

ASCAP NEWSLETTER

Across-species Comparisons And Psychiatry Newsletter

Volume 4, No. 10, 15 Oct 1991

"Hominids have been in existence for up to seven million years, bipedal for at least four million years, and have had much larger brains than those of apes for about two million years___But according to the work of Noble and Davidson...it was only in the last 40,000 years, some 60,000 years after the appearance of anatomically modern Homo sapiens, that language evolved."
Robert Foley¹

The ASCAP Newsletter²
is
a function of the
International Association
for the Study of
Comparative Psychopathology
(IASCAP)³

Correspondence with IASCAP is c/o
R Gardner, secretary, and editor
of ASCAP Newsletter
1.200 Graves Building (D29), UTMB,
Galveston, TX 77550-2777, U.S.A.
Phone: (409) 772-3474
FAX: (409) 772-4288

Newsletter aims; 1. A free exchange of letters, notes, articles, essays or ideas in whatever brief format.
2. Elaboration of others' ideas.
3. Keeping up with productions, events, and other news.
4. Proposals for new initiatives, joint research endeavors, etc.

IASCAP Mission Statement: The society represents a group of people who view forms of psychopathology in the context of evolutionary biology and who wish to mobilize the resources of various disciplines and individuals potentially involved so as to enhance the further investigation and study of the conceptual and research questions involved. This scientific society is concerned with the basic plans of behavior that have evolved over millions of years and that have resulted in psychopathologically related states. We are interested in the integration of various methods of study ranging from that focusing on cellular processes to that focusing on individuals to that of individuals in groups.

Features: 1. John Price reports on his consensus statement with Michael Chance on Michael's two modes of social relating, hedonic and agonistic. This statement makes important points and should stimulate comment ...p4
2. RG begins a responsive discussion with a discussion of the USA hearings on a Supreme Court nominee. . . . p10

Publications:

1. Williams GC, Nesse RM: The dawn of Darwinian medicine. Quarterly Rev of Biology 1991;66:(Jan issue)1-22
2. Nesse RM: Psychiatry. In (Ed) Maxwell, M: The Sociobiological Imagination. SUNY Press, 1991

Letters:

Aug. 26, 1991

I am now founding "International Center for Interdisciplinary Psychiatric Research, BYG-24B, SVOGERSLEV, DK-4000 ROSKILDE, DENMARK." The interests of this center obviously comprise comparative psychopathology (ethologist G Sorensen will be a board member). In accordance with

this, specific interests will be: reconciliation of biological thinking with human attitudes to psychiatric patients, ethics of relations to animals particularly laboratory animals, the mind-brain problem, applications of systems methods.

Axel Randrup, Roskilde, DENMARK

I sense that the new International Center will be collegially synergistic and with interests overlapping those of IASCAP. Keep us briefed!

Letters; (cont.) 3 September 1991

...[I enclose my "More on Psychodarwinism" published recently in Nature.⁴] I do not know whether this will close the correspondence [in Nature], but I would be interested to learn whether my contention that psycho-Darwinism is compatible with neo-Darwinism because its sole beneficiaries are the genes responsible for the comparator mechanism, can be shown to be flawed.

Regarding the birth of IASCAP, I am nervous as a new boy in making any comment. However--my initial reaction was a little bit chary. Having spent the best part of a decade as an organisational consultant, the awesome capability of structures to impede the free flow of ideas and to be used as a weapon by those who control them has made an indelible impression on me. The effect has been to create a Conservative-voting anarchist.

But having got to p 4 of the August Newsletter my heart warmed to the underlying motivation: "if you can't beat them, join them." Patently human groupings are subject to pretty acute speciation, with formal organisations being quite incapable of having any form of intercourse with less structured associations. As a result I can see that if the ASCAP readership is to get its "memes" (a word R Dawkins uses to describe the intellectual

equivalent of genes; does it have a wider currency?) through to the next generation, it clearly has to overcome this difficulty. Therefore, "God speed IASCAP" and please may I join.

Incidentally, Russell, I would be grateful if you could induce somebody to comment on my ideas as critically as they felt inclined. I am in sore need of counter-stimulation from the practical implications of what initially seemed very modest proposals for the modification of this house to better meet our needs.

Mike Waller, Worcestershire, UK

Your longer piece is scheduled for the November issue. The clarion call is now out for respondents. Thanks for the reasons your thinking is providing for new required learning!

Letters: (cont.) 9/16/91

...I will be pleased to be a charter member of IASCAP - time constraints and "knowledge" make my participation at a distance more necessary now. The group is into, as always, fascinating issues....

Seymour Itzkoff, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts, USA

I'm glad the material reached you and that you are happy to publish it in the Newsletter.

...[with reference to IASCAP], Isn't it confusing to use the initials ASCAP to mean different things?

J Birtchnell, Medical Research Council, London, ENGLAND

You raise an interesting issue. Do others feel the same?

Letters: (cont.) September 19, 1991

Thanks for the ASCAP. ...appreciate that you took the trouble to sum-

marize the [HBES] conference. Also, the talks, the trips, and your presentations, all enjoyable....

M McGuire, UCLA, LA, USA

Letters: (cont.) Sep 24, 1991

Hereby I send \$36 for the subscription of ASCAP 1991 and 1992. I got some '91 issues from a colleague, but my collection is incomplete.

In our Danish Society for Human Ethology we are very interested in ASCAP and regularly follow the correspondence.

Tyge Schelde, Frederiksberg, DENMARK

I was pleased to hear that you regularly follow the correspondence and discuss it in the Danish Society for Human Ethology. I am sure that the Executive Committee of IASCAP will feel similarly as your name and work came up a number of times in the conference at Odintune in July. We feel grateful for the time and energy that you and your group has put into documenting the details of patient communications.

Do you think that you or others of the Danish Society might share with the other ASCAP readers what impressions you have of the correspondence. I am sure that I speak for others in feeling curious and desirous of your insights.

I hope that other readers (even if not subscribers) would feel welcome in the IASCAP. We need to become acquainted with our colleagues in Denmark and other parts of Europe - as in many ways you are the vanguards - certainly more than in the USA.

Letters; (cont.) 29-9-91

... I leave today for Vienna and Budapest on teaching missions and to recruit a few IASCAP members I hope.

Michael RA Chance, President,
IASCAP, Birmingham, ENGLAND

Letters: (cont.)

30-9-91

Enclosed is a RESPONSE TO GARDNER AND BIRTCHNELL. [This will be published in a subsequent issue].

At present our subject area is scattered across many disciplines. Might we benefit from having a central source of relevant publications and work of members? Would it be possible for us to create a data base where members could send in their own work and we could build up a reference list that all interested could (maybe for a small fee depending on the work involved) call upon? Also might IASCAP publish a monthly list of relevant publications with small summaries? Would this be too much work?

Paul Gilbert, Vice President, IASCAP,
Derby, ENGLAND

For the editor alone, it would be. But it is an organizational issue for us to decide how such a wonderful project might take place. With the use of mailable floppy disks, fax machines, and E-mail (though we don't have that in this office), we should be able to make use of the techniques of modern communication. Although this office could act as a clearing house, some other location might be preferable -- as it might then demonstrate that this is a collaborative international venture (albeit with great distances separating the members). Are there further ideas?

Consensus statement on two modes of social relating, hedonic and agonistic.

by John Price (and Michael Chance)

History

Let me just recap a little for the sake of those who are not familiar with the concept of two modes. Michael first used the terms to describe the difference between macaque and chimpanzee groups. His long-tailed macaques, for instance, seemed to be perpetually testing out

the rank order of the group and were oriented towards fighting most of the time, even though actual fighting was not common.

The subordinate monkeys were either testing out the dominants, looking for an opportunity to rise in rank, or avoiding the random aggression which was directed down the hierarchy. The dominants, for their part, were watching for signs of imminent rebellion among their subordinates. As a result the animals all seemed tense and edgy, and their attention was preoccupied in monitoring the position and activity of the dominant animals.

In contrast, chimpanzee society, both in captivity and in the wild, is much more relaxed. Although fighting for status occurs, the fights are over relatively quickly and complete reconciliation usually takes place, so that there is no longer any tension in relationships which have recently been in dispute. The animals seem relaxed most of the time, and their attention, instead of being focused on the dominants, is free to engage other objects and facilitates exploration.

This relaxed acceptance of the results of fights, even of rank reversal, may be due to the fact that rank is not very important in chimpanzee society, food is widely dispersed, there is no shortage of sleeping sites, and sexual opportunities are very little influenced by rank. In macaque society, on the other hand, mating opportunities are highly correlated with rank, so that rank matters and is worth fighting about.

Michael makes two main points about the kind of adjustment which occurs with each mode. First, macaques are used to living with social uncertainty, particularly with contested social rank. According to the principle of the coevolution of ritual weapons and ritual defences, they have evolved thick "skins" for deal-

ing with the chronic tensions and "pecking" of the agonic mode.

Chimpanzees, on the other hand, are used to living in the relaxed conditions of the hedonic mode. The price they pay for this is that their behavioural repertoires, and probably their physiology, are not adapted to spending long periods in the agonic mode, and if this is forced on them, as it was by the provisioning carried out by Jane Goodall, their behaviour disintegrates; they are not able to maintain the ritualised aggression characteristic of the macaque agonic mode, and they start seriously injuring each other; probably also the unaccustomed social stress causes ulcers and other psychosomatic disorders. Presented with highly desirable bananas confined to a small space and only available for short periods in the day, they found they had, for the first time in their lives, something that really mattered to fight about.

Michael's second point is that primitive man probably had a chimpanzee kind of organisation and spent most of his time in the hedonic mode. This left his attention free to organise and dominate his physical environment. The disadvantage was that he did not develop the macaque's tolerance for long periods in the agonic mode, and therefore if he finds himself in the agonic mode for any length of time he lacks then resilience and the behavioural inhibition characteristic of the macaque and is susceptible both to psychosomatic disorder and to uninhibited outbursts of behaviour such as temper tantrums, wife battering and child abuse.

The problem we now face with the two modes concept is to adapt it for use with human beings. It was derived from a difference between species, but we want to use it for differences within species, partly to describe differences between human groups, but mainly to describe changes within

human groups from time to time.

This seems at the moment the most promising use of the concept, to describe the way that human groups (or dyads) can switch from the hedonic mode into the agonistic mode and back again. This kind of switching describes a phenomenon with which we are all familiar (particularly in marital relationships) but which our existing terminology lacks descriptive terms for.

In order to prepare the two modes concept for this task, we need to "humanise" it and to clarify its meaning so that it really does shed light rather than confusion on what is undoubtedly a very complex and confused field of study. Much progress towards this end was achieved by Michael's book Social Fabrics of the Mind, but some loose ends remain.

In our consensus conference, we distinguished between agonistic and hedonic modes in a dyadic relationship and the same two modes in a group of three or more. They are not necessarily the same. In a large group of human beings there is a tendency for polarisation into two opposing factions, so that the group as a whole is in agonistic mode but each faction on its own is in hedonic mode.

Romeo and Juliet is a good example. The social action in the streets of Verona is in the agonistic mode because of the feud between the heads of the two houses, but within the House of Montagu, as within the House of Capulet, the social action is presumed to be in the hedonic mode.

In general, when the relationship between the two highest ranking individuals in a group is in the agonistic mode, the group as a whole is in the agonistic mode, but within the faction headed by each of these individuals, the social action may be in the hedonic mode. Thus, in a family, there may be a coalition between father and son against mother and daughter; the marital relationship is

in the agonistic mode, therefore the family as a whole is in the agonistic mode, but the father/son and mother/daughter relationships are in the hedonic mode. This is unlike the situation in a group of macaques where, in spite of the formation of alliances, all the dyadic relationships tend to be agonistic.

Thus, in humans, the modes define dyadic relationships; and not as a trait variable but as a state variable, implying that relationships may switch from one mode to the other, so that the modes could be said to define episodes in relationships.

Although the term mode should be restricted to relationships, the terms agonistic and hedonic may be used to qualify other things. Thus, an agonistic society is one in which most of the relationships are agonistic, an agonistic personality is one who tends to have agonistic relationships.

Also we feel that we should be able to say that a person is in an agonistic mentality when his social action is dictated by a relationship in the agonistic mode (although we realise that Paul Gilbert has reservations about this last usage).

Definition of the two modes

Michael's original definition of the agonistic mode stated that the animals were oriented towards fighting, although fighting was not actually taking place. This emphasised the fact that in a group of macaques the psychological, physiological and muscular preparations for fighting are in operation when the mode is agonistic, and these preparations may be continued for a long time in the absence of fighting. This concept is important for psychosomatic medicine.

However, in humans, fighting (in the form of the exchange of catathetic signals) may be so subtle that it is almost impossible to tell whether it is occurring or not; and there is the added problem that omission of an anathetic signal may be

equivalent to a catathetic signal (frustrative non-reward) so that even if nothing is actually happening, the fight may still be going on.

Therefore it seems best in humans to use the term agonic to describe a relationship which is oriented towards fighting, whether or not fighting is actually going on. We think this slight change of definition may make the concepts easier to use in relation to humans, and therefore more useful.

We think we can get a more precise definition than "oriented towards fighting". Gregory Bateson and his co-workers in Palo Alto⁵ distinguished between the command (or definition) element of a communication and the informational content. Thus if I say to you "Pass the hammer" I am not only giving you information about what I want, but I am defining myself as someone who tells you to pass the hammer, and defining you as the sort of person who gets told to pass the hammer, and our relationship as one in which I give you orders. In this case, however, the definition does not exclude the possibility that we are reciprocal about the hammer, and that you might just as easily tell me to pass the hammer (but of course many definition statements do in fact define the relationship as asymmetrical (complementary)).

Redundancy and non-redundancy

Power in a relationship resides with the person who defines it, and in a complementary relationship one person defines it and the other accepts the definition given by the other. In a symmetrical relationship the definition is agreed by mutual negotiation. In both cases there are likely to be times when there is no dispute about the definition of the relationship, in which case — this is a very important point — *the definition components of the communication are redundant.*

At other times one of the members will have introduced a new definition which has not yet been accepted by the other, and here, the definition statements are *not redundant*} there is likely to be fighting about the definition until one (whom we might call the acceptor) accepts the new definition provided by the definer. *Thus, we can say that a relationship is in the hedonic mode when the definition components of the communications are redundant, otherwise it is in the agonic mode.*

To give a clinical example, a patient was a submissive wife whose depression enabled her to accept her husband's definition of their relationship, which was that he was having an extramarital affair. Then he redefined the relationship by bringing his mistress to live in the house, ostensibly as a live-in babysitter. The wife could not accept this new definition and offered a counter-definition, which was that the mistress should leave. The wife suffered many months of humiliation, driven to the kitchen or her bedroom while the husband and the baby-sitter disported themselves in the sitting room, and this made her very depressed. But even her new depth of depression did not make her sufficiently apathetic to accept the new definition by the time she came for treatment, and she was still feeling angry with her husband (a symptom of an agonic relationship).

When we come to a larger group, going by what we said above, the group is in the hedonic mode when the definition statements of the two most powerful individuals are redundant. This should generally be true, except in cases when numbers three, four and five are strong enough to gang up and challenge one and two. This definition accounts for the persisting hedonic mode in the Glasgow gang⁶ in spite of the bitter resentment of the number two that the investigator had

joined the gang as an extra supporter of the number one. Given that the investigator ranked number three (or equal to two), the struggle for definition between two and three could not tip the gang as a whole into the agonic mode.

In the course of these discussions, Antonia Price pointed out that Bateson only told half (or two thirds) of the story when he divided communication into definitional and informational components. She said that she spends a lot of time comforting people who are in trouble, often over long periods, and it is neither the informational nor definitional aspects of their communication that she is attending to; rather, she is hearing what might be termed the expressive/affective component of their communication.

This ties in with Talcott Parsons' distinction between the expressive female role and the male instrumental role (although both sexes perform both functions, particularly in the present age!). We could say that, in the agonic mode, the ear is tuned to hear the definitional component; in the hedonic mode, when the social action is task-oriented, the ear is tuned to the informational component; in the hedonic mode, when the social action is oriented towards nurturance and care giving/receiving, the ear is tuned to the expressive/affective component of whatever communication is taking place, there is, of course, a reflexive loop between mode and communication, in that the communication helps to determine the mode, and the mode determines what aspect of the communication is attended to (and how it is interpreted) as Cronen et al pointed out.

Uses of the two modes concept

I have gone on at some length about the two modes because I think the concept is important. It has clarified my own thinking, to such an extent that it is becoming difficult to com-

municate with people who are not familiar with the concept. So many things vary with mode. For example:

1. Reinforcement - is it positive or negative? Consider the simple act of turning away: in the agonic mode, if the other person turns away, it is a submissive signal and therefore rewarding and anathetic; in the hedonic mode, turning away is a signal of inattention and therefore aversive or catathetic.

2. The modes explain the change of individual behaviour with social context (see Paul's recent ASCAP contribution). For instance, a couple is in the agonic mode, quarreling or maintaining hostile silence. They then go out to dinner, where the husband is the "life and soul of the party". They then go home and, as so many wives report, "as soon as the door closed behind him his whole personality changed and he became hostile or silent."

The husband is simply behaving according to the mode of the social group he is in. His marriage was in the agonic mode, so alone with his wife, both before and after the party, he behaved agonically. But the group at the party was in the hedonic mode, and so he behaved hedonically - still competing, but competing by showing off not by putting down.

The two modes concept also draws attention to switching from one mode to the other. Switching from the hedonic to the agonic mode is similar to the "disassuagement" of Heard and Lake; when does attachment theory no longer account for behaviour? Here we are in the territory of frustration/aggression hypotheses and the idea of the equivalence of punishment and frustrative non-reward. Switching from the agonic to the hedonic mode is commonly called reconciliation. Why are we so much worse at it than chimpanzees?

Hedonic competition

The agonic/hedonic dichotomy should

not be confused with the difference between cooperation and competition. There is no cooperation in the agonistic mode, but there *is* competition in the hedonic mode. However, it is quite different from agonistic competition. Paul has pointed out that whereas agonistic competition is based on attraction; two rivals in the hedonic mode, instead of trying to intimidate each other, vie for attractiveness in the eyes of one or more third parties.

The most advanced form of hedonic competition is the political election, but similar activity is going on all the time in an "informed" way. The third parties note by expressing approbation or disapprobation, and the end result is the differential allocation of prestige to the two rivals. The differential prestige is the basis of a ranking system, so we should not think of the hedonic mode as only applying to egalitarian social groups.

The important thing is that the ranking in the hedonic mode is decided by third parties, rather than the rivals themselves. The two rivals may not meet, or if they do they may have an agonistic relationship, but they know that they cannot influence their relative rank by the methods of the agonistic mode.

This was illustrated well in the film All About Eve in which two rival actresses had a relation of agonistic bitchiness, but they knew that the more bitchy they appeared, the less attractive they appeared to their judges; only when they were on their own was it possible to "put the boot in" in the hope of making the other depressed and therefore less attractive to others.

Since there are always at least two rivals and one judge involved, this kind of competition could be called polyadic to distinguish it from the dyadic competition of agonistic mode.

The hedonic mode is also compatible with rank ordering established by

fighting or other agonistic means but which has come to be accepted by the losing parties; then the definition components of the communications are redundant, and the requirement of the hedonic mode is met.

Hedonic anathetic signals

The approbation and disapprobation which are administered in the hedonic mode are by definition anathetic and catathetic signals because they raise and lower self-esteem (RHP). But they are different from the equivalent signals of the hedonic mode. In the hedonic mode anathetic signals are not submission signals as they are in the agonistic mode; usually they are neutral or noninformatory about the relative rank of the sender and receiver of the signal. This means that they can be used between equals and in a down-hierarchy direction. One of the features of human social life is the enormous elaboration of these non-directional anathetic signals.

When anathetic signals do have a directional component, there is a risk of paradox or double-bind: a down-hierarchy anathetic signal may be interpreted as a catathetic signal if the definitional component is not accepted by the receiver.

Thus patronising or condescending behaviour is received as anathetic by someone who views the sender as higher-ranking (in the way that Mr. Collins is flattered by the "condescension" of Lady Catherine de Bourgh in Pride and Prejudice), but as catathetic by someone who views the sender as equal. Between equals there can be no implications of superior relative rank in anathetic signals, otherwise they are no longer anathetic.

Dimension or category?

Should we talk about a relationship being either agonistic or hedonic on the one hand, or should we use a dimensional terminology and say that it is more agonistic or less agonistic? Paul and

I have discussed this and we feel that a categorical terminology is justified because the middle ground between the two modes tends to be unstable, subject to positive feedback processes whose end-points lie in one mode or the other. This reflects the common feeling of "The more angry he got, the more she retaliated." There must be exceptions, such as cases when one member of a dyad behaves as though the relationship is agonistic when the other is behaving as though it is hedonic, but such instances are probably exceptions, examples of pathological social functioning, and worthy of study as such.

Conclusion

Should we define the agonistic mode as orientation towards fighting or as non-redundancy (of the definitional component of communication)? Are these two things the same? No, because non-redundancy can theoretically be dealt with by the methods of the hedonic mode, particularly by metacommunication (talking about the non-redundancy).

Let me illustrate this by an ~~example~~ from fiction. In her novel *September* Rosamund Pilcher depicts a hedonic marriage which, after eight years, experiences its first non-redundancy. The couple gradually realise that they have incompatible ideas about the education of their eight year old son (the American wife wants him to go to day school, the Scottish husband wants him to go to the family boarding school). They have never decided who should choose the school for the boy, nor have they decided who should decide who should choose the school.

They both realise that they can never give in on this issue, and the marriage switches into the agonistic mode. In the novel they do not metacommunicate, but if they had done, they might have remained in the hedonic mode. One of them could have said, "Look, we have an irreconcil-

able difference, what shall we do about it?" and the other might have replied, "We could toss a coin to decide the winner, or we could go to arbitration, such as Marriage Guidance."

In this way they might have avoided the drift into the agonistic mode, which must have been the usual method of resolution of non-redundancy in precultural times (and even now). Of course, it would have been easier for the couple to deal with the school problem before they got married, or at least before it arose in acute form: Non-redundancy is very much a case of prophylaxis being easier than the cure. Best of all to negotiate all possible definitions while at least one of the couple is still in love - surely one of the main functions of the state of being in love must be to facilitate the negotiation of definitions.

It is interesting that the advice to resolve ~~conflict~~ by arbitration is given in the *I Ching*, said to be the oldest book in the world⁸; under the sixth ideogram, entitled "Conflict", the following advice is given, "You feel yourself to be in the right, and therefore you proceed with complete confidence. The path you have chosen, however, will lead you into a state of conflict...you cannot engage in conflict with your adversaries, for this would lead to misfortune...it would be in your best interests to place the conflict before an impartial authority who can make an unprejudiced decision."

On the whole I think it is preferable to define the agonistic mode in terms of non-redundancy because this directs our attention to the cause which may be amenable to therapy. The exception, when non-redundancy is detected and communicated about and resolved in the hedonic mode, is of such rare occurrence that it deserves to be the exception that proves the rule.

I hope that this rather imperfect summary of my recent discussions with Michael will help to clarify the two modes concept, and if any ASCAP contributors still have any doubts about the definition or usage of the terms, I hope they will speak out. We know that terms can become so imprecise that they do more harm than good, as has happened with "hysteria" and "aggression." I think the two modes terminology catches a subtle but real and important variable in the genesis of psychopathology, and it is worth expending some effort to make the terms as useful as possible.

Response by RG

I hope that this feature contribution becomes a well discussed statement from IASCAP's president and president-elect. I'll respond with discussion of a public example.

In the USA in mid-October, 1991, Senate hearings on the suitability of lawyer Clarence Thomas (CT) to sit on the Supreme Court have entailed evidence that some years ago he sexually harassed a woman lawyer subordinate named Anita Hill (AH).

John and Michael provide new ideas about how to define interchanges such as the CT-AH relationship. They importantly suggest that *redundancy vs non-redundancy of the definition of a relationship* tells whether interactants are friendly vs adverse.

The presumption of defining an interpersonal situation means power is wielded. If the recipient does not agree with the definition, the responsive message is *non-redundant* with the initiating one and shows that conflict exists. If *redundant* and negotiated, ie, if the definition is accepted, then the situation is not hostile but hedonic.

Returning to the American real-life televised drama, AH described under oath how CT on a number of occasions asked her for unwelcome dates and

told her pornographic stories with the seeming expectation that these would be alluring. He seemed unaware that she found the allusions offensive. At the time, she refused dates, changed the subject, noted embarrassment, but was discreet. She clearly in some way did feel offended, however, at least enough to testify against him now years later. She stated that she had had concern for her career: he had the potential both to help or hurt that.

Now the problem: assuming her testimony to be true was her communication of discretion "redundant?" (Regarding truth, CT denied the harassment, also under oath, but such events are not unique to the two of them so that the human situation to which the testimony alludes for this discussion applies nonetheless).

He defined the situation; she acceded (neutrality) to some ambiguous degree that made the interchange more comfortable--the office situation was, to some degree, hedonic. They worked together productively.

But on other levels, this was not a "hedonic" relationship. As is true of many human relationships, there were many levels of interaction with subtle and concealed hostility.

Humans are distinctive perhaps because there are so many paths via which they can have things both ways; deception and "acting" are important. AH expressed current regret she had not been more forceful in her rebuffs of the alleged harassment, but at the time she had not for career reasons. Perhaps an adaptive advantage of the recently developed human language¹ is that it has allowed more subtle and future-oriented power negotiations.

But these human attributes raise problems if the concept is to be taken to the field. How can we apply this concept in actual interchanges? Some situations are hard to call. We need operational definitions. Then we need to gather actual data.

1. Foley RA: Language origins. The silence of the past. Nature 1991;353:114-115. Commentary on Nobel W, Davidson I: Man 1991;26:223-254.
 2. c/o R Gardner, 1.200 Graves Building (D29), University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX 77550 FAX: 409-772-4288. For ASCAP Newsletter Volume 4 (Jan through Dec, 1991) please send \$18 (or equivalent) for the 12 issues. For subscription to the ASCAP Newsletter, make checks or money orders out to "Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, UTMB."
 3. EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:
President: Michael R A Chance
President-Elect: John S Price
Vice President: Paul Gilbert
Secretary & Newsletter Editor: Russell Gardner, Jr
Treasurer: Leon Sloman
- At this time this "informal" organization has no official budget.
4. Waller M: More on psychodarwinism. Nature 1991;352:657
 5. Sluzki CE and Beavin J: Symmetry and complementarity: an operational definition and a typology of dyads. Acta psichiatrica v psicologica de America Latina 1965;11:321-330. Reprinted in (Eds) Watzlawick P and Weakland JH The Interactional View 1977, pp. 71-87.
 6. Patrick J: A Glasgow Gang Observed Long: Eyre Methuen, 1973.
 7. Cronen VE, Johnson KM, and Lannamann JW: Paradoxes, double binds, and reflexive loops: an alternative theoretical perspective. Family Process. 1982;21:91-112.
 8. Wing RL: The Illustrated I Ching. Dolphin/Doubleday, 1982.