



other may be also applied to inter-organism phenomena. Pioneering animal research by M Hofer [3], S Ackerman [4] and others has explored and documented the immense importance of maternal influence upon the physiology of neonatal rats. (This work was fostered by Dr. Weiner during his leadership at Montefiore Hospital, NYC, in the 1960's & 70's.)

But not just neonatal and developing organisms attend constantly to, and are attuned delicately by, signals and communicational atmosphere, but so are we all, children and adults together, humans as well as non-humans. Remember the powerful responses of CH to signals she perceived as catathetic and anathetic (ASCAP #8) - these are reactions familiar to clinicians generally -- and nonclinicians too, observed in others and in ourselves.

Assumptions implied by the concepts embodied in the ASCAP neologisms include far greater regulatory functions from interpersonal (inter-conspecific) interactions than we ordinarily credit them. In working with psychotic and depressed patients, the idea occurred to me several years ago that these hard-to-change and maladaptive-in-present-form-at-least-in-this-millennium "psychopathological states" could be indices to communicational states that are deeply canalized and that are there for adaptive Regulatory functions, albeit malfunctioning at this time and place in the patients. This thinking led deductively to psalics. (The next ASCAP issue - #10, 15 September 1988 - features data gathered by JMA Weiss perhaps relevant for alpha psalic).

Of course, John Price had had similar thoughts stemming from ethology that led him and Leon Sloman to mathematical formulae that were generalized in ASCAP #1 and to the now extensively considered R (or should it be RHP?! - see below). All of these ideas imply an enormously

complex, finely tuned, constantly adjusted orchestration of interpersonal communications that we participate in continually, with innumerable others and with single others, with strangers and with our families, face to face, via telephone, in written personal letters or via many other traces left behind, not only the kicked around feces of felines, but also in other forms, as in circulated notes. Because this is so much of ordinary experience, we take such regulatory impact for granted. Of course, innumerable facets of such communication, each studied with fervor by many separate disciplines, make agreement hard for new or integrative work. We have a Tower of Babel problem. These Gardner-Gilbert exchanges try to work on this.

#### Gardner-Gilbert Exchanges.

RG: Referring to PG's contribution in ASCAP #4: Now that the dimensional battle has joined (hostile-friendly plus dominance-submission), could I ask that you analyze the Emma passage according to your (or Leary theory's) lights? I do. think that my analysis illustrates the difference in task that we're about. I do. want to propound theory that is anchorable eventually in data so operational definitions are very important.

But beyond this are our basic metaphors. I see you as seeing man as the basic metaphor with other animals juxtaposed whereas I see man as a rather refined mechanism but composed basically of simpler parts. The scientific task is to discover the relevant parts. Where are the basic elements versus the less basic ones? Here you seem to understand psalics accordingly. This or that psalic recruits latterly derived elements, such as intelligence, etc.

But I see catathetic and anathetic signals as very basic. Hostile dominance, friendly dominance, etc are final outcomes of an exchange -

ways of classifying it. But cues for the classification stem from the components that you count (whether formally as I try in my reanalysis of the Emma first exchange with Mr. Knightley (ASCAP #3, p.3) or according to an inner calculus anyone deploys when in such an encounter). Put otherwise, catathetic and anathetic signals are "atoms" to the "molecules" your diagram exemplifies. Indeed, the molecules as seen in humans and other vertebrates may be late derived compared to the atoms when the definitions are strictly adhered to; definitions, that is, that relate to R of the sender versus R of the recipient.

PG: 1. I liked your idea that catathetic signals (cat sigs) are a classification of hostile dominance. (ASCAP #4, p.5) No problem here, very good.

2. You say that I use humans as my metaphor - probably - although I think this maybe misses the idea of mentalities derived from psalics? Incidentally, I see you have really taken to John's idea which I, perhaps have not stressed enough, that I do like. But what about some more on psalics?

3. I agree entirely that psalics recruit in various competencies. This is my point in this letter. They are like a "complex" or archetype which coordinates, brings together various competencies, eg, intelligence, hostility, etc to enact a role which involves specific types of appraisal behavior, etc. My point is that you appear to be considering the complex, the pattern that underlies roles, whereas I am interested in the competencies which are brought together to form a role.

4. As I was traveling on a train I thought that suppose we could playback time, get to really primitive life forms, then what would we observe first, hostility or

dominance? I think we would find dominance, but not as commonly understood. For example, single cell organisms will vary in their ability to exploit an environment and in that sense some will be more successful than others. There maybe no capacity to directly impede the activity of other members of the species over and above being better environment exploiters. At some point, a capacity to impede others of the same species occurs. One obvious example would be cannibalism (eg, fish). Subsequently we see the development of territory holding, which while not cannibalistic, does involve biting, etc. But basically a major aspect here is reducing the others' chances, etc.

So now we have a goal (resource exploitation and inclusive fitness - dominance) and a tactic - hostility. In my view, the goal and tactics must be considered separately because over time tactics may change rapidly, but the goals are only slowly modified (if at all). So to return to your useful analogy of atoms and molecules. I see the atoms as goals and tactics and the psalics (how they run together) as molecules. Indeed, I would suggest that this more adequately identifies 'the bits' that go into psalics. Now the concepts of cat sigs represents a composite of a goal and tactics. Indeed, John also agrees that the tactics can vary enormously in cat sigs.

5. Let me expand this a bit in regard to the Emma example (ASCAP #2 and #3), as you asked me to do, but first add a crucial point. One of the tactics in securing dominance is to deliver a signal which can also reduce the retaliatory power of the recipient - a pretty sophisticated tactic. In humans this is achieved by (say) delivering a rebuke (or attack) which operates on the recipient's internal control mechanisms. This is in my view a variant of overt hostility, but it

still acts to impede the other in attacking back. Crudely we may think here of guilt induction, *it*, getting the individual to feel badly about themselves. Incidentally since the yielding subroutine operates from "within" this is a sophisticated metaphor of this. Example:

"I cannot see you acting wrongly, without a remonstration."

First Mr. Knightley says "You have acted wrongly" which is a direct confrontation. Second, "without remonstrations" implies he is going to tell Emma off about this. To my mind both are catathetic signals - no matter what the conscious intent. There is no anathetic signal..

"How could you be so unfeeling to Miss Bates?" Now this is very clever. First he asserts that Emma has acted as unfeeling and he probably knows that "feeling for others" is a part of her self-esteem. So he has made his attack - you were unfeeling - but has done it in a way which must make her check internally, i.e., match her behavior to Miss Bates which what he knows to be an internal standard of her moral behavior. Again this is a straightforward catathetic signal but he's operating with an attack on how she likes to think (good) about herself.

From then on, she is caught in a double problem. Not only must she defend herself to him but also to herself. Furthermore had she not had her own self image attacked (activated from within) then in all likelihood she would have responded with anger.

So what we see here are sophisticated tactics to dominate - there is no anathetic signal at all, ie, nothing here that allows her to feel good about herself. Now we can argue whether Mr. Knightley's tactics are hostile - personally, I believe they are, and he is deliberately trying to manipulate Emma's own view of herself.

John's great strength is in his linking with RHP (R) and the origins in ritual agonistic behavior (brilliant). These are the breakthroughs as I see it. ... So I do not think we are in disagreement; my only point is that unlike some signals, there are two dimensions in the catathetic signal. When we begin to pull these apart, then we will be able to look at different patterns of cat sigs, eg, arrogance, excluding, ignoring, attacking, etc, ie, these relate to different mixtures and tactics in the composite of hostile dominance.

R6: Referring to PG contribution in ASCAP #6: I agree with you that interspecific RHP issues abound and that the situation can't be contained by intraspecific communication only with respect to adaptation etc. But in thinking about psychopathology, and how the human species has evolved its adaptations, then the vicissitudes of R (in my own mind, it has gotten simplified to R usually - see below) as related to intraspecific communication seem more interesting.

As a discussant of the presentation of a senior professor talking about narcissistic disorders, I presented the advisability of using anathetic signals in managing such patients in the hospital (ASCAP #8: "More R for CH"). Of course, this meant explaining R (which I like better than RHP because RHP has connotations of, and seems to me to be too limited to, the competitive sphere whereas nurturance, teaching, therapy also involve enhancement of one's own R via raising the R of others.)

For the rest of the day in the department, many people enjoyed playing with the concepts of R as well as with anathetic and catathetic signals. And we have begun using the concepts as shorthand ways of managing things on the ward - they turn out to be a practical deployment of

these concepts. I am impressed with how you and John are putting things together and forwarding "our science." As time goes on and the issues accumulate, I am grateful that you commented in that [long ago communication] about a "hedonic science" [that got ASCAP going].

PG: In regard to R, R rather than RHP, I think you are moving very close, if I may say, to my position. However, I continue to worry about the blurring of the distinction between inclusive fitness strategies which is what you are talking about with focus on nurturing etc and RHP which we (JPrice and others) think should stay as a competitively derived term, ie, it is a personally relevant construct whereas inclusive fitness is at the genetic level. Let me say quickly that my own thinking is wobbly indeed and very foggy (foggy and wobbly?) But this is an area of absolute central importance and bears directly on my concept of Jung's concept of archetype, etc. So let's keep it in the air. However, we stress caution in changing RHP to R.

Incidentally with personality disorders of DSM-III-R, B' type, it is most important to find ways for them being able to internalize a sense of value to others (positive attention holding). This is not just anathetic signals because these may not work unless the person is able to say "Yeah, I did that, that was good" etc. Anathetic signals could be simply being kind helpful etc without ensuring that the person can see "something" in themselves that they value. ..

P.S. if you want me to be clearer on "hedonic science" for ASCAP, quote Foucault[5] who said, when asked why he did not engage in Polemics: In the serious play of questions and answers, in the work of reciprocal elucidation, the rights of each person are in some sense inmanent in the discussion. They depend only on

the dialogue situation. The person asking the questions is merely exercising the right that has been given him; to remain unconvinced, to perceive a contradiction, to require more intonation, to emphasize different postulates, to point out faulty reasoning, etc. As for the person answering the questions, he too exercises a right that does not go beyond the discussion itself; by the logic of his own discourse he is tied to what he has said earlier, and by the acceptance of dialogue he is tied to the questioning of the other. Questions and answers depend on a game - a game that is at once pleasant and difficult - in which each of the two partners takes pains to use only the rights given him by the other and by the accepted fora of the dialogue.

The polemicist, on the other hand, proceeds encased in privileges that he possesses in advance and will never agree to question. On principle, he possesses rights authorizing him to wage war and Baking that struggle a just undertaking; the person he confronts is not a partner in search for truth, but an adversary, an enemy who is wrong, who is harmful and whose very existence constitutes a threat. For him then, the game does not consist of recognizing this person as a subject having the right to speak, but of abolishing him as an interlocuter, from possible dialogue; and his final objective will be, not to come as close as possible to a difficult truth, but to bring about the triumph of the just cause he has been manifestly upholding from the beginning. The polemicist relies on a legitimacy that his adversary is by definition denied.

#### Invitation to readers;

In the best spirit of "reciprocal elucidation," please send us your "non-polemical" opinion about whether R versus RHP should be the official ASCAP abbreviation for "resource holding potential" and the evolving concept that the designation has begun to take on (see the RG-PG exchanges above and previous ASCAP issues). Originally RHP became R because the software program forming this Newsletter adds

space with every additional letter and R is 1 not 3. But this only tipped a conceptual iceberg because the concept had indeed evolved beyond its limited game-theory meaning, in part stemming from the implications of JS Price's new "anathesis." Let us keep track of, and debate the merits/demerits of, such subtle changes.

Old ASCAP issues are available. Let us know if you need them.

ASCAP #10 (September 15) will present JMA Weiss' factor analytic results of a scale to measure psychopathy in normal, prison and psychiatric patient populations in the USA and India, as these have bearing on the concept of alpha psalic [1c].

1. ASCAP philosophy and goal. High scientific importance rests on comparing animal behaviors across-species to understand better human behavior, knowing as we do so that evolutionary factors must be considered for understanding properly such behaviors. To accomplish these comparisons, very different new ways of viewing psychological and behavioral phenomena are required. This in turn explains why we need new words to define and illustrate new dimensions of comparisons across species. We expect that work in natural history biology combined with cellular-molecular biologic research will emerge as a comprehensive biologic basic science of psychiatry. Indeed, this must happen if we are to explain psychiatric illnesses as deviations from normal processes, something not possible now. Compare to pathogenesis in diseases of internal medicine.

Some neologisms that hopefully will help implement these goals are those of:

a) Michael R. A. Chance: "hedonic" and "agonic" refer to the tone of groupings of conspecifics (members of a same species) i.e., relaxed and fun-loving versus tense and competitive. First initiated with CJ Jolly in 1970, this term is referenced fully in ASCAP #1, Footnote 1.

b) John S. Price: "anathetic" and "catathetic" describe conspecific communications. Catathetic messages "put-down" whereas anathetic signals "build-up" the resource holding potential (R) of target individuals.

c) Russell Gardner, Jr.: "psalic" is a 2 way acronym: Propensity States Antedating Language In Communication and Programmed Spacings And Linkages In Conspecifics, This describes communicational states conjecturely seen with psychiatric disorder and normality (human and non-human), ie, alpha psalic seen in manics, high profile leaders and dominant non-human animals. Eight psalics are named alpha (A), alpha-reciprocal (AR), in-group omega (IGO), out-group omega (OGO), spacing (Sp), sexual (S), nurturant (N), and nurturant-recipient (MR).

All of the above new or renewed terms are initiated or elaborated in Chance, MSA (Ed) Social Fabrics of the Hind, 1988, published by Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hove and New York.

2. H Weiner & E Meyer: The Organism in Health and Disease: Towards an Integrated Biomedical Model. Unpublished manuscript

3. Hofer MA (1982) On the relationship between attachment and separation processes in infancy. in Emotion, Theory Research, and Experience: Emotions in Early Development - 2. (Ed) R. Plutchick, NY: Academic Press.

4. Ackerman SH (1981) Premature weaning, thermoregulation and the occurrence of gastric pathology, in Brain. Behavior and Bodily Disease (Eds.) H Weiner, MA Hofer AJ Stunkard, NY: Raven Press, pp. 67-86

5. Foucault M (1984) The Foucault Reader (ed) P Rabinow. Penguin Books, pp381-2