

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24

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

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

John: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

John: Exactly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

John: Exactly.

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

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

is. Adaptation, the process of growing up, is the process of an individual beginning to learn to use these balances that the ⁶⁰³⁷⁸PAS talks about as E-I, R-F, U-A, and to use them effectively and efficiently. And part of the way that you do it, you've got to recognize in a way, I am too R. I don't know that I mean that one recognizes it as a child in terms of this, but the experience in terms of this, the things that happen to him because he is R, he has to make and recognize some kind of an adaptation. He has to feel a certain amount of guilt and a certain amount of shame because he is one way. Therefore he tries to be another way. Now if you're in an ambivalent state in terms of this, you are likely to end up being guilty either way. I mean you don't know what you are supposed to do, in a sense. That's the conflict, the ambivalence, there's another word -- complacent. I would say, for example, a characteristic of any of an XYZ there is likely to be some kind of complacency present, either complacency, confusion, conflict, all of these things can happen.

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

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

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

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

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

John: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

cheeks which again is a different manifestation of this business of touching, but the Soviet is still in terms of the men traditionally 00382 when they meet, they don't just shake hands, they kiss on the lips. This is a very hard thing in American society, still in terms of this is the idea of men kissing -- women can kiss each other.

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

John: Yes.

Walter: Like ours?

John: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Walter: I think when you have crowding:

1) each person gets less space.

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

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