

## ASPECTS OF THE HIGHER EVOLUTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL

### Lecture 86; the Question of Psychological Types

Friends.

We all know that in the course of our lives we meet, from time to time, very many people. We meet them in our homes, we meet them in the street, meet them in our office maybe, factory, workshop. Meet them when we go on holiday, meet them when we go for recreation and so on in this way we come into contact, more or less close contact with all sorts and conditions of men and women. And if we are really observant, if we go around with our eyes open, or at least relatively open, we shall begin to notice various things about the people with whom we come in contact, the people that we meet. We may for instance notice that they're all different, notice that they're all even physically different. They may all be built in the same sort of way, they may all have a single trunk and two legs and two arms, two feet, two hands, one head. It doesn't seem very imaginative, but despite this lack of imagination on the part of nature, despite this very standard pattern, this very standard equipment, we notice that they are all different. At the same time we notice too that in very many ways both physically, psychologically, morally, spiritually, they're very much alike. In fact they may be all the same.

And further than that we notice that people are both all the same and at the same time all completely different. We notice in fact as we move about, that people seem to fall quite naturally without any sort of forcing, into a number of groups. Into a number of groups, the members of which have certain characteristics, certain qualities, certain features, in common. And it's as though as we start sort of thinking about it and reflecting upon it, it's as though the members of these various groups were related to one another very much in the same way that the members of a single biological family are related to one another. They bear a sort of family resemblance to one another. And pursuing this train of thought we may say that we've all had the experience for instance of reading a book, say reading a novel - it may be some great classic of the past or it may be a comparatively modern novel - and in the novel there are various characters, various personages. Sometimes they're very well described, sometimes very vividly described. And every now and then when we read in this way and make the acquaintance of these characters in this way, the thought flashes across our minds, 'but I know somebody just like this' or 'I've met somebody just like this'. Who not only looks like that, looks like the person described by the novelist, by the writer, but behaves like that in the sort of situations which the novelist has described that particular character behaving in. And the same sort of thing happens when we actually meet people for the first time. We very often get the sort of feeling, well I haven't met this person before but I sort of know this person, they seem somehow rather familiar, and then it sort of comes home to us that we already know or have known someone very similar to this particular person. And sometimes in both these cases, both these kinds of cases, the resemblance is not just accidental, not just trivial but extends to the whole character structure as it were, so that the whole character structure of the person that we meet as it were in the novel and the person that we meet in the flesh and somebody else that we've known in the past seem pretty much the same, and in such cases of this, when we have experiences of this sort, we very often say that these different people, real and imaginary or imagined, are of the same type.

And if we are particularly observant we may notice that there are some types, certain types that seem to recur, that seem to turn up again and again, not only in literature, not only in fiction, but also in real life, and it's almost as though there's a sort of limited number of these relatively fixed types that we happen to meet, just like the famous case of the stage army in the old days - sometimes you had a play, you had a drama on the boards of the theatre in which there was a great army required, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands of soldiers. So you get them marching across the stage from left to right, left to right, backwards and forwards and you think well there are hundreds, there are thousands of soldiers coming and going on the stage but eventually you realise you seem to recognise them as you come round, you realise it's the same maybe thirty, forty people dressed up as soldiers just going round and round as it were. It's not fresh soldiers coming in all the time, it's the same old batch of soldiers just marching again and again over the stage. So it's very much like that in real life. You begin to realise as it were there's a relatively fixed number of types of people that you encounter.

Now this particular knowledge, this particular understanding is or can be of great practical use because it helps us in dealing with the people that we meet at least to some extent, if we know from certain little signs, certain little indications, the type to which a certain person belongs, and we can very often judge what their reactions, what their response, is likely to be in any given situation. If we say something to them for instance or if something happens to them or if they encounter a certain experience. So if we're able to as it were classify them in this way and as it were almost to predict their behaviour then of course we ourselves will know how to behave with them, how to avoid treading on their pet corns, how to put things across to them, how to anticipate their difficulties or objections and so on.

So in view of all these facts it isn't surprising that the question of what has come to be called psychological types should have been studied with considerable interest from very early times, and it isn't surprising also that this same question, the question of psychological types, is relevant to the subject that we're considering generally in the course of this series of lectures, the subject of the Higher Evolution of the Individual, and that's why we're considering this topic, this question of psychological types, today.

Now I want to begin in an easy, in a simple, in a straightforward manner, by describing some of the theories that have been put forward in this connection, and some of the lists of psychological types that have been drawn up by different people at different times on the basis of the theories. Before doing that though I should observe that the expression 'psychological types' is not the only one in use. This is the one that happens to have been popularised by Jung but there are several others which have been in use and which are still in use. We can speak not only of psychological types, we can also speak of 'personality types' or 'character types'. We can speak too of 'psychosomatic types' and, less technically we can speak simply of 'temperaments'.

Now all these different terms, all these different expressions, have got their own distinctive shades of meaning but we're not concerned with that this evening. For all practical purposes, so far as we're concerned now, all these different meanings more or less approximate. We can comfortably ignore any differences, any finer shades of meaning that there may be.

Now so far as I've been able to discover in ancient times, that is to say in classical times, in Greek and Roman times in the West there was to all intents and purposes only one theory of psychological types and this was known as the theory of the four humours. Humour in this particular context means simply a fluid and according to this particular theory the four humours are blood, phlegm, yellow bile (also known as cholera) and black bile. And according to this theory which originally was a physiological, a medical, theory, all these humours, all four of them enter into the constitution of the human body. They enter into it in different ways, to different extents, and it's the relative proportions in a person's body that determines not only physical health and strength but also according to this theory, temperament.

Now a person with a predominance of blood is said to be according to this theory of 'sanguine' temperament and he can be very easily recognised because he has a ruddy complexion, we are told. A sort of flush of blood to the face, he looks fine and healthy and vigorous as it were. So you very easily recognise this sanguine temperament, and by nature, by temperament as it were he's cheerful and optimistic. He's the sort of person who always hopes for the best rather like Mr. Micawber, always sure that something will turn up, that things will turn out right in the end. But this type of person, this sanguine temperament person even though cheerful and optimistic is not always very persistent. He may get discouraged, he may give up if his efforts do not immediately bear fruit or result in success.

Now a person with a predominance of phlegm in his system is said to be of 'phlegmatic' temperament and he is described by the ancient sources as being sluggish, as being not easily aroused or moved, as being apathetic, but also calm and composed. So one can see there's a positive as well as a negative side here.

Again one with predominance of yellow bile is said to be of a choleric temperament and we're told that he tends to be brunette in complexion, in colouring, with a rather strong, in the case of a man, muscular physique. Such a person, we are further told, is hot tempered, irascible and passionate. This is the choleric type. I can see a few people smiling as if they recognise themselves.

Then we've got the person with the predominance of black bile, a rather unpleasant fluid this. It's said to be acrid and evil smelling. A person with a predominance of black bile is said to be of the melancholic temperament. Such a person tends to be depressed, unhappy, gloomy and rejected, but also, again, serious, thoughtful and even meditative.

Now we can see at once odd or even bizarre though it may seem in some ways, especially from a medical point of view, we can see at once that psychologically at least there's a great deal of truth in this particular classification. We can see that it does correspond to facts, or at least to some of the facts and we might even with the help of this particular theory, this particular classification, be able to classify not only ourselves but even at least some of our friends.

Now the theory of the four humours is of course no longer accepted as scientific physiology but the nomenclature, the terms used - choleric, phlegmatic, melancholic and so on - these are very much still in general use especially in literary use.

Now in modern times in more recent times there have been and there still are many different theories of psychological types. Most of these are associated with psychology, not to say with psychoanalysis. Some

of them are rather suggestive, rather sketchy, not very complete, more of the nature of bright ideas, but others on the other hand are worked out in considerable not to say lavish detail.

Now we've mentioned psychoanalysis so let's begin with Freud. Freud of course is the founding father of psychoanalysis and perhaps the greatest name in the whole field of modern psychology, and Freud as is well known classifies individuals according to the stage of their sexual development and he distinguishes three such stages.

There's what he terms the oral stage, what he terms the anal stage and what he terms the genital stage, and according to Freud in the oral stage it is the mouth of all the organs, all the parts of the body which is the principal source of sensuous pleasure. In the anal stage he says the principal source of sensuous pleasure is the anal region, and in the genital stage it's the genitals or the sexual organs.

Now according to Freud a normal adult, a mature, a psychologically, that is to say sexually mature adult has passed through all these three stages from the oral to the anal and from the anal to the genital. But Freud points out, and here is one of his distinctive contributions again, Freud points out that development, the development of the individual can be arrested at any of the earlier stages. It is possible for the individual to get stuck in the first and the second stages, and one who had remained stuck in the first or oral stage he designates as 'an oral type'. And similarly one who has remained stuck in the second or anal stage designates as 'the anal type' and in this way the three main types of his classification emerge, that is to say the oral, the anal and the genital.

Now it could be objected that these are not true psychological types. Indeed I'm not quite sure if Freud himself specifically referred to them as such. But it is well known that Freud regarded sex as being of great importance in the life, especially the emotional, the psychological life of the individual and he pointed out in a scientific manner, perhaps for the first time in that manner in history, that it is also responsible for a great deal of human happiness and a great deal of human misery. So that we may say the effects of adjustments and maladjustments in this particular sphere extend to almost every other aspect of the total psyche of our whole being.

So therefore according to Freud sexual development proceeds, *pare passu*, with the development of the total personality. Freud would say for instance that one cannot have say an infantile sexuality and a mature adult personality in the psychological sense. So therefore it may be concluded that one is justified in regarding the oral, anal and genital types not just as types of sexual development or behaviour but as psychological types strictly speaking.

Now a number of Freud's followers have put forward their own theories. Some of Freud's followers seem to have exemplified his own teaching about the Oedipus complex and seem to have turned against their founding father in many ways and rejected some of his theories and put forward theories of their own. So it's so with this theory of psychological types as well. Sometimes the followers of Freud give a rather broader, sometimes a rather narrower context for their particular theories of psychological types.

For instance there is Karen Horney. Karen Horney's classification of psychological types is bound up with her theory of neurosis. Her theory is that neurosis is essentially a conflict, that conflict is an essential feature of neurosis. Her theory also rests upon recognition of the importance of human relationships and she points out that not only during infancy but during the whole of our adult lives, it's possible for us to take up towards other people three distinct attitudes and she describes them in detail. There's what she calls the attitude of moving towards people. Then secondly there's the direction of moving against people, and thirdly the attitude of moving away from people; and the child learns all three of these attitudes very early in his life. He's got all three at his disposal. He can either move towards people, against them or away from them.

Now Karen Horney points out that it should be possible for us whether as child or whether as adult, it should for us to adopt any one of these attitudes according to circumstances, according to the objective nature of the situation. We should as it were be able freely to decide well I'm going to move towards that person or I'm going to move away or I'm going to move against. It should be possible for a person, whether child or adult to be perfectly flexible as it were and to have all of these different attitudes, all of these different approaches to other people at his free disposal.

But this is not what happens most of the time. We usually find that as we develop, as we grow up, one or another of these three attitudes predominates or prevails. We sort of get into the habit of maybe always moving towards people even when we ought to be moving against them or moving away from them. We can't help moving towards them and even when we ought to be moving against them vigorously perhaps we either move towards them or we move away from them, and when we really ought to be moving away from them

we're either moving towards them or we're moving against them. We are as it were under the control of one or another of these particular attitudes which ought to be within our own control.

So one or another of these attitudes, she says, either the attitude of moving towards others or moving against them or moving away from them becomes the standard pattern of all our behaviour. We become rigid, we become fixed. Instead of either moving towards or against or away as circumstances require, we always mechanically react to all situations with the same sort of approach, with the same sort of reaction, with the same sort of response, and in this way she says, the three main types according to her classification, the three main types of personality emerge and develop. And she has names for these three types. The type that moves towards people, the type that moves against, the type that always moves away. She calls them first the 'compliant' personality, the person who invariably moves towards others, the compliant personality. Then the person who invariably regardless of circumstances moves against people she calls the 'aggressive' personality and the person who always moves away she calls the 'detached' personality, and she gives a very interesting description indeed of each of these types. Her descriptions are well worth reading. They're short but very much to the point and extremely well written. We've no time for details about them unfortunately this evening.

Now according to her, just to make clear something we just mentioned a little while ago, according to her neurosis is due to conflict between these attitudes, that is to say there's a conflict in you when you're confronted by a certain person or situation at the same time two contradictory attitudes are activated, and you don't know what to do about it. So this is Karen Horney's theory, her classification of psychological types.

Coming to another follower or former follower of Freud, Wilhelm Reich's theory is connected with his concept of what he calls 'Armouring' or 'Character Armour'. By character armour he means the totality of neurotic character traits inasmuch as these traits make themselves felt as a compact defence mechanism against the therapeutic endeavours of the analyst. This is how he defines character armour, and he mentions and describes three characters or character types all of which he says in varying degrees are neurotic. First of all there's what he calls the 'hysterical' character; then there's what he calls the 'compulsive' character and again the what he calls the 'phallic narcissistic' character, and his accounts of all these characters are very interesting but unfortunately we've no time to go into them in detail this evening.

Perhaps the best known of all the modern theories of psychological types is that of Carl Gustav Jung. Jung distinguishes between two different conscious attitudes towards the world and four different psychic functions.

First of all the two attitudes towards the world. The two attitudes towards the world are those of the extrovert and those of the introvert. Perhaps now we come on to more familiar ground. The extrovert is one who goes out towards the visible world. The introvert is the one who remains within himself. We may say that the extrovert explores or would like to explore the universe without whereas the introvert prefers to explore the universe within.

Now these terms extrovert and introvert are so familiar, are so generally current, have become so popular and of course sometimes misunderstood, that perhaps we need not dwell upon them further.

So what about the four functions, the four psychic functions. The four psychic functions are those, according to Jung, of thinking, of sensation, of feeling and of intuition. And Jung tends to use these terms somewhat in a sense of his own so perhaps we'd better say a few words about each of them.

By thinking Jung means our capacity for seeing how things fit together logically. By sensation he means direct perception of phenomena by means of the physical sense organs. By feeling he means not pleasurable and painful feeling, he means capacity to make accurate and coherent value judgements, that is to say judgements about the worth of things, their goodness or their badness, their value. And by intuition Jung means one's capacity for seeing beyond the facts, the bare facts, and sensing what may be described as the intangibles of a situation.

Now thinking and feeling or the thinking and feeling functions, Jung points out, are opposite and are complimentary. So too are the sensation function and the intuitive function, and according to Jung most people have one or another of these four functions - the thinking, the sensing, the feeling, the intuitive., particularly well developed and they also have the adjacent function or complementary function moderately well developed. But the other two functions exist in only a rudimentary or comparatively rudimentary form. Now by combining the two possible attitudes towards the world, the extrovert and the introvert with the four psychic functions Jung very ingeniously arrives at a total of some eight psychological types.

So let's just run through them to get some idea of what they're all about.

First of all there's what he calls the extroverted thinking type, extroverted thinking type. So what does this type do. This type collects, collects facts, collects data, ideas, thoughts. This type is always observing, always learning, always reading, always discussing perhaps. He's gathering, he's acquiring, he's accumulating facts, heaping up facts. He's surrounded by heaps of facts, mountains of facts. But this type, this extroverted thinking type, so busy, so ant-like in this way, rarely if ever works up all these facts into a coherent whole or understands their total meaning. It's rather like a child going down to the beach and along the beach the child sees all sorts of beautiful stones and pebbles so it goes on collecting them and it accumulates a great big heap but it never sorts them out. It never sorts them out saying well all these stones are of this particular geological type, or all those stones belong to this particular stratum, it never says that. It never gets as far as that. It doesn't arrange, it doesn't organise, it just makes a heap of them. So the extroverted thinking type does this sort of thing with facts and ideas, collects the fact, collects the idea yes, sometimes very many of them, great heaps of them as I've said, but doesn't usually do anything more with them, doesn't try to build them up into a coherent structure or to make sense of them. Just collection as it were for its own sake.

Now secondly there's the introverted thinking type, not extroverted but introverted, and the introverted thinking type is the complete opposite. The introverted thinking type has an absolute passion for synthesis, for bringing things together, bringing facts together, forming them into wholes, into patterns, and sometimes unfortunately this introverted thinking type has the pattern ready first and looks around for facts to fit into the pattern or to fit into the theory and it's said if the facts don't fit into the theory well according to the introverted thinking type so much the worse for the facts. In this connection I remember it was sometimes said of Herbert Spencer, the great philosopher, scientific philosopher, that his idea of a tragedy was a theory killed by a fact. So he must have been an introverted thinking type.

Thirdly we come to the extroverted feeling type. The extroverted feeling type is the adventurer. He's always seeking for new experiences, new things to do, new things to see, always looking out for new people, new friends, new acquaintances, new relationships, always something new, and the extroverted feeling type therefore is usually socially very good, a good mixer, but unfortunately the extroverted feeling type, though having many acquaintances sometimes has hardly any friends. He doesn't give himself time to go very deep or get very far with anybody. With him it's a question of quantity perhaps rather than quality.

But then we have, fourthly, the introverted feeling type. He or she on the other hand tends to be shy and withdrawn, but underneath we are told there's great intensity of feeling. Still waters run deep. On the surface so quiet, so gentle. You'd think that a ripple never disturbed that placid surface but underneath all sorts of strong and powerful currents are feeling, and this particular type, the introverted feeling type, tends to hold, even if secretly, certain values certain ideals, very very strongly indeed, but unfortunately is often unable to give them outward active expression.

Now fifthly there's the extroverted sensation type. The extroverted sensation type is the explorer, the globetrotter, the man who in the last century broke into darkest Africa and did his best to lay down railways there. The extroverted sensation type is always eager for new sights, for new sounds, for new people, for new places. We can see that the extroverted sensation type is not unlike the extroverted feeling type. Perhaps a rather cruder version of the same thing.

So sixthly the introverted sensation type. The introverted sensation type according to Jung represents the perceptive connoisseur, the man who cares not for quantity, or the woman who cares not for quantity but for quality in all sorts of fields, in all sorts of matters. He cares say for quality in food, he's a connoisseur in food. He likes very refined tastes. He may be the connoisseur in wine. He's the man who spends a long time sniffing the bouquet of the wine. He doesn't just gulp it down as some other people do, and he may be a connoisseur in pictures, he may know all about different schools and different eras and different periods, know exactly when the frame was made even and so on. But this sort, the introverted sensation type, can very easily degenerate into the dilettante and the aesthete.

Seventhly the extroverted intuitive type. The extroverted intuitive type is always in search of new possibilities in the outside world, to get new things done, to set new movements going, but he's also got a weakness. Once things are well under way, once they're moderately successful, once they're going he wants to leave them and to start up something new. You meet people sometimes like that in the world of societies, especially religious societies. They get something going somewhere and it's all functioning nicely so they can't stay with it and consolidate it, they have to go somewhere else and start up some new organisation, some new movement, and this goes on indefinitely. I knew a man in India once who used to do this all the time and during the course of three or four years started some twenty different organisations in different places from Kalimpong to Bombay, a distance of some two thousand miles. As soon as he started one he'd

fly off to the next place and start another one, and of course none of them lasted very long, but this is the extroverted intuitive type according to Jung.

And eighthly and lastly we've got the introverted intuitive type and he's concerned more with the possibilities hidden in the depths of the psyche, and he often gets lost. Some people think that Jung himself was an introverted intuitive type and for a person of this sort the external world hardly exists at all. He's always busy exploring those inner depths, finding his way through the murk and through the gloom right deep down in the depths of the psyche, and just like a person exploring the bed of the ocean he hardly is able to remember what the world is like above the waves.

Now I've given in this very very short summary fashion simply the bare bones of Jung's theory and his own account in his book on psychological types is extraordinarily rich and complex but we've no time to say anything further about it.

Another very interesting theory of psychological types is that of Erich Fromm. I'm afraid it isn't nearly so well known as Jung's but in some ways it's even more elaborate and even more thorough. We've only time at the moment for a very rough partial sketch.

Fromm's theory is based on the idea which is very important in his whole thinking, based on the idea that living for a human being means relating, and Fromm points out that man relates to the world in the first place by acquiring and assimilating things e.g. food, and in the second place by relating to people including himself.

Now the first of these, relating to the world by acquiring and assimilating things Fromm calls the process of assimilation, and the second, relating to the world by relating to other people and oneself Fromm calls socialisation. Now according to him character consists in the relatively permanent form in which energy is canalised in the process of assimilation and socialisation. He says that the individual can relate to the world, or what for him relates to the same thing, can canalise energy in five different ways, and these ways he calls orientations.

First he says there's the receptive orientation or accepting. A person of this type, a person with the receptive orientation believes that the source of all good, the source of all happiness, the source of all welfare, the source of all true being, is outside, outside himself, and he believes therefore that the only way in which he can get what he wants is to receive it from outside, from that source. Now this applies for him to material things, it applies to things like love - he thinks that love is something he must receive from outside because he hasn't got it. Applies to things like knowledge, applies to things like pleasure, and in the sphere of religion if this type of person, if a person with this type of orientation, the receptive orientation is religious in any way he tends to believe in a personal god situated out there. It may be in a literal heaven or in a metaphysical transcendental outer space, but he tends to expect everything from this god, all happiness, all knowledge, all power, salvation, enlightenment, will come from this god, from this external source because nothing can come from himself. He himself is nothing, he's got nothing. So whether it's in the sphere of material things or morals or psychological things, emotions, values, religious experience, enlightenment itself, it's all got to come from outside. He has nothing, he is nothing. So this is the receptive orientation.

Secondly there's the exploitive orientation or taking. Fromm says that persons with this type of orientation also believe that the source of all good is outside, also believe that he cannot produce anything himself, but there's a difference. This type, the exploitive type believes not that he's got to receive but that he's got to take by force or even by stealth. The exploitive type believes he's got to take what he wants. He can't produce it, he's got to take it, and in personal relationships this particular type, the person with the exploitive orientation tries very often to grab, to grab affection. Fromm says that this particular type of person rather enjoys taking or luring one person away from another. On the intellectual level, on the intellectual plane such a person, a person with this exploitive orientation delights in borrowing, not to say stealing, ideas. Using other people's ideas and possibly passing them off for his own. I remember I got a bit of a shock some years ago when I was looking through a book on Buddhism, it wasn't a very good one but I suddenly noticed that some pages seemed rather familiar as though I'd read them before or encountered them somewhere before and I thought that's odd, they seemed to be in a different style from the rest of the book but there were no quotation marks. This went on and on. So after reflecting a minute or two I realised I'd written those pages myself and they'd been lifted bodily from one of my books without acknowledgement. So this is the sort of thing. The person who wrote that particular book must have had this exploitive orientation of character. Lifting ideas, lifting whole passages from books and in this way making or compiling a book of his own. Of course this is the sort of thing that many of us do all the time at least so far as conversation is concerned. We exploit, we borrow, we steal.

Thirdly what Fromm calls the hoarding orientation or preserving. The person with this type of orientation doesn't expect anything from outside so there's no question of receiving, there's no question even of taking. The security of a person of this type is based upon hoarding and saving. He or she does not like to give, does not like to part with anything. In terms of emotional life and emotional relationships such a person thinks very much in terms of possessing, possessing people, having them as it were under lock and key and they also like to treasure up memories and even mementoes rather like Queen Victoria. On her death it was found that in all her palaces and castles and country houses she'd accumulated tens of thousands of souvenirs, little locks of hair in twists of paper and innumerable little mementoes under glass cases. She'd never thrown anything away at all. It all had to be thrown away after her death by her devoted son. So she must have been in this respect at least a person of this hoarding orientation. And such people also tend to idealise the past, they like to treasure up the past, they like to as it were stow away the past. They don't like to think that the past has been wasted. If say they're in charge of a gallery of paintings well if a painting is just old, even if it has no artistic merit at all they like to keep it, they don't like to throw it away, they like to hoard it. They think well why throw it away, it's old. They don't like to part with it. The same with people with their collections of books sometimes. Even though certain books are quite useless and just waste paper they can't bear to throw them away. They've got this sort of hoarding orientation. This reminds me of another little story just to refresh you a little bit. You may be getting rather tired of all these theories.

It reminds me of a story told me by a friend about his two maiden aunts who'd just died and left him a lot of money. They left him also a big house and the big house had an attic and he said when he explored it he found that the attic was full of thousands of little cardboard boxes each one full of dozens of paper bags and little bits of string neatly rolled up and he said these two aunties throughout their lives had never thrown away a single cardboard box, never thrown away a single paper bag and never thrown away a single piece of string. So there they all were neatly piled up in the attic, and of course as he said ready to catch fire and burn the whole house down at the slightest notice. So these two old ladies too must have had this hoarding orientation.

And fourthly there's what Fromm calls the marketing orientation or exchanging and this is very much more difficult to describe and to understand and I must confess that I myself couldn't make quite so much sense of it as I think I've been able to make of the previous orientations but one may say briefly that in the case of this orientation a man's qualities, his personal qualities, come to be alienated from himself and experienced not as parts of himself but as commodities. Detachable things as it were which have a certain value, a certain exchange rate, even a certain price, which means that they i.e. he, but he as alienated from himself, can now be bought and sold, that is to say the man himself really can be bought and sold. He becomes a thing and he experiences himself as a thing, and because he experiences himself as a thing he treats others as things too. And his value depends not upon what he thinks and feels about himself but by his price in the market. In other words it depends upon what others will pay for him i.e. for his services considered as himself. So that his value isn't in himself but in what he is and what he does and this is determined by other people. So that we may say that his identity does not consist in himself but rather in what others think of him and Fromm says that this orientation is particularly characteristic of the modern age. He doesn't directly say so but from what I've read of his other writings I rather gather that Fromm links all this up with the early thought of Marx which of course follows on from the later thought of Hegel, but we need not go into that now.

Now these four orientations, the receptive, the exploitive, the hoarding and the marketing orientations, all these four Fromm calls non-productive, though he also goes on to say that they all have both positive and negative aspects and for each of them, for each of these four orientations he draws up a very interesting list of positive and negative aspects. I'm going to take this evening the shortest of those because we've no time for them all.

We'll take the list which he draws up for the exploitive orientation, its positive aspects and its negative aspects all neatly tabulated side by side. He says for instance that the exploitive orientation is active - that's the positive side. But the negative side of its activity is that it's exploitive. Then again the exploitive orientation is able to take initiative but there's a negative side to that which is that it's aggressive. Then in positive terms the exploitive orientation is able to make claims but the negative counterpart of that is that it is egocentric. In positive terms the exploitive orientation is proud, that's positive. This is rather interesting, you see that Fromm regards pride as positive but the negative of that is that it can be conceited. Then again positively speaking the exploitive orientation is impulsive but negatively speaking it is rash. Positively speaking it is self confident but negatively speaking it is arrogant. Positively speaking it is captivating but negatively speaking it is seducing.

So in this way Fromm tabulates the positive and the negative aspects of each of these orientations and this gives his whole study of the subject very great richness and very great complexity of detail.

Now there's a fifth orientation which is what he calls the productive orientation. Whereas there are four non-productive orientations there's only one productive orientation and Fromm says that a person with this type of orientation aims at growth and development of all his potentialities, at the growth and development of all his powers but he also puts the question immediately afterwards, 'what is power?' and he makes a distinction. He says he means by power not power over, power over things or over people or over situations or over events, that's a perversion he says, power over is a perversion, but he means power to. Power to do, power to feel, power to act, power to think, power to develop. This is positive, this is healthy.

Unfortunately we've no time to pursue this matter further but I'd like just to add that Fromm's whole discussion of this subject is very very interesting indeed.

Now you must have noticed that all these theories of psychological types have been taken from the West, from the earliest, from the most ancient, down to the latest and most of them are in fact quite modern. So it's time we had a theory, a theory of psychological types from the ancient East, and you'll be interested I hope to learn that we can find one, an ancient Eastern theory of psychological types, in that very well known Hindu text The Bhagavad Gita.

Now the Bhagavad Gita's theory of psychological types is based on the Sankya philosophy which is one of the six systems of orthodox Hindu philosophy, and this philosophy as is well known is a strictly dualistic system, that is to say it recognises two ultimate principles. Most schools of Indian thought are monistic or pluralistic. Monistic meaning they recognise one ultimate principle, pluralistic meaning they recognise a multiplicity of ultimate principles of entities. But the Sankya is dualistic it recognises two ultimate principles, two principles beyond which you cannot analyse beyond which you cannot go, which are irreducible, which are there at the bottom of every thing and which cannot be reduced to one another. So there are just two of them, they are as it were eternally. So the two ultimate principles of the Sankya are what it calls the (Purusha) and the (Prakriti). By (Purusha) is meant very roughly pure spirit and by (Prakriti) is meant nature or matter. And the latter that is to say (Prakriti) or nature is said to be composite - to consist especially of what are called the three 'gunas'. The word guna means literally a strand but it's usually translated attribute or even quality or element. And the three gunas, the three qualities or attributes or elements are known as sattva, rajas and tamas and these are not very easy to translate.

Sattva is the attribute or quality as it were of light, of purity, of peace. Rajas is the attribute or quality of fire, of passion and of activity, and Tamas is the quality of darkness, of sloth and of inertia. And according to the Bhagavad Gita psychological types are determined by the predominance in the individual of one or another of these three. All three are in every individual but one or another will predominate and it's according to the predominating quality that the psychological type is determined.

So the Bhagavad Gita says that the man in whom the quality of sattva predominates is calm, peaceful, religious minded, gentle, wise and compassionate. The man in whom the rajas quality predominates is fiery, noble, high spirited and active, and the man in whom tamas predominates is dull, slothful, ignorant, stupid, brutal. So this is the Bhagavad Gita's classification and it's further of interest to point out that this classification is linked up, as everything in India has to be sooner or later, with the caste system. And of course it was all devised by these very brilliant people the Brahmins so according to their classification the Brahmin is the sattvic type. He's the holy man, he's got all the good qualities.

The Kshatriya is a person in whom there is both rajas and sattva. These are mixed. The Kshatriya being the warrior.

The Vaisha, the trader, the merchant, the peasant, the agriculturalist. In him there's a mixture of rajas and tamas. And the poor Shudra, that is to say the serf including the untouchable, he's composed entirely of tamas.

So in this way the three main character types are correlated with the four main castes.

Now there are other theories of psychological types known in the East but we're going to deal tonight only with one of these remaining types, which happens to be the most important and the most relevant because this one will give us, we shall find, a valuable clue to the nature of the connection between the question of psychological types and the whole process of the Higher Evolution, because we mustn't forget that it is with the Higher Evolution in fact that we are really concerned. We've spent this evening quite a lot of time on the various theories of psychological types but as I hope you'll find this is not time that has been wasted. We shall be able to appreciate the practical usefulness of these theories even from the standpoint of the Higher Evolution a little later on.



Now our last remaining eastern, ancient eastern theory of psychological types is a Buddhist one, and it's found in a very famous work, a very famous text book of Theravada Buddhism called the Vissuddhi Magga of the great teacher, the great Acharya Buddhagosa, and it happens to have been written about fifteen hundred years ago in Ceylon.

Now in principle its theory is quite simple. It posits just three main psychological types and it calls these in the original Pali, lobhacarita, dosacarita and mohacarita, meaning the greedy type, the angry type sometimes translated hate type and the bewildered or deluded type. So these three greedy, angry, bewildered, just these three types of person, and it's interesting to see that according to the Vissuddhi Magga, these three types are linked with three definite kinds of experience of the world. This is the determining factor.

The greedy type finds the world predominantly a pleasant place, finds experience predominantly pleasurable or we can even put it around the other way - a person who finds the world predominantly pleasurable or who experiences the world as predominantly pleasurable, experiences the world as consisting more of pleasant experiences than of painful ones will develop into the greedy type of character or the greedy psychological type.

And similarly for the angry type, for the hate type, the world is predominantly a painful place. This type of person finds that there's more pain in the world than pleasure and in this way the angry or the hate type of character develops.

And the bewildered type, well he isn't sure. Sometimes he thinks one thing, sometimes the other. Sometimes he thinks that the world is a very pleasant place but at other times he thinks it's just awful. So he wavers, he oscillates. He's the deluded type, the bewildered type, the type that can't or won't make up his mind.

Now Buddhagosa, the great teacher and great writer Buddhagosa gives many interesting details about these three types and he tells us for our information especially how we can recognise them and this is one of the most interesting parts of the whole Vissuddhi Magga. It's rather dull and scholastic in parts, it's rather dry in parts not to say hair-splitting in parts but when Buddhagosa comes to this part of the Vissuddhi Magga which means 'Path of Purification', he really lets himself go and you start thinking he might have made a good novelist.

So he describes the different ways in which we can recognise the different characters, the greedy, the angry and the bewildered, and he says well in the first place you can recognise them by the way in which they walk. Just watch the way they walk, the way they put down their feet. He said the greedy type of person walks along very smoothly and gently and evenly. But he said the hate type, the angry type walks along roughly digging his heels into the ground and striding along. So you can recognise him in this way, and the deluded, the bewildered type well sometimes he walks in one way, sometimes the other. If you watch him long enough you'll find out which type he belongs to too.

And then he says eating. You can recognise these different types by the way in which they eat. So of course Buddhagosa's thinking in terms of eating, especially rice, with the hand. So he says the greedy type makes the rice into very nice neat little balls of just the right size and very gently puts them into the mouth and he keeps his fingers very clean and he doesn't scatter a lot of mess around him, around his plate. But he says the angry type, what does he do? He makes very big unshapely balls and sort of tosses them into his mouth in a very angry motion and he scatters lots of bits and pieces around and his hand is rather dirty. He says this is the angry type or the hate type. And of course the poor old deluded type or bewildered type he acts in either way according to circumstances as it were or according to the whim of the moment.

And then talking. He said they even talk differently. The greedy type speaks very agreeably and smoothly and pleasantly and evenly but the angry type of course speaks roughly, harshly, loudly vehemently, rudely, and of course as for the poor bewildered type well what I said before goes here too.

And then he said you can even recognise them, and he's talking mainly of monks of course, you can even recognise them by the way in which they wear their robes and sort of colours that they choose. He said a monk who happens to have a greedy temperament will wear very nice neat robes beautifully laundered even though he might have had to do them himself, and they'll hang down just right. There are various rules about wearing the robes. The hem of the upper robe must be four inches above the hem of the lower robe and so on, so the monk with the greedy temperament will pay strict attention to all this and he'll look very neat and smart, and Buddhagosa says his robe will tend to be of a bright yellow colour like a buttercup. But the angry type or the hate type he'll just wear his robes anyhow. He'll just sort of throw them around himself and they'll be all uneven and hanging down a bit more on one side than on the other and he'll tend to choose rather dark hues, a dark or dull brown or deep saffron, something like that.

And Buddhagosa even says you can tell these different types by the way they sweep the floor. And especially novices when they join the monastery are given this job to do first of all and all the monks watch them to see how they sweep, Buddhagosa says if the young novice has got a greedy temperament he'll sweep with very nice smooth rhythmical strokes. Of course the broom is just a bundle of twigs you must remember so he has to sort of squat down and sweep. He just makes nice sweeping graceful movements with his arm like this and he very neatly sweeps up all the dust. But he says the hate type, if the novice is of the hate type, he brushes very quickly and unevenly and as it were angrily and he leaves lots of dust in the corner or even tries to sweep it behind the door and he makes a great dust in the process, so this is the angry type.

And of course again the deluded type well he just acts anyhow.

So Buddhagosa gives us in this particular section of his work a very great deal of information of this sort, all of it very interesting, but we've no time for further details.

Buddhagosa also does something very relevant to our present discussion. Buddhagosa correlates his three temperaments with what are called the forty (kammattanas) - what that means we'll see in a minute, and it's this part of his account which gives us our clue to the connection between the question of psychological types and the Higher Evolution.

But first of all what are these forty (kammattanas). Kammattana literally means place of work and the work is the work of concentration and meditation specifically. So the forty kammattanas are the forty methods according to the Pali scriptures of concentration and meditation, forty of them. We tend to think sometimes there's two or three ways of meditating but according to the Pali Canon alone there are forty. There are many other methods outside the Pali Canon.

Now Buddhagosa in the second section of this work, the Vissuddhi Magga, described all these forty methods in some detail but we're not going into that today. We're just taking them as it were as read, and having described them, having described all these forty methods of meditation taking many scores of pages to do so, in fact several hundred pages; he goes on to say which methods, which methods of concentration and meditation are suitable for which temperament.

For example he says that the person of a greedy type, one in whom craving prevails and predominates should practise the ten corpse meditations. He should meditate upon the ten stages in the progressive decomposition of a corpse and go if necessary to a graveyard or a burning ground for the purpose, and he should also practise recollection of the loathsomeness of food. In this way he will overcome his greedy craving tendencies.

And in the same way Buddhagosa says the angry type, the hate type should practise the Metta Bhavana, should practise the cultivation or the development of universal love.

And what about the poor old bewildered type, well he is especially advised to practise the Mindfulness of Breathing just to steady his mind a bit and to bring him down to one thing and get him to concentrate on that.

But Buddhagosa also points out that some of these methods, some of these forty (kammattanas) are equally suitable for people of all three temperaments.

Now we mustn't forget that for Buddhagosa concentration and meditation represent the standard spiritual practice, the standard spiritual procedure, if you like the standard means, the standard method of the Higher Evolution. So Buddhagosa in effect is therefore saying two very important things in making this correlation. Buddhagosa's really saying that so far as the individual is concerned, the Higher Evolution is not a matter of just some vague general process of development but something very specific. It's a specific course of action here and now. And he's also saying that the immediate direction of this course is determined by a person's particular temperament or psychological type.

Now it's good to remind ourselves of these two points that Buddhagosa in effect makes because we tend to forget them. We tend only too often, only too much to think of evolving and developing and growing and following the path of the Higher Evolution only in very vague general terms. We think as it were that it's enough if we have just a vague general intention to evolve - 'oh I want to develop, I want to go up, I want to soar as it were into the clouds' - we think that this is enough. We think too that it's enough if we engage in some sort of spiritual practice which will we hope in a general sort of way somehow bring us through or bring us out, bring us up to the goal in the end. We've no very clear idea exactly how. But Buddhagosa says in effect that we must be much more specific and much more concrete than that. He says we must know exactly where we stand. He says we must know from day to day, almost from hour to hour what particular action, what particular exercise, what particular method, what particular procedure, will help us to go

forward at this moment, and this means of course knowing what in us has to be corrected, what has to be developed, what has to be removed, where our weaknesses are, where our strengths are. In other words all this means knowing ourselves, it means knowing our own particular pattern of behaviour, it means knowing our own particular conditioning, it means knowing the psychological type, in a word, to which we belong.

So we'll be able to understand all this much better if we refer back to the theories of psychological types which have already been discussed this evening. My list as it were of them is by no means complete. For instance I haven't made any mention of Sheldon's well known classification of human types but I think I can say the list is complete enough for our present purpose.

Now we'll find if we look at them, if we examine them, that these theories of psychological types are mainly of two kinds. They are based as it were on two different principles of differentiation. They're differentiated or psychological types are differentiated in these different theories according in the first place to stage of overall development. That is to say if you are at this stage of development well you belong to this type, if you are at the next stage of development you belong to another type and so on. And Freud's theory is a theory of this type, that is to say Freud's theory of oral, anal and genital types.

Secondly, in the other kind of theory of psychological types the types are differentiated according to the specific faculty or function in the individual which happens to be most strongly developed, and of course the most prominent example of this type of theory is Jung's theory of the extroverted and introverted thinking, sensing, feeling and the intuitive types.

So if we classify them in this way we can see at once how useful both these kinds of theory of psychological types are. Because using both of them we are able to see at a glance almost just where we stand. Or even if we can't see it at a glance at least we can see it after a reasonable amount of self examination and self analysis. If we use them, if we have recourse to them, if we study them, they enable us to see what for us and within a certain context, is the next stage of development, the next thing to be done. Enable us to see what faculties are sufficiently developed already and what need to be developed in the future and having seen this we can see also what steps have next to be taken. In other words what specific methods of development we have to have recourse to. For instance if after studying Freud's classification we make up our minds or we decide or we discover somewhat to our astonishment that we happen to be an anal character, then we understand also that we have to take active steps to develop full genitality. And if after a similar perusal of Jung's classification of types we discover that we happen to be an introverted thinking type then we have to take steps to develop our extroverted feeling function, and in this way the whole business of the Higher Evolution becomes more specific, more concrete, more detailed, more particular. Not just some vague beautiful dream or even castle in the air but a matter of actual detailed practice.

Now at this stage a question might arise. Someone having heard about all these theories of psychological types, feeling perhaps a bit bewildered, tossed to and fro between them all, someone might enquire which theory is the right one, the true one or at least which is the best, the most helpful. But one has to say at once that there's no answer to this question on those terms. All the theories are useful, they all represent a cross section of the individual from a particular angle or from a particular point of view, and therefore they are all helpful to us in understanding ourselves. They're also therefore helpful to us in knowing what we must do in order to evolve and this is the reason why earlier on this evening I devoted so much time to these theories, to these different ways of classifying psychological types. We may say that the understanding of the kinds they represent is very necessary to us in the whole process of the Higher Evolution of the Individual.

Now that's one question which has arisen and which I hope has been disposed of but a number of other questions might equally well arise all connected in one way or another with the question of psychological types in the context of the Higher Evolution, so I'm going to conclude just by saying something about some of them very quickly and very briefly and saying it against a background of what has been said already this evening.

The questions relate to whether there is a religious type; whether there is a meditating type; whether the two sexes represent different psychological types and whether one should be an all rounder or a specialist.

Time is very short so we'll have to be very brief indeed.

First of all is there a religious type? Sometimes you meet someone, you get talking, you bring up religion and that person says, 'I'm not interested in religion, I guess I'm not the religious type'. So they may say it very defensively as if apologising for not being the religious type or they may say it very aggressively as if they're rather proud of not being the religious type as if that represented a sort of weakness. But the meaning in both cases is the same. What they're trying to convey is that since they're not the religious type it's no use talking

to them about religion or expecting them to be interested in it. It means the matter's disposed of. But of course the question arises what does one mean by the religious type and this means asking what does one mean by religion in this context. Here we can take the word religion in two senses.

We can take the word religion in the sense of the whole process of what I've called the Higher Evolution, the evolution of consciousness, the evolution of consciousness from simple consciousness to self consciousness to Transcendental consciousness to Absolute consciousness. One can take this whole process, the process of the Higher Evolution of man, as being represented adequately or inadequately by the word religion. So one can take religion in the first place in this sense.

Secondly one can take religion in the much narrower, the more limited sense of conventional pious belief and observance. Now if we take religion, the word religion in the first sense, take it as synonymous with the whole process of the Higher Evolution, then there's no such thing as a religious type in the sense of one particular psychological type, We can say, from this point of view, that all psychological types are religious types, all are cross sections of individuals and all individuals are capable of further higher development. It's a question of being aware on oneself and wanting to evolve.

But if we take religion in that narrower sense, in the sense of conventional pious belief and observance, then it may perhaps be possible to speak of a religious type and it may be that this religious type is identical more or less or to some extent with Jung's introverted feeling type or possibly introverted intuitive type, and if we take religion in this sense, this narrower sense as conventional pious belief and observance, then we must make it clear at the same time that both the so called religious types and the so called non religious types are capable of what we call the Higher Evolution. So first question.

Second question. Is there a meditating type? This question is very similar to the first one and the answer is pretty much the same. It depends on what you mean by meditation. If by meditation you mean development of a higher stage of consciousness then there's no separate meditating type. From this point of view all psychological types are meditating types. But if by meditation one means introversion then obviously there is a meditating type or types because there are introverted types. But in this case, if you take meditation in the narrower sense you'll have to say that both meditation and non meditating types are capable regardless of whether they practise meditation in the narrower sense or not, both capable of the Higher Evolution.

Thirdly, do the two sexes represent different psychological types? Now it's not easy to answer this question. To answer this question properly one would have to go into the matter very thoroughly indeed and it's not possible to do that at present. But one thing is clear, what we call sex which is a very mysterious thing that no one has really explained; Sex is not just a matter of physical differences, it also represents or at least is closely associated, perhaps inseparably associated with different kinds of mental outlook, different kinds of psychological conditioning. It's a well known fact, it's one that we all know from experience, that the feminine mentality is in many ways very different from the masculine mentality and to this extent it's possible to speak therefore of a masculine type and a feminine type. But whether these constitute different psychological types in the sense in which we've been using that term so far, that is another matter. At present we're concerned just with one practical corollary which is that if men and women as such have different kinds of psychological conditioning then they will have to have recourse to different methods of undoing those psychological conditionings, which means that they may have to take up different, possibly complementary, spiritual practices. We usually assume that all spiritual practices equally are suitable for both men and women but it may turn out not to be so and we may have to consider therefore if we're very practical separate provision in certain respects for the two sexes.

Now fourthly and lastly should one be an all rounder or a specialist and this question arises more particularly within the context of the second kind of theory of psychological types, that is to say the theory or the type of theory which differentiates the psychological types according to the predominance of a particular psychic function, for example Jung's theory. Let's say, let's suppose that someone is extremely intellectual, has a very good mind, is very good at abstract thought, very good at manipulating concepts, very good at philosophy and so on but has very little emotional life, doesn't feel much, doesn't seem to have very strong, very powerful emotions. So suppose such a person with this very strong well developed intellect but rather poorly developed emotional life, suppose such a person takes up the spiritual life, suppose they start wanting to evolve, to develop spiritually, well how should they proceed? Now some people, some advisers would say follow the line of least resistance. They'd say you've got a very good mind, a very good intellect, you're capable of philosophical thought, well go the whole length, go all out for philosophical development, try to reach truth with your mind, the Hindus would say be a Jnana-yogi, one who tries to know the truth by sheer dint, by sheer force of intellectual understanding, by means of dialectics as Plato would say. But another kind of adviser would say no, your intellect is already well developed, you don't need to develop that, you need to develop in a balanced sort of way - your emotions are under developed, you've got to develop the emotions. So don't think very much about developing the intellect, think about developing the emotions

instead, have recourse to devotional practices, do chanting, bow down before the image, offer flowers, read devotional books not philosophical books, and in this way try to develop in a balanced manner, try to develop your emotions to the point where they are equally well developed with your intellect.

Now this second view is on the whole we may say the Buddhist view, that development must be balanced, that all the functions as Jung would call them should be brought into full free play and this attitude of Buddhism is exemplified by the very well known teaching of the Five Spiritual Faculties: that is to say faith which must be balanced by wisdom, and wisdom by faith; meditation which must be balanced by vigour, and vigour by meditation; and all four held in equilibrium, held in balance, by this all important faculty to which there's no opposite or complement, that is to say mindfulness or awareness.

So this is how Buddhism sees the spiritual life, this is how Buddhism sees evolution from a certain point of view at least, sees it in terms of a complete harmonious unfoldment of all these different aspects of the individual, of the individual human being or if you like of the person, the personality, intellect and emotion, action and introspection, all developed and held in balance through this predominating and all important faculty of mindfulness and awareness.

So we can now see perhaps the importance of this question of psychological types in the process of the Higher Evolution of the Individual. We are after all individuals, but we're individuals of a particular type, we follow a particular psychological pattern. And if we know to which type we belong then we shall be able to know ourselves better. We shall have some sort of rough and ready map, some sort of crude chart with the help of which we can find our way about within the maze which is ourselves, and if we know ourselves better including know the type to which we belong, then we shall better know what step needs to be taken next. We'll know the next thing to be done and if we take that step, if we do that thing, then, and then only we may say, we shall evolve. Otherwise all our talk of the Higher Evolution will remain simply a beautiful dream.