just appears and gets right to work on His project, making some sense out of the chaos that exists. Sartre (1969) advises man to attempt to

find some meaning in an absurd universe. Apparently, at the very beginning of Genesis, this is the project that God, Himself sets out as His task. So, right at the start, man is given a purpose. He has a meaning. He has something to do. This is the first value-path of the Old Testament. The old arguments concerning the chronology of creation and the accuracy of the Biblical account, and Darwin versus religion, all pale before the importance of the value-path. There is a meaning in existence!

The next myth and its underlying value and value-path to be considered is in the third chapter of Genesis. Again, I will ask the reader's pardon for my own translation. I believe it is more in keeping with the spirit of the myth and the feeling of the language, and I enjoy the advantage of not having to make the translation beautiful, which was a problem other translators were forced to labor under.

> "And the serpent was the most cunning of all the beasts of the field which the Lord, God made; and he said to the woman, 'Did God really say you are not to eat from any tree of the garden?' And the woman said to the serpent, 'Of the fruit of the garden trees we may eat.

> But the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden, God said you may not eat of it and you may not touch it, lest you will die.' And the serpent said to the woman, 'You won't die. Because God knows that on the day that you both eat of it, your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.' (Genesis III:1-5)"

Of course, both Adam and Eve ate of the tree in the middle of the garden and they knew good and evil, and God caught them and punished them by sending them out of the garden, but not before He had this to say, "Now the man has become one of us, knowing good and evil, and now lest he reaches out and takes also from the tree of life and he eats and lives forever (Genesis III:22)." The tree of life received only cursory mention earlier in the myth. It seemed to have little or no importance, and God did not command Adam and Eve not to eat of it as He did with the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But suddenly we find that the tree of life takes on great significance. From this point of view of the mythology presented here, the importance given the tree of life is a psychological necessity. Man had achieved the knowledge of good and evil.

He was now a reasoning being. He could now ask the question, "What am I doing here? Where did I come from? Where am I going?" His answer would be "the whole thing is absurd." He would conclude as did Ecclesiastes that "All is vanity." But all would not be vanity if there were something to look forward to; if there were a very desirable end. In fact, if man were not really like God as the serpent said, but had to go another step to get there, a project for man would exist. That step is immortality. It is life as symbolized by the tree of life. Man did not complete his project of becoming God, and indeed, he cannot complete it, as the myth makes clear, for if he does, there is no future, there is no "why" to live, and if that happens, there cannot be a how (Frankl, 1963).

I have begun this chapter on the value-paths in the Old Testament by examining some of the earliest myths found in the Bible simply because they are the earliest myths found in the Bible. This was done although I was fully aware that by beginning with chronology, I would not be adding clarity. There is a rabbinical dictum which can be translated as "there is no former and no latter in the Bible." Some say that this

particular dictum was uttered because the rabbis began doubting the true historicity in the Bible. I have never agreed with that point of view because the rabbis of the Talmud were in the often perplexing habit of stating great wisdom in very few words and I find great wisdom in that utterance. What the rabbis were telling us is that the Bible is in fact, not a history book. Indeed much of the Old Testament speaks about the history of the Israelites and others, but the history is largely myth, and as was stated before, myth has something to teach us that may be far more important than history. History is to be taken literally. Myth is to be understood by the values and value-paths incorporated in it. Because so many people, even scholars, have held the opinion that the Bible is largely history, the belief is widely held that Judaism forever has its eye on the past. Nothing can be further from the truth. Judaism is in essence a present and future oriented religion. This, too, is a value-path which is found in the Old Testament.

In the twenty-ninth chapter of Deuteronomy is enumerated all those who are standing before the Lord in such detail that it is apparent that what is meant is that the entire people

were assembled. Yet, it is written that this covenant is written "with him who is here with us today before the Lord, our God, and with him who is not with us today (Deuteronomy XXIX:14)." The force of these words can only mean that future generations are to be included in the covenant, and so the eye is to the future. Rashi comments very succinctly, "And even with generations that are to be in the future." Thus, the interpretation of the myth advanced here is that what we are doing is not for the sake of the past but for the sake of the present and the future. This is a value-path in the Old Testament that we labor for the present with our eye in the future. We do not look backward. Perls would say that the Old Testament is telling us that rehearsal is better than leaving unfinished business (Perls, 1951). Buhler (1968) and May (1969) would probably speak more positively about it and label it "intentionality." Bonner (1965) might be willing to compare it to his concept of "proactive man."

The important question for this moment is why have I decided not to accept the value concepts of Rokeach or Lowe or Allport and utilized their umbrellas for values in this

study? The answer to that question is that I do agree with Rokeach (1968) that there are very few values; Rogers' developmental view of the infant placing positive value on that which perceives as life maintaining and life enhancing is eminently sensible, and what I get out of the Old Testament is that the primary value is on life. These three reasons seem to have a natural goodness of fit and I can approach the psychology of religion from what I find there and use religion's own material in studying it.

It now seems essential that I substantiate my point that the basic or one of the two basic values of the Old Testament is that of life. One piece of evidence was examined earlier when it was mentioned that a later editor of Ecclesiastes felt that he had to end the book on a positive note and added a few lines which would prove that there is a value to life. Another piece of evidence is found in one of the most touching and dramatic sections of the Old Testament. It is in Moses' farewell address to the people of Israel and is extremely emotion filled and beautiful. Moses says (Deuteronomy XXX:19) "I cause the universe today to witness for you, life and death have I put before you--the blessing and the curse, and choose

life so that you and your children shall live." I write these words with great frustration because I realize that I have not caught the pathos of the original. It is little comfort to me that no other translation I have seen has caught it, and yet, here in that one sentence is the one value of the Old Testament. Hillel will forgive me for saying that all the rest is commentary. To help the reader understand the beauty, the pleading and the wonder of the statement I will translate two of the medieval commentators on that sentence. Rashi says, "I advise you as a parent to choose the portion of life, as a man might say to his son, 'Choose for yourself the finest part of my heritage...'." Ibn Ezra comments, "These are the blessing and the curse and it is within your power to choose life: so that you shall live either in body or in memory; and the meaning is that life is to love."

The value, then, is life. Ibn Ezra seems to anticipate all of our existentialists and humanists in psychology, and although he is not Biblical, he gives a very Biblical value-path, that of love. Buhler (1967) would heartily agree with Ibn Ezra as she considers the love relationship as one of the

most essential, if not the most essential of the life goals of the maturing individual.

One further piece of evidence I shall bring for my assumption that the one value in the Old Testament is the value of life is also taken from Deuteronomy, but it is not just a part of Deuteronomy. It is the words with which every Jewish child is taught to arise in the morning and go to bed at night. These words have become known as the watchword of Israel. If my interpretation is somewhat unorthodox, it is not because I value the words less, but because I value them all the more. In Deuteronomy (VI:4) is the phrase usually translated, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is One." My translation would be, "Hear, O Israel, He that shall be is our God, He that shall be one." Again, I am relying upon the grammatical form of the Tetragrammaton and translating it as the future form of "being." Rashi alludes to something along those lines in his interpretation, part of which is "He, who in the future shall be One Lord." Once more I allude to a God of Being and cannot help but believe that the Hebrew meant just that; a very sophisticated people with a very sophisticated God. But what precedes and what

follows this most important sentence in the Old Testament is also of the utmost importance. It is preceded by an anticipation of some very important commandments to come, and commandments which should be obeyed very dutifully. And why should they be obeyed, "In order that your days shall be lengthened." In the prayer book (Hertz, 1961), as these commandments are read, some chapters are skipped and we come to Deuteronomy XI, in which it is stated that if all these commandments are kept, the result will be "that your days and the days of your children will be lengthened."

Such is the theme that runs throughout the Old Testament. There are value-paths, things which are good for the individual to do, and they are good because God has said that they are good. But even God, or the word of God which most theologians would agree, is reason enough to obey these commandments, for God to them is the value, does not seem to be enough. God as the supreme value does not appear to be borne out by the evidence itself which is presented in the Old Testament. Universally, the one value upon which everything hinges is the prolongation of life. Life, itself, is the value that is of the utmost importance to men; and Rogers' statement that

that which is life maintaining or life enhancing is valued by the infant, grows stronger and stronger in its impact.

This is not to imply that the theologians do not have a point. They certainly do, and as one who was trained in theology, I am going to take the liberty of making their point for them. But before I do, I will caution that my own bias is that the theologian, like the psychologist has become too specialized an individual. He sees the evidence only from a vantage point of his own specialized training. It is for that reason that van Kaam (1969) makes a plea for more interaction and cooperation between and among the various disciplines. The theologian would say that certainly God is the basic value in the Old Testament and he would bring forth proof from the book of Genesis. After all, was not God the Creator of the Universe, and if you want to say that life is the supreme value, was not God alive before there was any other life? Was it not God who breathed into Adam the spirit of life and made of him a living soul? And if we look at the book of Psalms, from which both Judaism and Christianity have been receiving solace and comfort for so many centuries, to whom are the psalms

addressed? They are addressed to God and not to life. The theologians might well continue and say to me, "You are confusing your values. You are making a god out of life which is not enduring and relegating God who is eternal to a secondary place."

These are all good questions and I believe it is my responsibility to answer them. The theologian is no fool and especially not the one I have conjured up, for I have put the questions in his mouth. My answer to some of the questions would necessarily be long ones. I would have to begin by reiterating that the theologian is missing the point of the myth. God certainly plays a central role in the Old Testament and it would not be my wish to take Him out of it or in any way attempt to diminish His stature. But He is a God of life or better, a God of existence. Here, we are going to have to go back to the creation myth and discuss the various elements in it and the role of God within it, and instead of taking the myth literally, which would be destroying it (Campbell, 1970), we will try to understand the value and the value-paths couched in the myth in a psycho-theological framework.

Since our hypothetical theologian began at the point of myth, it is logical to present some of the mythology of the Old Testament in some detail and show how it can be approached through a value and value-path orientation. It will also be remembered that the points at which existentialism, humanistic psychology and religion converged were at "life-death, unification of the universe and individual, and values." It is these three points which will be of major interest in this essay. Although myth has been dealt with to some extent and will be dealt with further, the other two main headings in the Old Testament that will be explored from the point of view of a value orientation will be law and ritual.

The myth our theologian began with is the Creation myth of Genesis and the point that he made was that in that myth God was the creator and must therefore be given the place of the supreme value. Without wishing to make a complete study of the creation myth, let it suffice to say that it originates much further in antiquity from other Mesopatamian sources, and that the myth is full of other gods and godesses. It will be remembered that in the beginning there was darkness over the face of the "deep." The word "deep," in the Hebrew,

T'hom is most likely the ancient goddess T'himat, found in other mythologies. The myth continues that "the Spirit of God was hovering over the face of the waters." In the Hebrew, the word "spirit" also has the meaning of wind. It is probable that the proper translation of the text is, "A wind of God was hovering over the face of the waters." Now, in ancient mythology, the wind and the water are very important in creation (Campbell, 1970). The wind is masculine and the water feminine, and through sexual intercourse of these two does some creation come about. The Old Testament myth was not born in a vacuum. People knew and believed the more ancient mythology. What the Old Testament myth accomplished was to take away the godlike powers of T'himat, the wind and the water. The wind was "of God." It was no longer independent. The force of the creation myth of the Old Testament is to establish one invisible God, a very sophisticated and very sound concept psychologically. The myth brought a unity into the world by introducing the concept of one God as the Creator. I would conjecture that some ancient seer or seers had the type of mystical or peak experience Maslow speaks of and did see the world as a unity. They could no longer accept the older mythologies. Since they

were no longer alienated from the universe, the concept of unity and non-alienation had to be given to the people. The vehicle of the myth was utilized to great effect. A way was given to the masses (perhaps put into form by priests) to glimpse the world as unified, as it had to be since it was the work of one creator. So, in this sense, the value is life and the value-path is perceiving the universe as a unity, since that is also the antidote to death as was stated by the existentialists and many of the humanistic psychologists cited above.

The second objection of the theologian is in reality a substantiation of the premise presented in this essay. The theologian argued that it was God who gave life to the man and that is exactly what is reported in the myth (Genesis II:7). "The Lord God formed man from the dust of the earth and He blew into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Unfortunately, we again lose much in the translation that is of important significance to our approach to the religious literature. The Hebrew word for man is "adam," which is why his name became Adam. The Hebrew word for earth or soil is "adamah." It is not difficult to see that the word

"man" (adam) was derived from the word "earth" (adamah), which forcibly brings home the point that man is united with the earth, because that is from where he came. Rashi goes so far as to say that when God made Adam, He used dust from the four corners of the earth, so implying that man is united with every part of the earth. But the myth continues that man is not "nothing but" soil or material. God blew into his nostrils the breath of life and then man became truly alive. The interpretation here is that man is not truly alive, not truly aware, not truly at one with the universe unless he realizes that he is both material and spiritual. He is body and mind and feeling. Once more, the myth is concerned with life as the value and the value-path of the myth is one which many psychologists are presently concerned with in their clinical work; that of helping the individual reintegrate all the parts of himself and recognize that he is made up of body, mind, and emotions and not deny any of them. It is recognized that in denying any one of these, there ensues a type of death, which most would consider a symbolic death of that particular part of the personality, but some would say (Bakan, 1966) could result in actual physical

death of the organism.

The last myth that will be examined in this essay is the myth of Cain and Abel. Of course, it is well known that this myth has received many interpretations from those who wish to see it from a psychoanalytical point of view. The myth is concerned with fratricide, sibling rivalry, guilt, and many other factors which fit so well with psycholanalytic theory. The same type of interpretation can be placed upon the myths concerning Isaac and Esau, Joseph and his brothers, Solomon and Absalom, and many more that the Old Testament recounts. In fact, I see this as one of the beauties of mythology. It is eternal because embedded in the myth is such a wide range of human experience and human feeling, that a myth cannot grow old. It has something to say to all people of all generations.

Needless to say, that while fully cognizant of the other interpretations that can be and have been applied to the story of Cain and Abel, that the explanation offered in this essay is somewhat different. First, let us review this well-known story. Cain and Abel, the children of Adam and Eve had both brought sacrifices to God. Cain, who was a farmer, an offering

of fruit; Abel, who was a shepherd, an offering of the choicest firstlings of his flock. The story continues that God accepted Abel's offering but rejected that of Cain. The medieval commentators say that it was because Abel's offering was from his "choicest" product and Cain's was not. Be that as it may, when the two brothers were in the field, Cain slew his brother and this deed became known to God. Cain's punishment is that he may no longer till the soil, but must become a wanderer forever on the face of the earth.

Cain then exclaims, "My punishment is too much to bear. Since You have now banished me from the soil, and I must avoid Your presence and become a restless wanderer on earth--anybody who meets me could kill me." The rest of the story is that God made it certain that no one would kill Cain, and Cain left and settled in Nod and founded a city.

What this myth is saying is that life must not be violated. Life is the value and even God, who could have punished Cain with death did not. But Cain saw the punishment as death. He would be alienated from the soil. His value-

path to life was to be taken from him. Without that value-path, without that meaning for life, Cain saw himself as good as dead. But the myth goes on. The psychoanalysts would say that Cain sublimated his aggresive impulses and built a city. The opinion expressed here is that Cain was able to continue living, the value life was to be realized again because Cain learned a new value-path. He could become alienated from the soil in that he was no longer a farmer, but he was not completely alienated because he found a new meaning to give to his life. He built a city. In this myth, we have an example of how the Old Testament value, life, can be achieved through diverse value paths. The value paths give us the "why" to live, and to quote Frankl (1966), "Where there is a why, a how can always be found."

As can be seen, I am not placing the value of life above God. I am also not explaining God away by defining Him as a value or as anything else. I would not object to one who wishes to say that God is the value, and I would happily listen to his ideas and perhaps, eventually concur with him. The door is open. I would not object to one who

perceives God as a value-path that helps give meaning to his life. I would go along with the saying in the Book of Proverbs, "In all your ways, you shall know Him." Notice, it does not give a single way, nor does it say, in all His ways you shall know Him. Each man has his own understanding of God and knows God in his own unique manner. It is just this that makes God infinite and encourages me from trying to define Him. I am not begging the question and I would welcome the opportunity to study the experiences of those who have experienced God, but I, personally, have not had any such experience and so I limit myself to the simple belief that God is there.

The next classification of categories in the Old Testament that shows a goodness of fit into the value orientation presented here, is that of "Law." It would be wise to examine a law or commandment first that is familiar to everybody.

The first law to be dealt with is found in Leviticus XIX:18. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This commandment is undoubtedly an easy one to fit into our value orientation, but it was chosen because of its familiarity and general acceptance, which would lend support to this theory, and also because it was the cause of a great deal of concern to Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, and one of the psy-

chologists dealt with earlier in this essay. In Civilization and its Discontents (Freud, 1961), he complained that civilization was not only rightly controlling sexuality, but it had gone too far in becoming actually antagonistic toward it. He places the blame for this antagonism on Christianity. "The clue may be supplied by...'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.' It is known throughout the world and is undoubtedly older than Christianity, which puts it forward as its proudest claim (Vol. XXI, p. 109)." Freud then inveighs against the commandment and concludes, "What is the point of a precept ...if its fulfillment cannot be recommended as reasonable (Vol. XXI, p. 113)?" He finally makes the point that man is aggressive. He also says that a commandment he opposes even more strongly is the one to "love thine enemies."

Freud here states that the first commandment is doubtlessly older than Christianity. There can be no question of that, since although it appears in Romans 13:9, it also appears in the Old Testament, Leviticus 19:18. One must wonder whether Freud knew that the commandment appeared in the Old Testament. My conjecture is that he did, because

he did write that it is "doubtless," which is a strong word, that the commandment is older than Christianity. He never stated that "Love thine enemies (Luke VI:35)" is older than Christianity. If Freud did know the origin of the commandment to "love your neighbor as yourself" there can be several reasons why he did not mention it. One reason is that despite all his disclaimers, Freud was very much a Jew all of his life and identified strongly as a Jew (Jones, 1953). He may have been disappointed that this commandment which was so diametrically opposed to his way of thinking could be found in the Old Testament, which is sacred to the Jews. Therefore, he may have been more comfortable placing the "blame" on Christianity, for it was Christianity which actually advertised the commandment. The other reason, and perhaps the more likely one, is that Freud also knew what the commandment actually means in Jewish teachings. The commentary of Nahmanides* notes the dative case used in this verse and, therefore, explains that love itself is not commanded, but

---

*Rabbi Moses (the son of) Nahman, Talmudist and Biblical commentator. Born in Gerona, Spain, 1195; died in Acre, Palestine about 1270.

only actions consistent with love. A good modern, yet traditional interpretation is found in Buber (1957), "I must act lovingly toward...my companion (usually translated as 'neighbor')...I must treat him with love as one who is 'like unto me.' This translation of the commandment would run, 'Thou shalt act lovingly toward your neighbor who is like yourself (p. 57)."

Freud either knew that this is the meaning of the commandment as handed down in Jewish teachings or he may have grasped the meaning intuitively. He says (Freud, 1961) "If I love someone, he must deserve it in some way...He deserves it if he is so like me in important ways that I can love myself in him (Vol. XXI, p. 109)." Freud is saying exactly what the present value orientation toward religion has to say about the law.

The value-path is recognizing that your neighbor or your companion is very much like you, with good qualities and with faults. He should, therefore be treated in a loving way which would make for a relationship. The value-path is toward a relationship. The relationship brings us to the value which is life as has been pointed out so frequently in this essay.

The next law to be examined is this essay is in reality an entire group of laws which are known as the dietary laws. These laws were chosen to serve as an example of the value orientation in the psychology of religion, also because they are familiar. Almost everybody knows that Jews are not supposed to eat pork. But they were also chosen because they are difficult. They are difficult not only to understand rationally, but they present some difficulties in their applicability to our model.

In the Old Testament, there exists a list of living things which may or may not be eaten. The list takes the entire eleventh chapter of Leviticus. The chapter begins, "And the Lord spoke unto Moses and to Aaron, saying unto them, 'Speak to the children of Israel saying, these are the living things which you may eat among the beasts on the earth. Whatever has a parted hoof and is wholly cloven footed, and chews the cud, among the beasts that you may eat (Leviticus XI:1-3).'" There follows an entire list of clean and unclean animals, or permitted and forbidden animals for food. Among the forbidden animals are the camel, the rock-badger, the hare and the swine. Among the unclean

water animals are any that do not have both scales and fins. This includes all of the so-called sea food, which is mainly shell fish. Among the forbidden fowls are the great vulture, the bearded vulture, the kite, the falcon, the ostrich, the owl, the pelican, the stork, and the bat. Winged insects are forbidden, but grasshoppers, locusts and crickets are permissable foods. The list goes on, but it is not important to belabor the point here.

The problem that exists for us is why are some things permitted for food while others are not. The most commonly heard answer to this question is that the Old Testament had forbidden animals which were known to be disease carriers. The most common example of this is the swine or the pig because it is a carrier of trichinosis. Perhaps health reasons were a factor, but it does not seem to be the complete story. I cannot think of a filthier animal than the chicken, which is permitted, and I do not know if there is any sea creature that bears more parasites than the carp which is also permitted. As far as grasshoppers and crickets go, I have no information, but I also have no uncrotrollable urges to sample them.

I am of the opinion that the true hint to the meaning of these very confusing laws is in the last three verses of this chapter which will be quoted in full.

> "For I am the Lord Who brought you up out of the land of Egypt to be your God; you shall therefore be holy for I am holy. This is the law of the beast and of the fowl and of every living creature that moves in the waters and every living creature that swarms on the earth, to make a difference between the unclean and the clean, and the living thing that may be eaten and the living thing that may not be eaten (Leviticus XI:45-47)."

The hint here is the phrase that "you shall therefore be holy." Earlier, the force of the Hebrew term "holy" was explained as "something apart, that which exists in the mundane but gives the mundane its link with God, who is the embodiment of holiness." It was also explained that one of the basic functions of Judaism was to remind man that even his most physical acts could be elevated to the holy. We know too, that according to our interpretation of Old Testament Mythology, man had a project to become God by means of immortality, which Bonner (1965) claims helps man toward a future

orientation, which he, as Frankl (1966) sees as very desirable. It is not difficult to see that immortality is life, and as God is different from man in that He is immortal, and our project is to become God, then we too, have to become "holy" as God is "holy." The value then is life, and in these laws, the value-path would be in the foods that we eat which bring us closer to He Who Is Eternal.

Another interpretation that seems sensible is that if indeed there are several ways of defining ourselves or affirming ourselves, which is tantamount to proclaiming ourselves alive, and one of those ways, and the most positive way is affirmation by difference (L'Abate, 1972), then by adopting different eating habits from surrounding peoples, would be one way of affirming that we are alive. Again, if as some say, the dietary laws serve the purpose of identification (Hertz, 1962), then it is apparent that the value inherent in these laws is the value of life. The value-path is being different of self-definition by difference and the sub-value-path is the eating habits of the people.

One further introjection at this point is that it may have been noticed (as it was by me) that this chapter of

Leviticus begins with the words, "And the Lord spoke to Moses and to Aaron." If we would recall the prophet-priest dichotomy elaborated earlier in this essay, these words may take on added meaning for us. This chapter is speaking of a group of laws and rituals, the job that was allocated to the priest. The vision is only alluded to at the end. It is of interest that Aaron (the first High Priest of Israel) is included in these instructions. Moses is considered the greatest prophet of Israel and usually God spoke to Moses alone in the Old Testament. An interesting study could be made as to how often God spoke to both prophet and priest in the Old Testament and in what context. It is conceivable that such a study may lend support to the prophet versus priest hypothesis that is being proposed.

The last one of the laws of the Old Testament to be considered at this time is chosen for very different reasons from the others. This law, which is in reality two laws, but will be coupled together, is unfamiliar to most people, today. It is also strange and makes no apparent sense. However, if the model of studying the psychology of religion that is being proposed here is to have any usefulness, we should be able to see some meaning to the law, outdated,

confusing, and culture bound as it may be. The law is found in Deuteronomy, Chapter XXII:9 and 11. "You shall not sow your vineyard with diverse types of seed, lest the plenty of the seed which you have sown be sanctified together with the increase of the vineyard." "You shall not wear mixed things, linen and wool together." It must be remembered here that we are dealing with laws that were given to an ancient and agricultural society. In order to understand them fully, it is necessary to become anthropological psychologists (van Kaam, 1969). In that way, it is relatively easy to explain the second of the laws regarding mixing wool and linen. It is well known that throughout the ages there has been enmity between farmers and cattlemen or shepherds. They have fought over rights to land and over the cattle and sheep grazing and destroying the farmers' crops. From that point of view, it can be said that this law reflected the enmity between the members of the two occupational groups. But in explaining the law in that way, we are not only explaining it away, we are also neglecting a difficulty in the first law quoted which bears a definite relationship to the second (Hertz, 1962). The

usual translation of the first law is that instead of the word "sanctified" which I used, the word "forfeited" is utilized. However, I used the word "sanctified" because the meaning of the Hebrew word in that passage is "shall be made holy."

Hertz (1962), in his translation is following the interpretation of Rashi, who says that the word has the force of meaning "to be lost." By taking these two laws together, the conclusion would be reached that by mixing diverse things such as seeds or linen with wool, they will be lost, or the effort will fail, which is in some way connected to the idea of holiness.

Earlier, I noted that the force of the word "holy" in Judaism is raising the mundane to a closer relationship with the source of holiness, which is God. Hertz gives another clue to the meaning of these verses when he asserts that there are distinctions made in the natural world which man should not try to obliterate by processes of intermixing. I think that Hertz is partly correct in his assertion, that there are things that cannot be mixed or they become holy, that is, they begin to exist only on a "peak experience" type

of level. Both feet are in heaven and they are no longer a part of the earth. I would reinterpret the verses to mean that you cannot make a rose out of a lily, and not take them literally at all. Another way of saying this is that we should not try to make of something what it is not, and the warning is not that we may make it into something bad, but that we may make it into something too good, so that it becomes holy (unified with God), and we lose it completely ourselves.

The law also can have to do with ourselves, in trying to make of ourselves that which we are not, and in so doing, lose ourselves. This, again, is Maslow's warning concerning becoming too desirous of "peak experiences" that we lose interest in all the other facets of life. The value underlying the law is life and living. The value-path that the law prescribes is to live by not trying to make things perfect, because they may possess a type of perfection in their own right, and it would be better for us to examine the thing, itself, and find and appreciate the perfection that is already there, than to try to change it, and by changing, lose it.

If the present interpretation of these last two laws is

a good one; in fact, if the interpretation presented concerning all of these laws is good, then we have a choice to make. We can either accept the value-path or reject it as not being applicable or meaningful today. But the point of this essay is not to try to influence people to accept Old Testament value-paths, but to find a way of understanding their own religious teachings and then make the decision as to the acceptance or rejection of particular value-paths. Most important, it is to become more aware that there are value-paths that may speak to us today.

The third classification of categories in the Old Testament is that which I have considered to be Ritual. In my interpretation of the Old Testament, I see the clearest way of dividing its components as into the categories of myth, law, and ritual. Ritual is the most difficult of the three which which to deal because it is very often a mixture of many factors. For instance, there is a myth about the circumcision of Moses' son in the Bible. Yet, circumcision in Judaism is also a law and a ritual. Indeed, if a man is to be converted to Judaism, even if he were already circumcized, he must go through a ritual circumcision in conformance with

Jewish law. Despite the fact that ritual is often a combination of myth and law, I feel it must be considered as having a life of its own and be analyzed on its own for it is ritual which often gives life to the law, and it is from the ritual that the myth often grows.

An example of a ritual laden portion of the Old Testament is that which is concerned with the Festival of Passover. Several verses from the twelfth chapter of Exodus are quoted in their entirety. The reader will certainly notice the mixture of law, myth, and ritual in the Biblical rendition.

> "And this day shall be a memorial to you, and you shall celebrate it as a feast unto the Lord throughout your generations, as an eternal ordinance shall you celebrate it. Seven days you will eat unleavened bread, certainly the first day you shall put away leaven from your houses and anyone who eats leavened bread, that soul shall be cut off from Israel from the first day to the seventh day. On the first day there shall be a holy convocation and on the seventh day there shall be a holy convocation for you, all manner of work you shall not do on those days except that which is necessary

so that every man may eat. That may be done by you. And you shall observe this day throughout your generations as an eternal rule. (Exodus XII:14-17)."

Several verses earlier, the ritual of the slaughtering of the paschal lamb was explained, but for the present, the ritual of the unleavened bread will be discussed. It is stated later in this chapter of Exodus (verse 39), that when the Hebrews left Egypt, they were thrust out and baked unleavened bread because they had no time to do otherwise. This is the reason given traditionally for the eating of unleavened bread on Passover; that the Hebrews had to eat it then because in their haste to leave Egypt, that was all they could prepare and were not able to enjoy the finer type of bread. However, the command to eat only unleavened bread during those seven days is given before the exodus took place. No wonder the rabbis of the Talmud declared that there is no chronology in the Bible. From the point of view of the theologian or the Biblical scholar, this would be a most important point and much concern would be given to the fact that the ritual was established before the historical event that gave rise to it. Schauss (1964) makes quick work of this problem by explaining

that in all probabilities, rituals existed before myths and the myth was then created to explain the ritual. That may very well be the case in the ritual of the unleavened bread, but from the point of view of this orientation to the psychology of religion, it is important to discover if eating unleavened bread for seven days indeed has a life-maintaining or life enhancing value.

I think the clue to the answer to this question lies in the statement which is found so frequently accompanying rituals in the Old Testament, "you shall celebrate it as a feast unto the Lord throughout your generations, as an eternal ordinance shall you celebrate it." A very modern attitude taken toward ritual is expressed by a student whom I shall try to quote as well and as completely as possible. "What a nerve the old priests and ministers had in ordaining certain ways I'm supposed to act and things that I'm supposed to do. I have my own mind and what I feel like doing right now is exactly what I'll do." I don't believe that particular student's decisions upon his present actions will live for many generations. There is something missing that I think Bonner (1965) expresses very well. "The present oriented person

is in the paradoxical position of trying to achieve 'happiness' or 'adjustment' in a moment that does not in fact exist (p. 121)." Again he says, "The human traits of freedom, responsibility and commitment...all imply a tomorrow (p. 116)."

The human hope is for a tomorrow. Tomorrow is a promise of life and it is life which is the basic human value. The ritual of the unleavened bread is to endure for all tomorrows. I believe it is that which was able to capture the human spirit. The value of the ritual, which is indeed still observed to this day, is the value of life. The value-path chosen in this instance is the eating of unleavened bread. Another value-path implicit in this ritual is the celebration of freedom. The ancient Hebrews achieved their freedom from slavery in Egypt upon that day, according to the myth. Eating the unleavened bread is a symbol of that freedom and according to May (1962), "Freedom is existence, and in it existence precedes essence (pp. 5 and 6)." In other words, May is saying that freedom is life, and in the ritual, the unleavened bread symbolizes freedom.

The next ritual that will be examined is one which is not familiar to most people, and in fact, may appear to be

quite unnecessary. I am referring to the ritual of burning incense to the Lord which is found in Chapter XXX of the book of Exodus. This ritual is no longer practiced in Judaism (although it seems to be gaining in popularity among the younger generation of the United States), but will be examined in order to try to determine what significance it had in the past and perhaps discover why it has been discarded. The Lord tells Moses to take certain ingredients including stacts, which is a fragrant oil or resin, onycha (of great interest because it is identified as being obtained from certain shell fish found in the Red Sea.) The interesting point here is that although the shell fish may not be eaten, an ingredient of it may be used for the making of incense which becomes holy. Another ingredient is galbanium which is the gum of a shrub growing in Asia Minor and interestingly enough, does not have a pleasant aroma. These should all be mixed with salt in certain proportions for the incense to be made by people skilled in that sort of work.

This compound should then be put in the tent of meeting. "...it shall be unto you most holy. And the incense which you shall make according to that composition, you shall not

make for yourselves; it shall be unto you holy for the Lord. Whoever shall make something like that, to smell it himself, shall be cut off from his people (Exodus XXX: 37, 38)." There must have been some significance to the burning of incense and a meaning to each ingredient. In Psalms CXII:2, prayer is compared to incense and in the Talmud it is said that the four Hebrew letters that make up the word "incense" stood for "holiness, purity, mercy, and hope," all of which would be value-paths in the lives of men. Hertz (1962) claims that incense possesses antiseptic properties and that it has a marked effect both on the worshippers' nervous systems and upon their emotions. In general, it sounds like fairly potent "stuff."

My own conjecture at this point is taken from two hints about the ingredients of the incense. The first concerns the onycha derived from a ritually unclean sea animal and the second is the malodorous galbanium. Yet putting these two disagreeable ingredients together in the right combination elevated them from the prohibited, on the one hand, and the distasteful on the other, to a level close to that of holiness, which has the force of universal at-one-ness. So again, this

ritual may have had the value of giving the worshipper a glimpse of life in the mystical sense of the unity of life, and the value-path was through the ritual. But again, the worshipper is warned not to attempt to trifle with this substance on his own. He is in need of guidance when dealing with such potent material.

The fact that the ritual remains as part of the Old Testament, but is no longer used, is indicative that the value underpinnings to it have been lost to antiquity. Not even the myth of the meaning of the word found in the Talmud could revive the ritual. Even Hertz's claim for the wonderful physiological effects of the incense could not revive the use of this ritual. This would be one example of a value-path in the Old Testament that is not tenable for the world, today, and could not, and probably should not be revived any more than the ritual of animal sacrifice should be. The important concept to be understood is not that every value-path in the Old Testament should be reinstated, but they should be comprehended. If we are to reject something, it is important that we understand what it is that we are discarding. As May (1962) remarks with great cogency, "You cannot have freedom

or a free individual without some structure in which (or in the case of defiance, against which) the individual acts (p. 7)."

Nevertheless, there is a message of incalculable value in the ritual of the incense. Again, I will reiterate that I am not proposing that we reincorporate the burning of incense into our daily lives, although some are doing so (perhaps because they understand the meaning of it intuitively, or perhaps because it is just the "in thing" to do in their own social strata). The message that I feel is so important is in the apparent contradiction in the Old Testament. In one place it gives the message that the shell fish is a detestable creature which should be avoided if we are to approach the holiness of God, then it tells us that onycha, which derives from shellfish, is an essential ingredient in the incense which is "holy." Plainly and simply put, this is all contradictory and illogical, and in that way it resembles the human being very greatly. Perhaps that is the strength of the Bible. Perhaps the message is that just because something is not good for one purpose, it does not mean that it is not good for others. The message may well be that this is life; the integration of

many things, the mixing of various ingredients that may seem bad, in order to make something good, just as in the mixing of diverse kinds of seeds which may seem good could result in something evil. In psychology, we might speak of the integration of all the aspects of me, the good me, the bad me, the smart me, the stupid me. Wisdom would be in knowing the proportions in which to mix them and knowing in which situations to allow which part to be the dominant factor.

This point of view is in great contradistinction to much of the philosophy of logical positivism which has habituated us into thinking in terms of dichotomies and reductionism The way of thinking proposed here is that of integration of many seemingly contradictory parts of man. Life, as I believe the Old Testament considers the basic human value concept, cannot be reduced. The value-paths as have been shown in the analyses of the Biblical data are infinite, contradictory, complicated, logical, illogical, and mirror the human being himself. The Bible refuses to be rubricized. Perhaps that is why it has existed throughout the ages. Better than the psychologies of the past and better than the scientific study of the Bible, it has remained whole, as sullied

and contradictory as it is, and by so being, has been a very human document. That last statement is a contradiction in itself, because those who love the Bible the most, generally believe it to be a document of divine origin. What I would then be saying is that the document people revere as divine, is the most human of all. The existentialists might say that this lends support to their idea that man wishes to become God, or Maslow might say that it lends support to the idea that man yearns for something greater, outside of himself (Maslow, 1968). Frankl (1963) would agree with this idea, but I would be very satisfied with just leaving that contradiction stand and saying, "there it is, another contradiction; and it is part of life."

Before leaving this phase of the study of Western religion through its basic religious document and the study of that document through the vehicle of value and value-paths, it is important to make explicit that which is implicit throughout this essay. The value put forth as the value in the Old Testament is "Life." But it was found that the existentialists in their study of being were forced to examine its opposite, non-being, and it was found that humanistic psychology, in being

so interested in life was being forced to re-examine death. I have been examining the Bible throughout this essay as an existentialist-humanistic document, which has been an inescapable position for me since I cannot but see the Old Testament as almost completely experientially. Like religion, the Old Testament is in its way danced out, not thought out. Yet, I have not spoken of death as a value in the Old Testament. I have earlier in this essay mentioned that there were possibly two basic values in the Old Testament. Indeed, I believe there are, and I believe that the second value is death.

When I quoted Deuteronomy XXX:19, ..."Life and death have I put before you...and chose life so that you and your children shall live," it was obvious that there was a chance that the people might choose death. What would make a person choose death? This is a question I cannot answer, but apparently to some, death is, in Hamlet's words, "A consummation devoutly to be desired." The Old Testament recognizes that there is a death wish and almost pleadingly asks that people choose life. However, I believe that the Old Testament does recognize death as a value. It would take an entire study to explore that

concept fully, but it is only proper that it be mentioned here in recognition of the opposites that the Old Testament accepts as part of the human being. In this respect, it is also freely admiteed that I am falling into Freudian territory and saying that the Bible gives credence to his concepts of a life instinct and a death instinct. I would be far more comfortable to rephrase that and proclaim that Freud was in the tradition of the Old Testament when he postulated those two basic instincts of mankind.

My thesis is that the Bible postulated two basic values; one, the value "Life" which is the positive, and the second, the value "Death," which is the negative value. There are innumerable value-paths which can lead to the achievement of either of these values. The Old Testament "chose life" and emphasizes the value-paths which lead to life, but others or the opposite forms of the former exist, which lead to death. In speaking of death, an interesting point to make of those who actively "choose death," that is, commit suicide, substantially more suicides occur among those who have no children than those who do, and that the single, widowed, and divorced have considerably higher suicide rates than those who are

married (Bakan, 1966). I do not believe that I have to belabor the points made by the existentialists and the humanistic psychologists about the importance of meaning, love, and purposefulness in life. Apparently, what we may be able to infer is that one's job does not fulfill the need for meaning and purpose to the extent that many would have us believe. There is a possibility that the value-paths found within the Old Testament are more to the point and can provide western man with at least some ideas of what he lacks and possibly some paths which he can take to overcome these difficulties.

Until now, we have been examining portions of the Old Testament which are accepted for the most part, as portions of the Old Testament, and important for that reason. In the next chapter, I will examine that portion of the Old Testament which the entire Judeo-Christian world agrees is basic and fundamental to their religion.

Chapter VI

VALUE-PATHS AND NEEDS IN THE DECALOGUE

In this chapter an attempt will be made to examine the Decalogue or The Ten Commandments as it appears in Chapter XX of the Book of Exodus bearing in mind the value-paths inherent in these commandments. At the same time Maslow's (1968) famous hierarchy of needs will be examined for the purpose of determining whether the value-paths involved in the satisfaction of these needs are consistant with those of the Ten Commandments. His theory of meta-motivation (Maslow, 1967) will be considered as most important in this regard since, in the Ten Commandments, as opposed to many of the other commandments of the Old Testament, there is an emphasis more on the spiritual aspects of man than there is on the physical.

We will first examine Maslow's hierarchy of needs and discuss in some detail how they can be met and generally how Old Testament value-paths coincide with them.

Maslow's basic proposition is that the human being is not an empty organism and there are certain basic needs within

him which must be satisfied. If they are left unsatisfied, then sickness will result. These needs are arranged as a hierarchy going from the most basic at the lowest part to the most spiritual at the highest. It is also important to remember that Maslow considered all of these needs as having biological rooting. He too, was not attempting to revive the old mind-body controversy. The hierarchy would look like this:

Self Actualization

Esteem (Respecting oneself and feeling successful)

Love (Belonging, being a part of)

Safety (Security, order and stability)

Physiological (Satisfaction of hunger, thirst, and sex)

Self-actualization is the most difficult of all these needs to speak about, but they are the ones with which the Ten Commandments is most concerned. I would like to emphasize early in this chapter that these needs, especially when we get to the higher ones, are not mutually exclusive and a value-path that satisfies one of the needs on the lower level can also be important to the satisfaction of a need on a higher level. An example of this can be found in the dietary laws of the Old Testament that were discussed earlier. These

laws prescribe the eating of only certain types of food (this very same message can hold true with the ritual of the eating of unleavened bread on the Passover). Of course, the food satisfies a physiological need of hunger, but the ancient Israelite being cautious to eat only those foods prescribed as ritually clean is also fulfilling a safety need by conforming to the order of his society and a love need because he can then feel that he is continuing to earn the right to belong to that society. If he is maintaining the dietary laws in a situation in which it is particularly difficult to do so, he may also be fulfilling an esteem need.

It must also be emphasized that according to Maslow's scheme, the higher needs in the hierarchy cannot be realized unless the lower ones are fairly well satisfied. An example of this can be found in the following little hypothetical soap-opera.

Let us pretend that one of our cute little undergraduates is in love with a boy. Her physiological needs are taken care of fairly well; she is well fed, gets enough sleep, is not thirsty, we'll assume she is not even troubled about sex, etc.

Her safety needs are also well taken care of in that she lives in a nice house, her environment is well-ordered, she drives to the University each morning, attends classes regularly, and is fairly certain that her Mrs. degree will soon be earned. Her love needs are also pretty well in line. She is popular with her sorority sisters and above all, she has found her "prince charming." I believe that any college instructor will recognize that this is not only a soap opera, but also somewhat of a fairy tale.

But to continue with our narrative, let us now assume that our young lady has a terrible fight with the gentleman who was to award her the Mrs. degree. Out of frustration, despair and anger, she gets into her car and starts driving aimlessly into the mountains. Now, a terrible thing happens. As she is driving on a desolate mountain road, she is suddenly confronted with a blizzard. The snow is falling in a blinding rage and the road soon becomes impassable. Dusk is coming and our young lady has been forced to stop her car and just sit there. But to no avail, the storm shows no sign of letting up and our young lady realizes that she is in trouble. Now, let us recall that her journey began because

she was having problems with her love needs. At this point, her love needs are completely forgotten and she becomes concerned with safety. Her world is no longer an ordered, predictable place. Indeed, it is a strange world that she is now in. She cannot even recognize a landmark. The cold begins to penetrate her bones. She is becoming hungry. Her thoughts turn to survival and she is now concerned only with her physiological needs. She leaves her car and begins walking in the unfamiliar territory. Her concern is only with the most basic of the physiological needs. She must get warmth and food.

Let us make a happy ending to our story and say that by chance, she stumbles into a farmhouse, where the kind people give her warm, dry clothing and food, and allow her to remain with them for several days until the weather situation returns to normal. Her physiological and safety needs are satisfied once more, and her thoughts turn to her beau whom she calls. To her delight, she discovers that he had been worried sick about her for the past several days and will personally come to get her and bring her home with him. Her love needs are again being taken care in a satisfactory

manner and she can go back to the business of doing well in school and satisfying her esteem needs.

With the above narrative we can see how Maslow's hierarchy might work in a "real life" situation. We can also understand how needs must be satisfied going from lowest to highest before a person is in a position to become self-actualized.

Also basic to Maslow's theories are the ideas of Being Motivation and Deficit Motivation. Maslow (1968) briefly defines these two comcepts as "satisfying deficiencies avoids illness; growth satisfactions produce positive health (p. 32)." Utilizing our above soap-opera, we can say that when our coed was stumbling about in the snow, it was due to deficiency motivation. She was trying to save her life and fulfill her needs, but she found no intrinsic reward in doing so, and I would venture to guess that she would not voluntarily live through that particular situation again. She was doing what she did to avoid illness, or more dramatically, in this case, to avoid death.

Now, if the situation were somewhat different, and she were well-fed, warmly clothed and walking with her boyfriend

through familiar woods on a cold, snowy night, we could state that she would be fulfilling a love need, but this would not be satisfaction for deficit motivation. She would be enjoying the experience and possibly even glowing within. This is Being motivation; she is growing through it, and it is producing positive health.

After all of the basic needs in the hierarchy are satisfied, a man is capable of self-actualization, which means that he is now capable of living up to his potential and is positively using his capacities. But this is obviously not always true. It is apparent in our observation of western society, especially so, in the United States, that in many cases in which the lower needs on the hierarchy are satisfied, the individual still is not a self-actualized person. Maslow, like Bonner (1965), and Frankl (1966) see man being pulled to the future as a very important ingredient in the healthy personality. Cross, Doost and Tracy (1970) report in their studies on hippies that the values of the hippies center about immediate striving for fully experiencing whatever pleasures are available. The future is of little concern to them, yet it is commonly known that the greater percentage of the hippy community springs from

homes where their basic needs would tend to find satisfaction. Maslow (1967) recognized this and therefore postulated that the self-actualizing individual is motivated "by some values which he strives for or gropes for and to which he is loyal (p. 94)." He finds that not only are such people devoted to something outside of themselves, but they have the kind of outlook which makes the feeling of "I want to" coincide with "I must." This is very much like the rabbinical dictum of true freedom being the desire to freely burden oneself with the obligation of fulfilling the religious law.

Maslow (1967) therefore postulates such things as metamotivations or motivations which go beyond the lower ones on his hierarchy. We do not understand fully what these metamotivations are, but in examining religion and concluding as I did that the supreme value is "life," I would be willing to venture a guess and say that underlying these metamotivations are metavalue-paths. Maslow (1967) states, "the tasks to which they are dedicated (self-actualizing people) seem to be interpretable as embodiments or incarnations of intrinsic values (rather than as a means to ends outside the work itself, and rather then as functionally autonomous).

The tasks are loved (and introjected) because they embody these values. That is, ultimately it is the values that are loved rather than the job as such (p. 99)." He also says that upon further examination these values are irreducible. An example would be the lawyer who loves his job because the end value is justice, and justice according to Maslow is an irreducible value. I would submit that justice is a value-path. "To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice (Proverbs, XXI, 3)." Of course, it is also my contention that the value that is being approached is the value of life. Simply stated, life cannot exist without justice, and of course, there are many ways of following the value-path of justice and each one of them is irreducible.

Maslow almost comes to the very same step that I have come to through the study of the Old Testament. He finds in the self-actualizing people there are values that tend to be similar, no matter what road they may be taking, be it law, education, art, religion, science, mathematics, or anything else. These people tend to show the same love of these "values" even outside of their professional lives. He also finds that

there is less differentiation between the world and the self in these people. They have incorporated the world into themselves and are fully a part of it. He states that to identify one's highest self with the highest values of the world out there, means to some extent at least, a fusion with the non-self (Maslow, 1967, p.103). How similar this is to the value-paths that were discussed earlier. God had been identified with being or life etymologically, and the ritual tells men that they should be holy because the Lord is holy. In other words, their highest selves should fuse with the highest value, and that is the value of life.

Yet, Maslow implies, we fear the highest values both within ourselves and outside of ourselves. According to Maslow there is some ambivalence toward approaching what he considers the highest values. If the value is life, as I contend it is, and its opposite is the value, death, is it possible that Freud may not have been so wrong as he is thought to be concerning these two instincts coexisting in man? Freud would have the perfect explanation. The problem for us would be to try to test it. But perhaps testing is not all that essential. Perhaps, another glance at the mythology of the

Old Testament might bear out Maslow's point. What of the myth of the "golden calf"? Here was a people freed from bondage, having witnessed all sorts of miracles, at least the myth tells us so, getting ready to enter its own land and enjoy true freedom, and at the first opportunity they got, reverted to worshipping an Egyptian idol, instead of celebrating the life they now had both within them and on the outside. To me, this is a fine example of a great ambivalence toward the value of life. The mere fact of using that which is not alive as an object of worship would suggest that there was some fear of committing themselves completely to life. Psalms 115 speaks to this point very plainly and very dramatically. "Their idols are silver and gold the work of men's hands. They have a mouth but they don't speak, eyes they have but that can't see. Ears they have and they can't hear, they have a nose but can't smell. Their hands can't be used, their feet can't walk and no sound comes from their throat. Their makers shall become just like them, all who have trust in them (verses 4-9)." The Psalmist recognized the fact that people not only identified with their gods but introjected them, or possibly projected

themselves into their gods. This would be the point Fromm (1966) makes when he says that the important question is not whether God is dead, but whether man is dead.

I believe Maslow is saying the very same thing in speaking of our fear of the highest values. I would even be so presumptuous as to say that Maslow may even be hinting that the highest value is life, itself. "Can we be said to be raising into meaningfulness the possibility of absolute values (Maslow, 1967, p. 119)," he asks, and then he seems to back off by talking about absolute reality. I cannot believe that when he spoke of absolute values he was unaware of the existentialists' viewpoint of the absolute value being existence, itself. He pays too much tribute to the existentialist philosophers and psychologists (Maslow, 1968) for me to think that he did not have this in mind when he spoke of absolute values. He becomes even more clear at the end of his (1967) essay, "Immortality also has a quite definite and empirical meaning in this context for the values incorporated into the person as defining characteristics of his self live on after his death, i.e. in a certain real sense, his self transcends death (p. 125)."

I would be more prone to say that the value-paths incorporated into the self live on after his death because the value-paths are the paths leading to life. Of course, it is not a real physical immortality that I am speaking of (although I do believe in immortality in a different context). The human being cannot achieve physical immortality. He can never attain his value which is life because that would then make the value meaningless. I would have it and so what? That is why Sartre had to go to God in whom he did not believe to give man an ultimate project which could never be achieved. But it would make life meaningful. That is why, as May (1969) explains, Godot never could come. It was the waiting that made life meaningful for the two tramps. That is why, in Judaism, the Messiah cannot ever come and in Christianity the second coming of Christ can never happen. But these concepts and these hopes are essential. They should not be lost because they too are value-paths toward life. It was perhaps with great wisdom that the ultra-orthodox among the Jews opposed the establishment of the State of Israel (and it hurts me to say this because I am an ardent Zionist) because traditionally Israel was not to be re-established

except under the leadership of the Messiah. It is possible that the ultra-orthodox Jews understood intuitively that if the State were established the waiting for the Messiah would lose its power, and that would be a defeat for life. It has been mentioned over and over in this essay that an essential part of life is community, relationship, love, and the like. Bion (1961) makes the point that in the pairing group, the Messiah or the Messianic idea occupies a central position. What is being said is that the pairing group becomes future oriented. It has a hope to be fulfilled which will not be fulfilled, but in the meantime, there is relationship and love and that is life.

Although Maslow's thought was in many respects original and unique among psychologists, he can be seen as an excellent representative of the "Third Force" in psychology. Because of that quality and because his hierarchy of needs is clear and orderly, and is enhanced by his theory of meta-motivations, it was decided to use his psychology as a reference point in discussing the Ten Commandments.

In Jewish Law, these commandments are not given any priority over the others that appear in the Old Testament, and there are

a total of six hundred thirteen, three hundred sixty-five appear in the negative form (thou shalt not's) and two hundred forty-eight in the positive construction. Why the Decalogue has received such prominence in both the Jewish and Christian Traditions is difficult to ascertain. Hertz (1962) says that it could be "On account of the awe inspiring manner in which they were revealed to the whole nation (p. 294)."

> "Amid thunder and lightning and the sounding of the shofar, amid flames of fire that enveloped the smoking mountain, a Majestic Voice pronounced the Words which from that day to this have been the guide of conduct to mankind. That Revelation was the most remarkable event in the history of humanity. It was the birth hour of the Religion of the Spirit, which was destined in time to illumine the souls, and order the lives of all the children of men. (p. 294)."

I would tend to believe it was not so much the way the Decalogue was delivered as what the contents of it are. In fact, it would probably not be incorrect to suggest that it was precisely because of the contents, that the manner of

delivery became of such great significance. Again, I am taking the position that the law and the ritual probably preceded the myth of the smoke and fiery mountain. A more modern example can be found in American History. The battle of Gettysburg was no more significant, and possibly less so, than was the battle of Petersburg, yet Gettysburg is imprinted indelibly upon the minds of all American school children and for that matter, adults also. The reason for this is, of course, the Gettysburg Address, one of the most magnificent speeches of all time, encompassing the spirit of democracy and compassion in but a few very simple words. It appealed to something higher in the human spirit than is ordinarily found. The same can be said for the Decalogue; it appeals to that which is highest in the human spirit.

In my own experience as a rabbi, I found universally, that when questioned, the least observant (in a religious sense) of my congregants claimed that they believed in, and lived by the Ten Commandments. This was patently untrue, but I learned to understand that these people yearned to live by the "spirit" of the Ten Commandments. As Frankl (1966) phrases it, man lives by ideals and values. This, I believe

is the strength of the Ten Commandments, they encompass ideals and values by which men would like to live, and for that reason they are not only enduring, but beg for understanding by the modern man who is so greatly in need of just these ideals and value-paths that are waiting to take hold of his mind and soul and pull him from his half death of valuelessness and anomie.

Once again, I am taking the liberty of rendering my own translation of these commandments which I don't believe will be too different from the traditional ones. Also I am following the traditional Jewish breakdown of the Decalogue in which verse two of chapter XX serves as the first of the Ten Commandments.

I. "I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, from the house of Slavery." There are some who say that this is a positive commandment to believe in God, and there are those who say that this serves only as an introduction to the Decalogue. What is of major interest in this essay is that God is not introduced as the creator or as the "first cause," but he is introduced as a God who grants freedom. "We are our choices," says Bugental (1965), and one who is not free cannot make choices. Implicit in this command-

ment is that men can choose and men are free, therefore men are alive and therein lies the value. Maslow (1967) says that metamotivated people value freedom very highly, and indeed they should, because metamotivated people know that the value is life and that freedom is a value-path that leads life to its fullest psychological impact. This would also serve as an explanation for something I have been trying to communicate throughout this essay. When I speak of life as the value, I do not mean only physical life, but I am also referring to psychological life or spiritual life. All of these are tied together in a way which I do not fully comprehend, but a man may be physically alive, and yet, a goodly portion of him may be dead. Part of his personality or part of his spiritual life may have become obliterated for any number of reasons, and that part of him is then dead. Life, as a value means fully living, as many parts of the individual as possible being aware and alive. The metamotivated person may be the one who has managed to become aware and bring to life more facets of himself than most others have been capable of doing. It is not even always of importance to consider the physical condition of the

individual. There have been cases, and I am personally aware of cases of people who had very little time left to live physically and were perfectly well aware of this fact, yet they managed to live more usefully and more fully than many whose physical conditions were excellent. Life, then to be the value, must be biologically rooted, as are the "meta-values" of Maslow, but must include all facets of the human being.

This first commandment clearly does not fit into Maslow's hierarchy of needs unless one would be prepared to say that it answers a safety need. The fact that God exists would give the person in a primitive society a feeling of security. He would be able to feel that there is order and stability in the world because there is a God who assures order and stability. I would be loath to accept this interpretation. It would be very much like saying that the scientist becomes a scientist because implicit in science is the faith that there are rules and order in the world. Just as I am opposed to reducing values or reductionalism in the study of man, I would oppose the same type of reductionalism pertaining to the scientist, as not only an easy way out of a complex problem,

but also as demeaning and dehumanizing. I would stand by my interpretation that the first commandment has its strength in its appeal to the higher nature of man in proclaiming the basic value, or in Maslow's terms, it appeals to the meta-motives of self-actualizing individuals.

> II. "You shall not have other gods besides me. You shall not make yourself an idol or any picture of anything that is in the heavens above or on the earth below, or that which is in the water under the earth. You shall not bow down to them and you shall not worship them, for I, the Lord your God am a jealous God, counting the sin of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, and showing mercy to the thousandth of those who love me and keep my comandments (verses 3-6)."

Perhaps it is this commandment which has had the most profound influence upon me in the general thesis expounded in this essay. It is, of course, a call to monotheism, and in my case perhaps, one God equals one value. Here, again, I perceive a commandment of freedom and of life. It is formed in a negative construction, not telling the people

what to do, but rather what not to do. As was stated earlier in this essay, when the subject of defining God was discussed, the point was made that a positive definition limits greatly, a negative definition limits to a very small extent. The same problem is evident in the "Golden Rule." Everybody is familiar with Jesus' saying, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." Not everybody knows Hillel's phrasing of the same principle, "that which is hateful to you, you shall not do to another." Certainly, I am more cogently aware of things that I do not like to have done to me and if I refrain from doing them to others, I still have a great deal of freedom in how to behave toward others. In the positive phrasing, my freedom is cut down to a large extent, but it is universally recognized that it is the same underlying spirit with which both sayings are infused. Of more interest in the two dicta just quoted, is the existential spirit of them. They begin with the experience of the person, his own phenomenological self is the point of departure. From his rooting in his self, he then steps out and acts towards others.

Likewise, in this commandment, the negative is emphasized.

It is interesting to note that the first commandment was completely on a positive level, suddenly the negative comes into focus, thus recognizing both aspects of the human being in one short paragraph, or better still in a few short lines, since the original Hebrew was written without vowels and without punctuation marks. The job of punctuating the sentences came much later in the course of Jewish History. While the first commandment was positive, my conclusion had to be that it was addressing itself to what Maslow called the meta-motives. It is of interest to note that Maslow saw the human being as basically a positive entity. Therefore, the positive may correspond with what Maslow considered the higher nature of man. Another empirical study that may come out of this piece of research could be based on discovering how the positive or "yea" saying may correlate with the meta-motives and "nay" saying may correlate with the deficiency motivations.

However, this commandment is very specific in things that people should not do and in that way corresponds well to the Safety aspects of Maslow's hierarchy. The people know they are not to make idols, they know specifically that they

are not to worship or bow down to pictures. This puts a definite order in their world. It makes their world a more stable and therefore, a safer place in which to live. Psychologists are recognizing more and more that setting limits is a most important part of raising children or even in psychotherapy. The patient in psychotherapy is told that he must not use physical violence against his therapist. Some (Cohen, 1970) in work with groups have told participants who were threatening to have psychotic breaks that it is against the rules in this group to do anything like that, with the result that the threatened psychotic break never materialized. Therefore, it would seem appropirate to say that at least part of this commandment falls into the category of satisfying a safety need.

There is also an element of threat involved in the commandment. God will visit punishment upon the children of those who disobey the commandment. Again this would be part of the Safety need. It is making clear some contingencies. It was said earlier that not knowing the contingencies is a cause of anxiety. It can be assumed that if we do know the contingencies much anxiety can be avoided and the individual

will feel safer. Such is the force of the threat of the second commandment. But directly after the threat comes a promise, that there will be a reward not only to the third and fourth generation but up to the thousandth generation of those who love God. In this part of the commandment, it can be said that a love need is being satisfied. The individual can feel that he is really belonging and is a part of God's plan because God will take care of him and his posterity, for all intents and purposes, forever. But here, also the concept of immortality comes into play. Indeed, Maslow spoke of this type of immortality when he said that the values that are incorporated into the self cause the self to continue living even after death. In this sense, the love need merges with a meta-motivation of doing righteousness for its own sake, or simply because the individual feels a part of the world and wants to do it because it is the good thing to do. We also know that the concept of immortality is a concept of life, and thus, as we suspected, we find that in one commandment there are embodied two levels of Maslow's hierarchy, some of his meta-motivations and the value of life. It begins to become more clear just why the Decalogue has been such an important and indispensible part of the western

religion.

III. "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain because the Lord will not consider him pure who takes His name in vain (verse 7)."

This commandment is generally interpreted to mean that one must not swear falsely by the name of God. I believe that the ninth commandment deals with the issue of swearing falsely and I think that the third has an entirely different meaning. Notice the commandment states that it is God's name, or rather, the Lord's name that is not to be taken in vain. The name mentioned in this commandment is the tetragrammaton which was already discussed at length and identified with the concept of being or life. To take something in vain means to make of it nothing. The force of the Hebrew word for "vain" in this commandment is exactly that and a direct translation would be not "raising the Lord's name to nothingness." It is a warning against becoming cynical, or perhaps, over sophisticated about the matter of existence, itself. The Book of Ecclesiastes was discussed earlier. It is well known that the force of that beautifully reasoned and very powerful book is that everything is in the final analysis, meaningless.

It was also mentioned that the editor at the end tried to soften the impact of the book by adding the last few sentences.

The remainder of the Hebrew verse is difficult to render into meaningful English. Literally it means that "the Lord (Tetragrammaton) will not make innocent he who raises His name to nothingness." If we can comprehend the implication of raising being to nothingness, as meaning dichotomizing, intellectualizing, reducing that which is just there, that which is part of the world and part of being, and comes to meet us in its uniqueness and fullness, I believe we can capture the meaning of the Hebrew text. And he who does raise existence to nothingness is not innocent. He has lost his innocence in that he no longer accepts the beingness of the universe. He has to make of it something that it is not. He does not, as a child does in innocence accept what he perceives as just being itself. That man is truly not innocent (Cohen, 1971). According to this interpretation of the third commandment, it can be seen as a meta-motivation. Maslow (1967) says that "human-independent reality is seen most clearly in its own (human-independent) nature, least distorted by observer-intrusions (p. 118)."

IV. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days you shall labor and do all your work. But the seventh day is a sabbath to the Lord, your God; you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your man-servant or your maid-servant, or your cattle, or the stranger who is within your gates. Because in six days, the Lord made the heaven and the earth, and the sea, and all that is in them, and he rested on the seventh day; therefore, the Lord blessed the sabbath day and made it holy (verses 8-11)."

The importance of the sabbath day and of this commandment cannot be overemphasized. Jesus was chastized for desecrating the Sabbath, yet the Sabbath remains as integral a part of Christianity as it is of Judaism. Almost every state in the United States has its own peculiar set of "Blue Laws" which are perpetually being fought in the courts. Yet, somehow, they always seem to survive in one form or another. The commandment is honored more in the breach than in the practice, and despite all this it remains essential to the Judeo-Christian heritage.

It can well be said that the commandment to rest on the

Sabbath is in answer to the physiological needs on Maslow's hierarchy. Certainly, the human being and the beast of burden needs some time to rest. It can be said to fulfill the safety needs on the hierarchy because it does give some order and stability to the world. In the Jewish calendar, the days are counted from Sabbath to Sabbath. Thus, there are no names to the days of the week. Sunday is "the first day," Monday is "the second day," etc. until Friday which is called either "the sixth day," or "Sabbath eve." And anything can happen on the six weekdays as is well known by anybody who works, goes to school, cares for a home, or is engaged in any task, but the seventh day, the Sabbath is predictable. It is the day of rest and later Jewish Law and custom ordered it so, that just about every minute of the day was accounted for. The same is true for Christianity. Vestiges of such ordering can be seen in the traditional Sunday dinner, which in some homes is an inviolable institution. It can also be argued that the Sabbath fits well with the love needs on the hierarchy. It is a day devoted to the family. Once again, I will refer to the film production of Fiddler on the Roof, in which it will be remembered that Tevye and his wife and daughters

were arguing and bickering until the Sabbath candles were kindled. Then Tevye appeared in a black robe and all the family sang together and the parents, in song, blessed their children. Peace, love, and harmony ruled. It was a very dramatic and sudden changing of moods, but most of all it was true to life. Too, it can be said that the Sabbath fits well with the esteem needs for on the Sabbath day, each man, no matter how low his station in life is or how poor he is, becomes transformed into a king. He is a success simply because he is living on the Sabbath day.

Perhaps, most important, the Sabbath also speaks to the meta-motivations in Maslow's thought. Maslow would probably consider the Sabbath day as unquestionably a "B-value" because, in a sense, that is what it is all about. It is impossible here to describe the thirty-nine categories of work that the rabbis prohibited for the Sabbath day, but let them be summarized by saying that if one observes the Sabbath day in its fullest details, it is simply not possible to meddle with the environment on that day. The human being goes out as he is, in all his majesty and simplicity to meet the environment, but he is not to do anything to it. It is just to be there in all its

simplicity and majesty, and the man is just to let it be. He is even to be careful not to step on a fallen leaf for fear of breaking it, which would come under the thirty-nine categories of work mentioned above. The truly observant Jew will not even wear a wristwatch on the Sabbath. What for? He doesn't even have to know the time of day. In a sense, he is supposed to be suspended in eternity. Just as in the third commandment man is warned against being robbed of his innocence; in the fourth commandment, he is told how he can have his innocence and live in it, not all the time, because that is not only impossible, but self-destructive and dysfunctional, but for one day each week he can experience innocence in a truly innocent way.

Then there is the question of why we observe the Sabbath. All of these things may be very nice, but what do they lead to? What is the purpose of them? It is here that I find myself in agreement with Frankl(1966). Self-actualization is not an end in itself. To put it in my terms, the meta-motivations are not values, they are value-paths leading to the irreducible value. The commandment itself gives the answer to that question: "For in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth...and

rested on the seventh day; therefore, the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy." The commandment is telling us to observe the Sabbath day, not because of anything that we may have done, but because the Lord rested on the Sabbath day. It was God's day for rest, and once again, God is identified with existence. In psychological terms, the word identification is used to denote a defense mechanism by which the individual takes on the characteristics of another person and behaves in the same manner as the other person in order to become more like him. Here we find the commandment saying, "You shall rest on the Sabbath day, because God rested on the Sabbath day." It is another path by which men can strive toward becoming God.

No wonder the Sabbath plays so great and significant role in both Judaism and Christianity. This fourth commandment contains within it every level of Maslow's hierarchy. It has the ability to appeal to every person, no matter which level of the hierarchy he is attempting to satisfy. If anything can be considered as containing universal appeal, it is the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. On the other side, it is also no wonder that the fourth commandment is

more honored in the breach than it is in the practice of it. It was said that this commandment is more honored thusly because it speaks to every level of the hierarchy of needs, even to the metaneeds. Maslow(1967) recognizes that we fear the highest values both within ourselves and outside of ourselves. My interpretation, which is akin to Maslow's, is that we fear the value-paths in hierarchial form since they all lead to the same value, but I see them as different in different individuals (and, therefore, also irreducible). What Maslow calls the highest values are simply value-paths that seem to be more compatible with those whom he considers as self-actualizing people. In the case of the Sabbath, we find value-paths that can apply almost universally. By their very nature they would cause a conflict. Existential anxiety, it seems to me, can be caused both by finding no meaning and by completely fulfilling the meaning (May, 1969). The Sabbath comes very close to the latter.

Maslow (1967) says, "Nor should we forget that witnessing these ultimate facts (or values) often makes the person acutely conscious of his own unworthiness, of his inadequacies and shortcomings, of his ultimate existential smallness, finiteness

and powerlessness simply as a human being and as a member of the human species (p. 121)." The very nature of the Sabbath causes one to witness the "ultimate facts," in Maslow's terms, for it brings us closer to God than any of the other myths, rituals or laws found in the Old Testament. Perhaps that is why what I consider the warning word was put at the end of the commandment; the words, "And He made it holy." Actually, that word needn't be there. The sentence would make perfectly good sense if it were absent entirely. It will be remembered that earlier in this paper, it was discovered that holiness is a mixed blessing. Because holiness approaches God, it may become useless to man like the mixing of seeds of diverse kinds, or in the case of the incense, which became holy, and therefore could not be used for man's benefit alone. What I would think this fourth commandment is telling us is that here is a value-path that could appeal to all men, and it is very potent, indeed, therefore, be careful with it, it is a path leading to existence, and it is a path which may lead to non-existence. Tread lightly upon it, but have your choice. It is very much like the choice of life and death before us. The last word of the commandment asks us to "choose life."

V. "Honor your father and your mother so that your days will be lengthened upon the earth, which the Lord, your God gives you (verse 12)."

Concerning this commandment most of the medieval commentators explain that the father and the mother are to be honored, because the parents are conpared to God, and in cooperation with God gave life to the individual. Nevertheless, the commandment is fraught with grave difficulties. This is especially true in our times, when many people do not understand the difference between "honor" and "love," and also, the connection between them. Notice that the commandment does not say "Love your father and your mother." Love cannot be legislated. It must come because the lover wants to love, and the one who is to be loved draws love from the lover. That is the same kind of distinction that was made in the law to "Act loving toward your neighbor...." Honor or respect, which is another valid translation is a different matter. It is entirely possible to respect someone and honor him for many reasons, even though he is not worthy of your love, or you believe he is not worthy of your love. I can respect a man who is President of the United States, simply because

of the position he occupies, or I can even respect the fact that one whom I may believe is such a complete incompotent had the gall to attempt to attain that position and succeed. I can also respect my parents and behave with respect toward them simply because they are my parents, and at one time early in my life they saw to it that I had the chance to live and make of myself whatever it is that I am.

Honoring and respecting somebody also have the quality of maintaining a relationship. I believe it is a truth that children do not love their parents as much as their parents love them, and that this is the way it should be, for if it were not, then people would not leave their parental homes and establish their own families. Love almost universally goes in the direction of from the parent to the offspring. If honor and respect go in the opposite direction, then a relationship can be maintained and through this relationship, another type of love may be born. For certain, without the relationship, love is completely impossible. A memory I will always carry with me and a man I can never forget or fully repay is now a part of my life that enriches me and makes me more of a human being. When I was studying at the seminary many

years ago, I was also having some great difficulties with my father. I knew that I must move out of my parents' home, and since I was a student, the logical place to live (and the only place I could afford) would be the seminary at the dormitory. I went to the rabbi who was in charge of making such arrangements and told him that I wanted a room. He asked me why, and I told him that it takes an hour each morning to get to the seminary. I went to the rabbi, because I knew he would understand that I could use that traveling time to greater advantage. Now, in New York City that amount of travel is nothing out of the ordinary, and spending that much time on the subway is taken for granted by many, if not most residents of the city. The rabbi looked at me quizzically and asked, "Now, is that the real reason?" There was not any getting away from it, so I told him of the almost daily fights with my father. He looked at me very seriously, and said, "It is good that you told me the truth, and I am going to do for you what may be the greatest favor of your life. I am not going to allow you to move into one of our rooms, because if I do, I will be robbing you of the opportunity of resolving your differences. You cannot get to understand each other by one

of you running away. Stay there and fight it out. Now, I do not know what your problems are, and you may be one hundred per cent right, and he may be very wrong, but listen to him with respect and answer him with respect. It will not be long before that respect grows into something much greater."

I heeded that old rabbi's advice, and although I recognize that it may have happened anyway, I firmly believe that the above incident marked the beginning of a beautiful father-son relationship which exists to this day.

It is unfortunate, that so frequently in the practice of psychoanalysis, the impact upon the patient can be summed up in three words: "Blame your parents." As is well known, the art of psychoanalysis has filtered down to the layman as a "science," and as a science, it is gospel. Very frequently, in working with groups, a participant will begin a recitation of all the faults and shortcomings of his parents. There are times, when it is appropriate in the stage of the group, and the participant is at a level where he can "hear" such an intervention, that I will ask how it is possible that such insensitive, unfeeling, unloving parents, such as his, could have produced so fine an offspring. This intervention is

never menat sarcastically, and it is not taken so, because most of the participants in these particular groups are fine and good people. The usual response I get from that intervention is, "I never thought of it that way," of "You mean that they may not have really been so bad. Maybe they weren't." The participant usually discovers that he was exaggerating his parents' faults and not even considering their strengths.

Not only is placing the blame on parents frequently a therapeutic cop-out, but it is even more unfortunate when we consider that the founder of psychoanalysis was Sigmund Freud, a man who not only respected, but adored his parents (Jones, 1953). He went to great pains to see to it that his mother lived comfortably after she was widowed and never gave up his very beautiful relationship with her. It can be said that Freud "honored his father and his mother." It seems a shame that the practitioners of the art he developed, and the recipients of its benefits so often obtain results that would be repugnant to and in most probabilities, disowned by Freud, himself. Thus, today, honoring of one's parents is being abandoned, at least in the popular mind, by science itself.

In Maslow's thought, honoring of one's parents could

conceivably fall under the rubric of the safety needs because it maintains a relationship with members of the family, and the family has been, and for the present, still is the basic unit of society. Maintaining such a relationship provides for security, order and stability both in the life of the individual and in the life of the society of which he is a part. It would also be fulfilling a love need in that it gives the individual a sense of belonging to a certain structure. He is part of a family which he values, and is, in turn, a valuable part of the family. It would also fit into his concept of meta-motivations. The self-actualizing person is one who is able to accept other individuals despite his differences with them. He is able to respect them as human beings in their own right (Maslow, 1967)). It would seem obvious that when one has the ability to respect and accept differences in other people and still hold them in high regard, he would not be excluding his parents from the list of those he is able to respect. It becomes obvious then, that this fifth commandment speaks to much that is in the biological rooting of the human being according to Maslow.

It is also a value-path to my way of thinking in that it

gives honor and respect to other human beings. Of course, there is a special relationship one has towards his parents. One of the most annoying parts of that relationship is in the saying in "popular wisdon" that an offspring always remains a child in the eyes of his parents. To a great extent, there is much truth in that saying, but that does not mean that the parent does not respect or love his child. As example of this was given in my grandfather's refusal to accept my rendition of the law concerning the Sabbth in his case. I am certain my father would take very much the same attitude towards my expounding Jewish law or rendering a psychological explanation of anything. Yet, he respects my knowledge, and it is a source of great pride to him that his son has accomplished these skills. Yet, it is very easy for me to become angry at him and tell him that I have surpassed him in certain fields and he should listen to me. But, despite the fact that my father is never going to consider me as fully grown, and I believe this is true and probably universal (another hypothesis worthwhile to be tested), and the commandment recognizes it as such, I still should respect and honor him. The burden is placed upon me. (It is interesting that the

Hebrew word for "honor" or "respect" is the same root as the word, "heavy." One might say that honoring someone is a "heavy" burden to carry. Indeed, it should be upon me for it is a value-path that I am free to follow or not follow. Following any path is always an individual thing, but following this path is another way of obtaining a full psychological life. It allows me to see and admire the virtues in another person, even in the circumstances in which he does not fully appreciate all of the virtues that are in me.

The commandment, again, does not mince words, but says quite outright that the value of this path is the value of life. "In order that your days may be lengthened," is the reason given for following the commandment. The reason is life.

VI. "You shall not murder (verse 13)."

I am certain it will be noted by anybody who is not familiar with the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament, or anybody who is not familiar with the Hebrew itself, that this is a strange translation of the commandment. It has come down in English translation as "Thou shalt not kill,"

and indeed, it is imprinted on the popular mind in just that form. However, the Hebrew word in that commandment means "murder." It is always used in the context of murder throughout the Bible, and it is just an incorrect (albeit more beautiful and poetic) translation to render it as "Thou shalt not kill."

There is, of course, a vast difference between killing and murdering. To kill is to do some act upon another individual which results in his losing his life, no matter what the circumstances may be. To murder is also to forcibly take one's life from him, but it is only murder under certain conditions. Thus, if a criminal attacked me and tried to kill me, but I was able to kill him and save my own life, I certainly killed but I did not murder. Or, if I kill to protect the lives of my family, it is killing, but not murdering. But if I were to kill somebody with no valid reason for doing so, it would be murder. There are, of course, other complications involved, such as the state of my sanity at the time, the possible misperceptions that I may have been laboring under, and many other things that the law might take into consideration. Basically, killing is a general taking of life;

murder is a legal term applying to specific situations. Murder may then be operationally defined as a killing which the law defines as murder. This sixth commandment is speaking to the legal aspects of killing.

Indeed, it would have to be so considering the value of human life that is utmost in the Old Testament. If, for example, somebody were threatening my life and it was obvious that he would kill me, and the commandment read, "thou shalt not kill," I would be obliged not to kill him, but to allow myself to be killed. This would be a type of inverted valuing of human life in that I would be valuing his life over my own. The fact of the matter is that his life is not more valuable than is mine, and if my belief is that everybody's life is of great value, then I have to start somewhere in my thinking. That starting point is obviously "me." When I get down to the existential basics, I must say that nobody's life is more valuable than my own. Therefore, I will do anything in any power to preserve my own life, physically, psychologically, or spiritually. What comes to mind in this context is the famous story of the four chaplains during World War II who chose to give their life jackets to other men, and they, themselves,

sank with their ship. On the surface, it would seem like the chaplains were valuing the lives of others above their own lives, but that is looking at it on a very superficial level. Actually, what the chaplains were doing was giving the message that the value that they had incorporated so strongly into themselves was the value of life and saving lives. Here was an opportunity, or a value-path for putting that value into practice and by example, even in the midst of war and killing, teach their value to others. If they had not done what they did, they would have been willfully ignoring their one, ultimate guiding value, and would have been truly destroying their lives, although they would have possibly remained alive physically. But it is by his values that man lives (Frankl, 1966). Here we have the case of four men who, by dying, were affirming the ultimate value of their own lives and paradoxically, by giving up their lives were enabling themselves to live.

The commandment is worded, "You shall not murder" because of the value placed on life. By using the legal term "murder", the commandment is cognizant of the value of all lives including the individual to whom it is addressed. Had the commandment

in fact been worded, "thou shalt no kill," it would be possible to say that it was recognizing other lives as having more value than mine.

This commandment fits well into two levels of Maslow's hierarchy. It satisfies a physiological need because the basis of all the physiological needs is in keeping the individual alive. The Old Testament does legalize capital punishment and murder is a crime punishable by death. So one way of not inviting one's own death is by not murdering another. It also fits well into the second level of the hierarchy and satisfies the safety needs because if it were followed by all, to a large extent, there would be more security for all. Also, because it was well known that the penalty for murder was death, it established a very clear cut contingency and made the contingency known to all. Knowing the contingencies involved in our behavior does provide some order and stability in our world which makes it a psychologically safer place in which to live.

There can be little doubt that the value underlying this commandment is the value of life. Nor can there be much doubt that this sixth commandment illuminates a path for us to approach

the value of life. That path is, of course, not to murder. It is of interest here to point out that this concept of not murdering was expanded very greatly by the rabbis. They said that doing nothing to save a man's life who was in danger of death is the same crime as murder. Saving lives, a very positive act, was therefore drawn out by the rabbis from a negative commandment. The rabbis go even further than that though, in expanding this law. They say in the Talmud that one who saves a single person's life is accounted as though he had saved the entire world. On the other hand, one who is instrumental in the destruction of a single person's life is accounted as though he had destroyed the entire world. This is just as it should be in an ideal sense, for the human being who reaches full development has in a very real sense become an integral part of the world, and in turn, the world has become an integral part of him.

VII. "You shall not commit adultery (verse 13)."

In the Old Testament "adultery" does not mean not looking at another man or woman; it does not mean sinning in your mind. It means a married person having sexual intercourse with some person other than his spouse. It is to be taken very literally

and the commandment is also a forceful one. Elsewhere in the Old Testament, it is stated that adultery is punishable by death to both the parties involved. It should be stated that in Old Testament times, since polygamy was permitted, a married man could have sexual intercourse with an unmarried woman and it was not considered adultery. However, if he had sexual intercourse with a married woman, whether or not he was married, it was considered adultery and was punishable by death for both the man and the woman. Later, in Jewish Law, this was changed, and a married man who had sexual intercourse with even an unmarried woman is guilty of adultery.

The importance of this commandment is concerned with family sanctity and it was considered that remaining sexually faithful to one's partner in marriage added strength to the marriage and to the family, which was very important as a path to the value of life. Writing in 1972, it seems almost difficult to speak directly to that point. Things are changing. People are talking about the family unit dying out and being replaced by greater things. It is an entirely new world and things that seemed important fifteen years ago, no longer seem so important to many people. In Old Testament days, it

was important that a woman remain faithful to her husband so that her children's lineage be known and so that the children would be able to inherit that which was rightfully theirs upon the death of their father. A man wanted to know whether or not he was raising his own children. Perhaps men still do want to know that, but today, we have the Pill. A woman need become pregnant only if she wants to become pregnant. Today, we have abortions, and as everybody knows, it is a woman's right to choose. Today, too, we have the very growth engendering concept that if someone can find fulfillment in a "love relationship" which happens to be extra-marital, would it not be very selfish and immature of the spouse to object to his partner getting that fulfillment?

We also have the highest divorce rate in the history of mankind, but I am told that divorce is also growth engendering. Something within me rebels at all of this and I find that I have to agree with Fromm (1956) that people do not know what love is, and that they no longer know what fulfillment is. Although I do not want to go into a long intellectual discussion of this subject, I will quote Frankl (1967) where he says that all too often sex functions as a cheap escape from those

philosophical and existential and psychological problems and challenges by which we are besieged in an age like ours.

However, it would appear to me that very much like the commandment concerning the Sabbath, this one is met by people in our civilization with a great deal of ambivalence and the reason for this ambivalence is the very same. The commandment speaks to all levels of Maslow's hierarchy, which means it speaks to all levels of ourselves and to almost all people. We want to keep the commandment and yet we are afraid of it, and that fear comes out in the tremendous rebellion against it.

It fits well with the physiological needs because while prohibiting sex outside of the marital situation, it implies that sex is a part of the marriage situation. Indeed, there are many rules and laws in the Old Testament concerning sexual intercourse, some of which are extremely culture bound and may seem very outdated at this time. However, the spirit of these laws is not that sexual intercourse is sinful or a bad thing; on the contrary, it is a very good thing within the prescriptions set down. Therefore, by implication, the seventh commandment is saying that the sex

need be satisfied, but within the framework of a legally constituted marriage.

It also speaks to the Safety needs because it is there as a protective device for the family. As was stated above, it was believed that fidelity adds strength and endurance to a marriage and a family. Knowing that the family is there breeds a feeling of security. It also adds some order to the world. The family is an institution one can come home to and find his place in. Indeed, each member of a family knows exactly what his place is within the family, which is a very secure feeling. Even a low place is better than not knowing any place at all.

It seems obvious as to how this commandment addresses itself to the love needs. Certainly, in a stable family, there is a feeling of belonging by each member. This is not always true in the outside world, but in the stable family, it is. There would be the feeling on the part of a parent in a healthy family that "my children belong with me, no matter what the circumstances are, this is their place." The children would know that that is the feeling on the part of a parent. It would be communicated to them

in many ways. Certainly, they would then feel loved and feel that they were truly a part of this family; that they belonged in it. The very same feeling would exist between the husband and wife. Each would feel that they belonged together; their place is with one another, and nothing in the world, save death, could possibly separate them. Truly all in a healthy family would feel that he is an important part of that unit.

The seventh commandment has a great deal to do with the esteem needs in that by being a part of a healthy family, and this applies mostly to husband and wife, by being one of those who makes the family work and remain intact, he is accomplishing something of vast importance. But it also means that he is able to respect and love another individual within all the ups and downs, and moods, and ailments of the day to day intimate relationship that a marriage entails. His being able to love and respect another through all of that means that he first loves and respects himself (Fromm, 1956).

Having a functional, successful family is also related to the meta-needs or meta-motivations of Maslow. It means allowing and even helping another to fulfill his potential,

while at the same time, you are fulfilling yours. In the ideal sense it means establishing an "I-Thou" relationship with another person. That is, each partner in the marriage is a subject to the other (again in the grammatical sense). Neither of them use the other as we would use a piece of machinery without concern as to what the feelings of the other person happen to be. Each one seeks to enhance the other while at the same time enhancing himself. The two become an "I-Thou primary person (Buber, 1958)" and in a sense then merge into one, but with this merging, each one becomes more uniquely himself (May, 1969). There is a greater awareness and a greater appreciation of the other person and, at the same time, a greater awareness and a greater appreciation of the self.

If there is all of this which admittedly sounds very romanticized, but I am convinced can and does exist, then there would be absolutely no need for adultery. But, if this were universal, and there were indeed no need or desire for adultery, there would also be no commandment against it. An old truism states that acts are not prohibited unless they are first comitted. Perhaps, it was felt that by prohibiting

adultery, one step could be taken to make for the ideal type of marriage described above. Be that as it may, it is my belief that almost universally, people desire that type of marriage and look forward to it. One of the saddest experiences in my life was sitting in the living room of a young divorcee who asked me if I would like to look at her wedding album with her. The thing that struck me in those pictures was the radiance that shone on the faces of both her and her groom. I could not help but think of all the joy, the plans, the hopes of these two young people which were now shattered. The pictures told the story that what these people looked forward to was just that type of merging, I-Thou relationship spoken of above.

But this merging is life. It is very close to reaching the ultimate project of becoming God. This, as was stated earlier, creates fear in people; it creates ambivalence (Maslow, 1967). They want it and at the same time they do not want it because they are afraid of it. It reaches into every part of the self and many people are afraid of experiencing all parts of their selves. The commandment against committing adultery may be interpreted as a value-path toward

the value of life. In this case, life is embodied in marriage, which in its finest sense entails the merging of two individuals into one and as that one into the cosmos, while retaining their own individual identities.

VIII. "You shall not steal (verse 13)."

Traditionally, this commandment has been interpreted to mean a protection for the sanctity of private property. If that is so, then it is indeed a culture-bound commandment. When I was in Israel and lived on a Kibbutz (collective settlement) for several months, one of the things I found most annoying was that nobody seemed to care about my property. If my jacket fell, or someone dropped it off the rack while I was in the dining hall or the social hall, nobody bothered to pick it up. When I questioned members of the kibbutz about this, the answer I received was that it doesn't matter, it can always be cleaned. Indeed, there was a cleaning establishment on the kibbutz where it could be cleaned and if a garment were ruined, it would be replaced just by asking for another. My protestations of, "But it is mine and I don't want it dirty or ruined" were simply not understood. But nobody ever stole anything from anyone else. Even I, as a "rich American"

who had possessions there that nobody else had, never experienced any of my things being missing. When I questioned members of the kibbutz about this, I was told that since they had no concept of private property, stealing something would only mean stealing from themselves and that would be ridiculous. So, there are the two edges of the double edged sword of communal living. I would not like to judge which attitude outweighs which, but it can be seen that there are societies in the western world in which a commandment against stealing is unnecessary.

Hertz (1962) interprets this commandment psychodynamically and says that since private property is gained by industry and intelligence, it is an extension of the human personality. "Any aggression on the property of our neighbor is, therefore, an assault on his human personality (P. 299)." Here is possibly an example of a Jew with more of the Protestant Ethic than most Protestants possess.

I believe that we must accept the traditional interpretation of the commandment; that it was stated in order to protect the private property of individuals and admit that it is culture bound to Old Testament culture, but it is also applicable

to our own culture and society today. We do live in a society that believes in private property and we do want to have some safeguards to protect that which belongs to us. But I am reminded of the beautiful tale about the Hassidic rabbi who was awakened in the middle of the night by the sound of a burglar who was escaping from his house with his silver candlesticks, the only things of monetary value he owned. The rabbi quickly recited a prayer that he and the Almightly declare the candlesticks "ownerless," so that the thief would not be guilty of transgressing one of the Ten Commandments. However, not many of us are of such saintly dispositions and we desire to keep that which is ours.

In Maslow's hierarchy, this eighth commandment would fit in the category of satisfying a safety need. It is obvious that one of the most important aspects of ownership of property is that it helps give the owner a sense of security. It helps to bring order to his world and makes him feel that he has accomplished something, even if his accomplishments are numbered only in the amount of physical items that he possesses. A commandment forbidding others to

take from him that which he possesses is then a safeguard to his security and would fall under the rubric of Safety needs.

By stretching the point a bit further, it might also be said that this commandment can be classified with the esteem needs. Commanding one not to steal means that there is something to be stolen which belongs to someone else. If that property is indeed gained by man's intelligence and industry, as Hertz says, then the possessor of the items, simply by the fact of possessing them gains a certain amount of respect for himself and feelings of success. Once again, I am reminded of Tevye in Fiddler on The Roof singing, "If I were a Rich Man," and all the honors that would come to him through wealth. Interestingly enough, while the song began with the fantasy of all the material things he would have if he were rich, it ended on a spiritual, yet pitiful note. He would have a seat on the Eastern Wall of the synagogue. Traditionally, synagogues were built with the ark containing the Torah on the Eastern wall so that it would be closer to Jerusalem. Only the most highly esteemed men of the community were given seats in the place of honor. Esteem was usually measured by scholarship in small Jewish

Communities, but Tevye recognized that it could be bought by money also. He would be asked questions even too difficult for a rabbi to answer and it wouldn't matter whether or not his answers were correct, because when you are rich nobody cares. But, and here is the real dream, he would be able to spend his days studying the holy books, "And that's the sweetest thing of all." That was also the way he could earn true esteem and there was his conflict. He needed wealth in order to have the time to study and become learned, and that would bring him esteem. Today, we need the time to study and become professionals which helps us get the money with which to buy the material things that bring us esteem. Somewhere, something is a little bit backwards. I think I like Tevye's way better. At any rate, stealing a man's possessions can certainly be seen as robbing him of his esteem also, in many cases.

Not stealing is a value-path because it does not isolate one from the community of mankind. In our day, we know that larceny is punishable by imprisonment. It is not necessary to examine all the implications of imprisonment at this time. Certainly, the newspapers are full enough of what it does to

man. But the story does not end there. Even after the thief's crime is paid for and he is released, he always bears the stigma of being an ex-convict which means he frequently cannot find a job, cannot join the community of mankind and is an isolate.

In the Old Testament times, it meant either being physically removed from the community, going into slavery for a certain number of years, or having to repay the theft in a manner that was often very shameful. In either era, present or Old Testament, the punishment for theft was a type of isolation from the community that meant spiritual or psychological death.

IX. "You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor (verse 13)."

This commandment prohibits not only perjury in a court of law, lying in general, but also slander of any type. Insofar as it is so far reaching in meaning, it is a most important commandment. There is an old Hebrew saying that "Life and death are in the hands of the tongue." There is much truth to that. It would be impossible to say how many careers, lives, homes, and families have been ruined because

of slander, but once more, this is a commandment more honored in the breach than in the practice. The reasons for this are probably the same as were found for the very commonly broken fourth commandment concerning the Sabbath.

Because this commandment is phrased in the negative, I will examine it from the point of view of those who suffered from the consequences of being the targets of the "false witness" or slander. It is the type of commandment that recognizes that people do live in a society and can be punished by that society through no fault of their own. Therefore, this commandment is more for the preservation of value-paths for the victims than for the transgressors.

In Maslow's scheme, all levels of the hierarchy are involved; physiological needs because when a man is the victim of slander, he often finds it difficult, if not impossible to find work, which makes it impossible to sustain himself. He goes hungry; he may lose his home; he may lose his family. All the various components needed to satisfy the physiological needs are taken from him including food, shelter, sexual outlets and all the rest.

Likewise, the safety needs are imperilled. The security

he once knew crumbles as he loses his position. The order and stability that were part of his world, and indeed helped make his world a safer place to inhabit are slowly diminished. The result is fright and anxiety.

The love needs are no longer being satisfied. He finds that one by one his friends desert him. The social realm he once inhabited is no longer a friendly place to him. There is no place to which he belongs. He is not a part of anything. He becomes very much alone.

His esteem needs are not satisfied. While he may have been successful and felt successful, he no longer does. He has lost station in life and all the familiar symbols of his success are disappearing one by one. While he may have been a man of great self respect, he finds it more and more difficult to muster up that self respect, because he may not even be aware of what is happening. He knows that things have changed and people no longer respond to him in the manner in which they did in the past, but he may not know why.

If he was a self-actualizing person and meta-motivated, he is no longer. We know that in Maslow's hierarchy the lower needs must be fairly well satisfied before the higher needs

become pre-potent. When a man is concerned with feeding himself, he is not interested in "truth, beauty and justice." As Maslow (1967) remarks, "the religionist, fostering spiritual values, had better start with food, shelter, roads, etc. which are more basic than sermons (p. 116)." Or, I believe it was "Mack, the Knife," who said, "First feed our face, then teach us right and wrong."

The above horror story, which is much more common than many of us realize may have all begun just because somebody said, "I think I saw John with Mr. Jones' wife last night," which may or may not have been true, and if true may have been very innocent. It could have also begun more maliciously with a co-worker of John's deliberately lying to the boss in an innocent fashion and asking, "Why did John take home those classified designs last night?" In either case, it was slander which really ruined the life of a human being.

If I were to theorize in what order the downfall of the man would take place, I think it would be almost a reversal of the hierarchy. First, his esteem needs would no longer be satisfied, then his meta-motivation would disappear, then

the satisfaction of love, safety and physiological, in that order. The reason why I reversed self-actualization and esteem is because I think that as long as the esteem needs are still satisfied, the individual can still be "meta-motivated." Once esteem is gone, the meta-motivation follows very swiftly on its heels.

In my approach to the Old Testament, this commandment certainly protects many value-paths of the members of society in that if the commandment were not broken, these value-paths would remain open to people and they could approach the value of a full psychological, physical, and spiritual life. The value is, of course, life, and the value-path is not putting stumbling blocks in the way of those who are trying to approach the value and allowing them to go on any of the many value-paths open to them in their quest for the value that makes life truly worth living--life.

X. "You shall not covet your neighbor's house; you shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his man-servant or his maid-servant, or his ox, or his ass, or anything that belongs to your neighbor (verse 14)."

This commandment does not mean that we shall not want

things that belong to other people. If that were the meaning of the commandment, then it would have the power of telling us that we should not wish to better ourselves. Why should we not want a house as good as that of our neighbor? The force of the Hebrew word translated as "covet" is much stronger than that. It means to "lust after;" it means an unhealthy single-minded drive to get that which does not belong to us. It does not mean, however, that we should not lust after wisdom or truth and beauty. The commandment speaks of material things and tells us that it is these that we must not lust after. To get them is not bad, if we also are able to obtain spiritual things. The story is told of the young man who is being interviewed for a position by one of the legendary, self-made millionaires in American folk-lore. During the course of the interview in that very plush office, the young man says to the aging tycoon, "You are one of the men in this country I admire the most. Every time I think of how you started with nothing and by your own sheer will and effort finally achieved the position you are now in, my heart fills with admiration." "It is really not difficult," replied the old man, "if that is the

only thing you do."

It is that type of lusting which the commandment warns us against in all its examples, except for the moral one concerning lusting after your neighbor's wife. The interpretation os the commandment that I propose then is not that it is in reality a negative one, but its impact is positive. It is a very spiritual commandment telling us that material things should not occupy so central a place in our minds and desires. We should leave room for the non-material or the spiritual.

This commandment would be telling us to take heed of Maslow's meta-motivations, to be interested in truth, beauty and justice. It is saying very much like Maslow, that "the spiritual life is part of our biological life--the highest part, but part." Perhaps too much time is spent on our acquisitions and our desire for more acquisitions, and not enough time is spent with spiritual matters. Certainly, the man who is lusting after his neighbor's house, or dish washer, or automobile can have very little energy left for concern with truth, beauty and justice. Those things are vague and they do not get you anywhere, anyway. Such a man

would have little time or energy to spend in appreciating his family, his friends, his surroundings, or just being. Such a man is a driven man and it is doubtful that he could even satisfy his love and esteem needs, not to mention the meta-needs. He could not feel a sense of belonging because to him there would be nothing to which it would be worthwhile to belong, except perhaps in order to make contacts for business. He cannot feel successful because he never feels that he has "made it." He is never satisfied. There is always more that he lusts after and feels he must obtain. There is no such thing as success for such a man. This commandment is saying, "stop lusting, stop running, just be." It belongs well with Maslow's conception of metamotivation.

In my interpretation, it is also a value-path, and becomes one by enumerating those ways which are not value-paths. It is saying that one who lusts after material things cannot be on a value-path, for material possessions alone to not lead to life. Life is not made of only material things. Life is made of unification of all things, material, spiritual, psychological, philosophical, etc., and all these entities cannot be unified with the individual as part of the unification, if

he is not willing to recognize all of them, appreciate all of them, and possibly most important, stand still for a while and just be with all of them.

In this psycho-theological interpretation of the Decalogue, I have attempted to understand the commandments in light of the nature of the society in which they were first promulgated and I have also tried to show their meaning for the present. Some of them were translated differently from the usual English translations that we take for granted, and some were translated in almost the identical words that can be found in any Bible. In every case, I have tried as best I could to remain faithful to the spirit of the Hebrew wording and meaning of the Hebrew terminology. My interpretation of some of the commandments was new and perhaps a bit radical. Others were interpreted no differently from where the traditional interpretations have stood for centuries. Virtue was not seen in the ability to change meanings and be new and different. Virtue was seen in the attempt to illuminate these very important precepts in a manner that would retain their own spirit and hopefully help people of this age understand them from the vantage point of our own times. In

all cases the medieval commentaries of Rashi, Nahmanides, S'forno, and Ibn Ezra were consulted as was the more modern commentary of Hertz.

It should be made very explicit that I approached this task from two very strong biases. One was the bias of Judaism and the other was the bias of humanistic psychology. Both of these biases merge within me, and I have managed to incorporate them as a unity within me. No claim of completely objectivity can be made. Religion is a very important part of me, humanistic psychology is a very important part of me, and most important in me, is Judaism. I have been very greatly involved in these interpretations, and so while they are by no means objective, they are me and they are true insofar as I am able to be true to myself. As a man of my times, I have also utilized insights from classical philosophy, existentialism, both philosophical and psychological, psychology, anthropology, and sociology. It was my hope that these insights, far from diminishing the impact of the Old Testament, would increase it.

Chapter VII

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study has been to add a new dimension to the psychological study of religion. It was found that in the past, psychologists studied religion either from a view of defending or attacking it. Much emphasis was also placed upon "individual" religion and individual experiences of a religious nature. Frequently, these experiences were reduced to "nothing but" phenomena and the "individual" religion type of studies frequently looked upon these religious interpretations as idiosyncratic. In general, it was concluded that the psychological study of religion in the past, while being interesting and admirable in the methodological and scientific construction of the studies, was virtually incomprehensible to the laymen, and many professionals in the field of religion, as well, and did not address itself to the needs of western man.

My own starting point was based upon the growing concern evidenced in the literature of the humanistic school of psychology in the question of values. It was also based upon

my own observations of society today which seems to be groping for some value system and unable to find one. At the same time, there is a growing concern in both of these places with the study of religion. Among the humanistic psychologists, there is a desire to admit more religious data into the field of psychology for scientific study. Among laymen, the tremendous interest in the occult that seems to be growing day by day, I see as a search for some meaning in an apparently meaningless world. I could not help but wonder whether religion, even in antiquity, did not see the world as meaningless and absurd, and set about to put some meaning and structure into the world. If this were so, then would not the answers that religion found and advanced exist in the officially accepted texts of religion and not in "individual" religion or idiosyncratic religious experiences? My next question was that if indeed these answers are embedded in the official texts of religion, would we not have to consider them as values by which men were advised to live? If again, the answer were found to be in the affirmative, then I must discover the values and ask whether they would be applicable to western civilization in

the twentieth century.

With all this in mind I began a journey that led me through the religious records of antiquity, philosophical thought, sociology, anthropology, Biblical criticisms and scholarship, and psychology. For the purpose of this study, I decided to rely on the Old Testament as the basis of religious thought because it is the Old Testament which is accepted as sacred literature by the two major religious groups in western society. Furthermore, because Christianity interprets much of the Old Testament as prophecies validating the teachings of the New Testament, I decided to focus most of my concentration on the Ten Commandments or Decalogue, which is accepted as paramount in both of these religious groups.

It soon became apparent that one of the basic conflicts in our society involves that of science and religion. Yet on closer examination, it was found that the two do not differ to as great an extent as commonly thought. In general, it is a semantic difference. Both religion and science use symbols to convey their meanings. In science, the symbols may be mathematical or present themselves in the style of

various formulas such as Einstein's famous $E=MC^2$, which is completely incomprehensible to the uninitiated. In religion, the symbols generally take the form of the language of mythology, or ritual, or law, which is also incomprehensible to the uninitiated. In both, the symbols represent universal truths or values. In both, science and religion, there are people who assume different but complementary roles, which I have called the prophet and the priest. The priest translates the visions of the prophets into a form that can be used by the people. The danger is that the form becomes functionally autonomous, and the message of the prophet is forgotten. I believe that this has happened in both science and religion. However, in science, the form or technology is continually updated and remains useful. In religion, the form--myth, ritual, and law have stagnated to a large degree, and they no longer are important to the western world. But, in both cases, mankind has been left in a "value vacuum."

Humanistic psychologists are the people in science who are presently taking the initiative in trying to recover and discover values that may be meaningful for mankind.

Therefore, it was important to examine humanistic psychology in some detail. In order to understand the humanistic movement in psychology from an historical perspective, existentialism and existential psychology, as antecedents to humanistic psychology were examined. The philosophies of Heidegger, Sartre, Buber, Tillich and Rosenzweig served as the basis for this examination. It was found that all of them, because of their interest in existence or being were moved to an interest in non-being or death. But a common denominator among them, even the most pessimistic of them, was that they seemed to place the greatest value on the existence of the individual, or life, itself. This was found to be true of the humanistic psychologists, also. It is important to repeat that by "life" is meant not only physical existence, but a full psychological existence of awareness of both internal and external stimuli, and an ability to merge the self with all of these forces and to feel at one with them, while at the same time, retaining the self's unique individuality.

The psychological literature concerning values was then examined and many definitions of values were found. It became

obvious that the psychologists, themselves are groping to find a way to deal with values, and perhaps even deeper than that, they are groping to find what value really means. Basing my own feelings on my research of the Old Testament and on the philosophy of the existentialists and some of the existential psychologists, and on my own reaction to what I was finding, I decided that the one who came closest to enunciating a universal, eternal value was Carl Rogers in his description of the infant's evaluating process of placing a positive value on that which is life maintaining or life enhancing. This is precisely much of the message of the Old Testament statement. "And you shall choose life." But juxtapposed to that in the Old Testament is the possibility that we may choose death which led me to believe that there is a value for death in the Old Testament side by side with the value for life. This very same way of thought is found in the existentialists who insist upon our preoccupation with death as an essential part of life. Likewise, Freud (1961) appears to have been writing and theorizing with very great insight in his insistence that the life and death instincts were essential to the functioning of the organism.

For the purposes of this study, I have concentrated on the value of life, but because death is its opposite, and therefore, it may be somewhat confusing as to how it, too, may be a value, a few words must be written about it. The Old Testament, Tillich (1952), Bugental (1967), Lepp (1968), Freud (1961), Sartre (1969), and others all consider death as a most important part of human existence and believe that life and death coexist in the human being, or in the case of the existentialists, in Being. The Old Testament, as was discussed, had to give a place of prominence to the Tree of Life and make it inaccessable to humanity, thereby assuring us of death and the value of death. It has become my belief that man cannot live life fully unless part of his life is directed toward life and part toward death. The value-paths that lead toward death are those which are concerned with ideals and causes for which we fight and devote much energy. True, these causes, if good, help assure a better life for us and for many others, but they are the things for which men die in order to attain. The life value-paths are those which lead to a full relationship with another person or persons. By a full relationship, I am referring to

Buber's (1958) concept. I believe that Freud hinted toward the same concept in writing "the man who is predominantly erotic will give first preference to his emotional relationships with other people (Freud, 1961, p. 83)." It is important to note that when Freud used the word "erotic" in this particular essay, he was using it as the adjective of "Eros," the life instinct. In short, then, it is those value-paths that lead to relationships that are the life value-paths and those that lead to ideals and causes that are the death value-paths. A relationship is something we live for, a cause is something we would die for!

Once again, I point to Fiddler on the Roof for an example of what is being said. Fiddler is so excellent an example because it is familiar to almost everybody. It does not get particularly "heady" about religion, and basically, it is the story of man living his Old Testament. And, indeed, in this case, it was very much his Old Testament as can be seen by the frequent misquotations Tevye was so fond of uttering. Here I am referring to the marriages of Tevye's three older daughters. Each one broke with "tradition" in her marriage. Tradition, in this case, is seen as the "cause" for which a

man would die. In the instances of two of his daughters, Tevye rationalized away the tradition and chose the relationship. His choice was for life. In the third case, of Havah, marrying outside her faith, Tevye was torn between the relationship and the tradition, but finally (and not so finally), in a very dramatic outburst excalimed, "No! There is no other hand!" This may not be seen as a value-path leading toward death until we recall that when his wife came weeping to him about Havah's marriage, Tevye said that Havah is dead to them. At the end, when Tevye said, "May God be with you," inaudibly to Havah and her husband, his choice was again for relationship and life. I found the deep, heart rending struggle between life and death dramatically brought to life in that sequence.

I would be willing to go so far as to guess (the guess implies a hope and a desire to research this subject thoroughly at a later date) that the phenomenal growth of groups is tied in with the value-paths leading to life, because in those groups the great emphasis is on relationship. I would also guess that the value-paths most prevalent in western civilization today are those which lead toward death because their

emphasis is not on relationship, but on ideals and causes. The quotation by Skinner on page twenty-two of this essay provides a salient example of those value-paths with which nobody can argue because they are all good, but no mention of a relationship with emotion is mentioned. From this comes the "valuelessness" some speak of, the "alienation," the "meaninglessness," the "anomie," or any other labels we wish to give the prevalent restlessness in society today. We are living half lives. We indeed have something to die for, but very few of use have something that we can live for. In a large measure, this is the reason for my decision to concentrate almost exclusively on the life value.

If life is indeed one of the two values of the Old Testament, then the values of the Old Testament are found and quite logically, all of our problems in this area should be solved. Unfortunately they are not. The question, problem, and quest is for a way of achieving life. I became aware that this is one of the main things the Old Testament is about, and through the medium of values, is a method of studying the Old Testament that may have great meaning to twentieth century man. To my knowledge, it is a new approach to religion which

may take the study of religion out of the realm of an interesting anthropological exercise and capture the heart of central man. It is just this "capturing" that humanistic and existential psychologists see lacking, and perhaps a void can be filled. One of the underlying values is life as defined above and the Old Testament has its ways of conveying methods to us by which to approach that type of life. It is an existential reality that we never achieve it, and never can; for if we do, we become God, which is not only impossible, but also undesirable.

I divided the methods used in the Old Testament into three broad categories which I called "Mythology," "Ritual," and "Law." Upon examination of samples of each of the three categories, the underlying value was indeed found to be life. But there was always another element that was quite salient. This was a "map" marking out a way of approaching life or Being. That we do not immediately recognize these maps or paths may say a great deal about how distant from ourselves we have really begun to live. According to Richardson (1971), Heidegger saw people as "ek-sistent beings radically open to Being (p. 126)." Apparently, we are not so open to Being as the maps seem to be hidden from us. For these maps, I chose

the name "value-paths" since they are paths leading toward the value.

There are possibly an infinite number of value-paths that can be taken in order to approach life, just as there are possibly an infinite number of ways of achieving a relationship that is good and strong and becomes a primary one. The Bible enumerates many of these paths, but doubtlessly, not all. Each value-path is indeed a path, a road taking its own way in its approach to life. Some are fairly straight, some are winding and have more curves, some take sharp turns, some veer to the right and some over to the left, and as such, all of them are irreducible. Each one is unique and cannot be broken into pieces. It becomes apparent now, that the various definitions of values worked out by others in the field are quite different from the values that I found in the Old Testament. They may bear some similarity to what I have termed value-paths. However, I see only harm in attempting to define and reduce these concepts any further. Bonner (1965) may have been transmitting the very same message concerning man in his title On Being Mindful of Man, which is doubtlessly from Psalms VIII, "O Lord,

what is man that you are mindful of him..." In the psalms, no attempt is made to define man except that he is little lower than the angels. Maslow comes close, also, toward this very same idea in discussing his meta-motivations when he says that there does seem to be some underlying principle or value that motivates self-actualizing people. He is also very explicit in stating that the meta-motivations are biologically rooted in the individual, the same as are the "lower needs" he has worked out in his hierarchy.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs was seen to be a potentially excellent model to be used in this study. Therefore I presented it with a fairly detailed explanation of what the hierarchy means and worked out an example of how it may be employed in analyzing a life situation of a human being.

I then examined each of the Ten Commandments which are found in Exodus (the Decalogue is repeated in Deuteronomy with some minor changes) and explained and interpreted each one. At the same time, I attempted to show how the value-paths embedded in each of them fit into the various levels of Maslow's hierarchy of needs and how the prescriptive element

of the commandment satisfied the particular need in question.

During the course of this study, several hypotheses worthy of empirical testing came to light and have been so designated. Indeed, one of the purposes of this study was to discover such hypotheses and it is hoped that I and others will follow these and possibly discover more that have thus far gone unexplored.

Another purpose of this study was to discover whether the values of the Old Testament are tenable and workable in present day society. The conclusion reached is that the value dealt with is life, and indeed, that is the quest of modern man just as it was the quest of Old Testament man. The question then must be rephrased to read, "Are the value-paths of the Old Testament tenable and workable in present day society?" I believe that some are and some are not, and that many which are would have to be reworked and given new form. Perhaps what I mean can be understood more easily by saying that the old value-paths may have to be modernized into new super-highways. One of the most far reaching value-paths is that of the Sabbath Day. I explained earlier how following this commandment helps us approach life very closely.

But it cannot be expected that twentieth century man is going to refrain from riding in an elevator in order to observe the Sabbath. Nor is he going to put away his wrist watch on the Sabbath day. But I certainly see the importance of the Sabbath from the value-path point of view and I can envision the psychologist and the religionist working together to discover ways in which the Sabbath can become important to mankind. I can also envision that these ways would be in keeping with the spirit of the value-path and would also be understandable and acceptable to modern man.

What I am envisioning, and in fact hoping for, is a reestablishment of the working relationship between the prophet and the priest. It does not matter who takes which role in this relationship. There would be times that the religionist is prophet and the psychologist is priest; and there would be times when their roles would be reversed, and possibly times when one man is both. But of the utmost importance is that the channels of communication be open for them and neither be too proud or too ashamed to ask for help from the other. It is possible that this message was given in the Old Testament in the myth of Moses at the burning

bush, when he tried to evade God's call to speak to the pharoah ("nothing but" a Jonah Complex?) by saying that his speech was unintelligible. God told him that Aaron would do his talking for him. From the prophet-priest orientation developed here, it would mean that pharaoh could not understand Moses' visions because Moses was a prophet. Aaron could communicate them to pharoah because he was a priest. Being a priest, he could also understand Moses.

It must also be remembered that there are segments of society for whom the old traditional interpretations serve very well. It would be an injustice to attempt to sway them to our point of view which they may never comprehend. This is especially true since the point of view presented here depends heavily on viewing God as "existence." Those who wish or need to retain the concept of a "personal god" would not be able to subscribe to so radical (yet traditional) a concept.

The final purpose of this study was to see if it is possible to approach the psychological study of religion from a value orientation. In a sense, this study has been

an experiment, because I was not only trying to discover if it could be done, but I chose to make that discovery by attempting to do it. My own answer to this question is that the value-orientation approach to the psychological study of religion is indeed a valid one. There is no doubt that I am answering this question quite subjectively, but subjectivity is not a vice in a study of this nature. I have achieved a new and deeper, and I believe, truer understanding of the Old Testament during the course of this study; by trying to understand it by means of a value approach. My appreciation of the greatness and magnitude of the Old Testament has deepened, and my esteem for the wisdom of its authors has become intensified.

If some of these results are found in the reader also, then I would consider this experiment to have shown significance at a level of confidence far beyond my greatest dream. In the final analysis, the measure of significance is man, and what is man? He is "nothing but" everything.

References

Albright, W.F. From the stone age to Christianity. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1957.

Alfven, H. Antimatter and cosmology. Scientific American, 1967, 216 (4), 106-114.

Allport, G.W. The individual and his religion. New York: MacMillan, 1950.

Allport, G.W. The person in psychology. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Allport, G.W., P.E. Vernon, & G. Lindzey. Study of values manual. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960

Altizer, T.J. & W. Hamilton. Radical theology and the death of god. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966

Arsenian, S. Changes in evaluative attitudes during four years of college. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1943, 27, 338-349.

Arsenian, S. Change in evaluative attitude during twenty-five years. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1970, 54, 302-304.

Baillie, J. The roots of religion in the human soul. New York: Doran, 1926.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966

Bakan, D. On method: toward a reconstruction of psychological investigation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967

Bakan, D. Sigmund Freud and the Jewish mystical tradition. Princeton: D. Van Nostrend, 1958

Bender, J.E. Changes in religious interest: a retest after fifteen years. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 1958, 57, 41-46.

Bennis, W.G. Patterns and vicissitudes in t-group development. In L.P. Bradford, J.R. Gibb, and K.D. Benne (eds), T-group theory and laboratory method. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967, 248-278.

Bion, W.R. Experiences in groups. New York: Basic Books, 1961.

Bonner, H. On being mindful of man. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1965.

Borowitz, E. A layman's introduction to religious existentialism. New York: Delta, 1966.

Buber, M. Eclipse of God. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Buber, M. I and thou. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

Bugental, J.F.T. (ed.) Challenges of humanistic psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Bugental, J.F.T. The search for authenticity. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Buhler, C. The course of human life, New York: Springer, 1968.

Buhler, C. Human life goals in the humanistic perspective. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1967, Spring, 36-52.

Bultmann, R. Kerygma and myth. R.H. Fuller (trans.), London: Billing & Sons, 1960.

Campbell, J. The masks of god: creative mythology. New York: Viking, 1968.

Campbell, J. The masks of god: primitive mythology. New York: Viking, 1970.

Chasin, B.H. Value orientations and attitudes toward death. Dissertation Abstract, 1968, 29 (6-A), 1963.

Cohen, A.M. A personal communication, 1970

Cohen, A.M. Return to innocence. Unpublished manuscript, 1971.

Cross, H.J., R.M. Doost, J.J. Tracy, A study of values among hippies. Proceedings, 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1970, 449-500.

Dewey, J. A common faith. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.

Dukes, W.F. Psychological studies of values. Psychological Bulletin, 1955, 52, 24-50.

Festinger, L., H.W. Rieken Jr., S. Schachter, When prophecy fails. Minneapolis: University of Minn. Press, 1956.

Frankl, V.E., Self transcendence as a human phenomenon. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1966, Fall, 97-106.

Frankl, V.E., Man's search for meaning. New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Freud, S. Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud. J. Strackey (ed.). London: Hogarth Press, 23 volumes.

Volume XIX, the ego and the id. 1961.

Volume XXI, Future of an illusion: Civilization and its discontents, 1961.

Volume XXIII, Moses and monotheism, 1964.

Volume XXII, New introductory lectures, 1964.

Fromm, E. The art of loving. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Fromm, E. You shall be as gods. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966.

Glatzer, N. Franz Rosenzweig his life and thought. New York: Schocken, 1953.

Goffman, E. Interaction ritual: essays on face to face behavior. Garden City: Anchor, 1967.

Goldin, H.E. Code of Jewish law. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1927.

Goodenough, E.R. The psychology of religious experience. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Gordis, R. Koheleth - the man and his world. New York: Block Publishing, 1955.

Hertz, J.H. (ed.) The authorized daily prayer book. New York: Block Publishing, 1961.

Hertz, J.H. (ed.) The pentateuch and haftorahs. London: Soncino Press, 1962.

Heschel, A.J. God in search of man. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1959.

Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society; 1955.

Huxley, A. Introduction in Prabhavands, S. & C. Isherwood, (trans.), the Bhagavad - gita. New York: Mentor, 1944.

James, W. The varieties of religious experience. New York: MacMillan, 1970.

Jensen, A.R. How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, (1), 1-123.

Jones, E. The life and work of Sigmund Freud. New York: Basic Books, 1953, three volumes.

Kadushin, M. The rabbinic mind. New York: the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952.

King James Version. The Holy Bible. New York: World Publishing, N.D.

Kinsey, A.C. Sexual behavior in the human female. New York: Pocket Books, 1965.

Kluckhohn, C. Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E.A. Shils (ed.) Toward a general theory of action. Cambridge: Addison Wesley, 1951, 388-433.

Krasner, L. Behavior modification - values and training. In C.M. Franks (ed.). Behavior therapy: appraisal and status. New York: McGraw - Hill, 1969.

L'Abate, L. A personal communication. 1972.

Lepp, I. Death and its mysteries. B. Murchland (trans.) New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Lowe, C.M. Value orientations: an ethical dilemma. The American Psychologist, 1959, 14, 687-693.

Maslow, A.H. Comments on Dr. Frankl's paper. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1966, Fall, 107-112.

Maslow, A.H. Religions, values, and peak experiences. New York: Viking, 1970.

Maslow, A.H. A theory of metamotivation: the biological rooting of the value-life. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1967, 7, (2), 93-127.

Maslow, A.H. Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1968.

Masters, W.H. & Johnson, V.E. Human sexual response. Boston: Little-Brown, 1966.

May, R. Existence: a new dimension is psychiatry and psychology. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1967.

May, R. Love and will. New York: W.W. Norton, 1969.

Mikraot G'dolot. New York: Pardes Publishing, 1951.

Miller, A. Death of a salesman. New York: Viking, 1958.

Morris, C. Varieties of human value. Chicago: University Press, 1956.

Murchland B. Introduction to I. Lepp, Death and its mysteries. New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Oden, T.C. The structure of awareness. Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1969.

Perls, F. R.E. Hefferline & P. Goodman, Gestalt therapy. New York: Dell, 1951.

Plato, Dialogues of Plato, J.D. Kaplan (ed.), New York: Washington Square Press, 1951.

Polanyi, M. Personal knowledge: towards a post-critical philosophy, New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

Pruyser, P.W. Some trends in the psychology of religion. Journal of Religion, 1960, 40, 113-129.

Richardson, W.J. Humanism and existential psychology. In T.C. Greening (ed.) Existential Humanistic psychology. Belmont, Cal: Brooks/Cole: 1971, 122-133.

Robinson, J.M. The later Heidigger and theology. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Rogers, C. On becoming a person: a therapists view of psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.

Rogers, C. Therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In S. Koch (ed.), Psychology: a study of a science. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Rokeach, M. Values and public opinion research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1968-1969, 32, 547-559.

Royce, J.R. Metamorphic knowledge and humanistic psychology. In J.F.T. Bugental (ed.), Challenges of humanistic psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Sartre, J.P. Being and nothingness. H.E. Barnes (trans.) New York: Washington Square Press, 1969.

Sartre, J.P. Existential psychoanalysis, H.E. Barnes (trans.), R. May, Introduction, Chicago: Henry Regency Co., 1962.

Schauss, H. Guide of Jewish holy days. New York: Schocken, 1964.

Scholem, G. Major trends in Jewish mysticism. New York: Schocken, 1954.

Scneidman, E.S. The enemy. Psychology Today, 1970, 4, 3

Sherif, M. Intergroup conflict and cooperation: the robbers' cave experiment. Norman: University Book Exchange, 1961.

Skinner, B.F. The behavior of organisms: an experimental analysis. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1938.

Skinner, B.F. Beyond freedom and dignity. New York: Alfred and Knopf, Inc., 1971.

Smith, M.B. Social psychology and human values. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Spranger, E. Psychologic des jugendalters. Quelle and Meyer, 1925.

Stace, W.T. The teachings of the mystics. New York: Mentor, 1960.

Tillich, P. The courage to be. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952.

Tillich, P. The shaking of the foundations. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Van Kaam, A. Existential foundations of psychology. New York: Image Books, 1969.

Weisskopf, W.A. Existential crisis and the unconscious. Manas, 1963, 16, 49.

Whitely, R.L. A study of the Allport-Vernon test for personal values. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1933, 28, 6-13

Wolpe, J. & A.A. Lazarus. Behavior therapy techniques. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1966.

Zusne, L. Metaphysical parallels of the study of values. The Psychological Record, 1965, 15, 537-543.