

Journal of Humanistic Psychology

<http://jhp.sagepub.com>

Frank Barron: A Creator On Creating

Alfonso Montuori

Journal of Humanistic Psychology 2003; 43; 7

DOI: 10.1177/0022167802250582

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jhp.sagepub.com>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Association for Humanistic Psychology](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jhp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jhp.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

FRANK BARRON: A CREATOR ON CREATING



Frank Barron: 1922-2002

ALFONSO MONTUORI first met Frank Barron in 1984. In 1991, Frank was a member of his dissertation committee at Saybrook Institute, and they later went on to collaborate, with the assistance of Frank's daughter Anthea, on the edited book *Creators on Creating* (Putnam, 1997). Montuori's research has been in the areas of creativity and innovation, systems and complexity theories, planetary culture, organizational theory, strategy and strategic thinking, and cultural epistemology. Regardless of the subject matter, Frank's influence pervades his work, particularly Frank's view of creativity as a general orientation to life rather than a special gift confined to special people in special domains. His books include *Evolutionary Competence* (Gieben, 1989), *From Power to Partnership* (coauthored with Isabella Conti) (Harper San Francisco, 1993), and the three-volume series *Social Creativity* (co-edited with Ronald E. Purser) (Hampton Press, 1999-2000). Montuori's articles have appeared in publications including *Academy of Management Review*, *Human Relations*, and *Journal of Management Education*. A member of the General Evolution Research Group, he is book series editor of *Advances in Systems Theory, Complexity, and the Human Sciences* at Hampton Press; associate editor of *World Futures: The Journal of General Evolution*, and a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Transformative Education*, *Tamara: The Journal of Critical Postmodern Organization Theory*, *Pluriverso* (Italy), and *Elites* (Italy).

Journal of Humanistic Psychology, Vol. 43 No. 2, Spring 2003 7-23
DOI: 10.1177/0022167802250582
© 2003 Sage Publications

Some there are, and not solitaries only, who in the midst of the spectacle of the world stand a bit aside and muse upon the passing show. They give to its every particular their sustained present attention, thus rescuing a part of the spectacle from time's erosion. What they save may be called eternal, for the object of their attention has been that which stays when time and particulars have passed. We call them artists or poets if they not only give their enduring attention to what abides through the cycles of change, but in addition make a social communication of their vision and create a new form in which the essence of the particulars is conveyed so that at least one other person may be given to see what the artist has seen.

The study of individual human lives offers to the psychologist this valuable possibility. Psychology, if it holds itself apart from vulgar curiosity and from dehumanizing generalization, can be a sacred discipline devoted to the celebration of the human spirit.

Barron (1995, p. 79)

Frank Barron, the man who wrote these words, might well have been describing himself in the above passages. For him, the study of human lives was indeed both an art and a science and a “sacred discipline devoted to the celebration of the human spirit” (p. 79). And Frank was decidedly not someone who would use the word “sacred” lightly.

As Frank's friend and student, I have felt compelled to write something about him and for a very specific reason. Clearly, I want to honor a man who was my teacher, mentor, and friend. Frank was such a complex, multidimensional, multifaceted figure that it was difficult to get an understanding of the whole person—or, rather, the whole person was there all the time, every time I was with him. What was less clear was where that whole person had been, what he had done, and who his friends were, as I discovered trying to put together a *Festschrift* for him and finding myself calling, in no specific order, Hans Eysenck, Howard Gardner, Timothy Leary, Michael Murphy, Stanley Krippner, Teresa Amabile, Mike Arons, Harrison Gough, Richard Baker-Roshi, Claudio Naranjo, and many of his other “unusual associates” (Montuori, 1995). Frank would never boast about his work or his influence. In fact, I remember having several conversations with him over the years only to find out later that he had spent years researching the topics in question and had published remarkable studies about them. That's one of the many things that was so unusual about him. He

never approached you as “the expert” but was always listening with what seemed to be, in that overused but powerful term, a “beginner’s mind,” open to possibilities, eager to really hear what you had to say, explore the questions you were exploring, and dialogue about them. And this was not some kind of manipulative fake modesty on his part but rather his way of engaging a subject matter, and his interlocutor, anew and not getting stuck in his own findings and categorizations in the process.

In Frank’s obituary in *The New York Times*, Harrison Gough, emeritus professor at UC Berkeley and a fellow member of the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research, put it this way:

He worked in a way that might seem, if you hadn’t followed it for very long, to be casual and without any particular focus. But after a few years it became clear that there was an inner compass that guided him and continued to guide him for all of his life, really. (*The New York Times*, 2002, p. 29)

The casual approach and seeming lack of focus reflect Frank’s personality, both singularly free of academic ego and posturing and drawn to enormous transdisciplinary complexity that could not easily be reduced to a single, easily expressed academic project. In these pages, I want to take the opportunity to remind the reader of both the great and fascinating diffusion found in Frank’s work and the vital integration that manifested both in his life and in his work. Frank never pushed his work or his enormous wisdom and erudition on anyone, and in these days of hype and sound bytes and publicists, this is surely a rare quality.

I am particularly happy to bring Frank’s work once more to the attention of readers of the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* because Frank identified himself clearly as a humanistic psychologist (although not in any exclusive sense, I should hasten to add) and was actually president of APA Division 32 from 1989 to 1990. Frank was a founding board member of the Esalen Institute, and through his relationship with Rollo May, Michael Murphy, Claudio Naranjo, George Brown, Gregory Bateson, Richard Baker-Roshi, Ralph Metzner, Stanley Krippner, and others too numerous to mention was part of a group associated with much of humanistic psychology’s intellectual creativity on the West Coast.

I would like to invite humanistic psychologists to revisit Frank’s work, and I hope these pages will serve as a way to renew interest

in his tremendous contribution not just to the psychology of creativity but also to the understanding of human personality. One of the particularly interesting characteristics of Frank's work, and of Frank Barron the man, was the extraordinary way in which it combined elements from diverse disciplines, perspectives, and traditions. This kind of eclecticism rubbed purists of all stripes the wrong way. "How could Frank Barron be president of Division 32?" someone asked me once. "His research is psychometric!" A true individual and individualist, Frank did not let himself and his creativity get caged in by categories that would allow him to belong to this or that group and benefit from their support, political or otherwise. If his work was complex and multidimensional, it is because it reflected the complexity and multidimensionality of both subject matter and author as well as his integrity as a scholar.

EMERGENT EVOLUTION AND HOLISM

In his last major work, *No Rootless Flower*, Frank recalls that while writing the autobiographical sections of the book and reflecting on his life, he found that he was, in many ways, still working on his undergraduate senior thesis at LaSalle on emergent evolution and holism. These two terms have now become widely used buzzwords, the subject of endless books, articles, and research projects, but they formed a connecting thread throughout Frank's work for more than 60 years.

The problem of psychic creation is a special case of the problem of novelty in all of nature. By what process do new forms come into being? The specifications of the conditions under which novelty appears in human psychical functioning is the task to which the psychology of creativity addresses itself. In doing so, it links itself to the general scientific enterprise of describing the evolution of forms in the natural world. (Barron, 1995, p. 299)

We have much to learn from Frank's exploration on this subject for many different reasons. Frank's findings are crucial in providing us with the human dimensions of creativity, complexity, simplicity, order, disorder. But we must also take into account not so much his methodologies but also his larger approach, the way he developed his inquiry.

Reading the concluding chapter of *No Rootless Flower*, we find Frank contextualizing creativity in the evolution of the universe, reflecting on necessary correspondences for a theory of creativity. Yet after one particularly heady section that begins, appropriately and “cosmically,” with the Big Bang, Frank concludes by gently sitting us down in a pub in Dublin, where we find him nursing a Guinness while he overhears a conversation, a fleeting, humorous, if typically dark and edgy, exchange about Ernest Hemingway’s recent suicide. This was one of Frank’s almost magical abilities. He could take the most seemingly abstruse, abstract, and cosmologically huge aspects of our existence, with discussions of galaxies and protons, spiral into a duet between Yeats and Wittgenstein on the inability of the human mind to grasp our origins, and then relate it, obliquely and poetically, gently but insightfully, to this moment, right where we are sitting now.

Frank’s study of emergent evolution and holism led him to address such key questions as the relationship between complexity and simplicity, order and disorder. The mathematical and scientific dimensions of complexity are now being exhaustively studied, and complexity has indeed become somewhat of a fad, perhaps in the same way that quantum physics was 20 years ago. But Frank’s work focused on outlining the phenomenology and existential implications of complexity and the characteristics of people who do not only deal well with complexity but actually welcome it in their lives. Frank also realized the importance of disorder in the creative process. Whereas traditional social scientific thinking—and, in the 1950s, perhaps society itself—was obsessed with order, Frank demonstrated that order without disorder would lead to the bland, static homogeneity of a closed system. Creativity and self-renewal, he argued, required embracing disorder and emerged out of the dialogue between order and disorder and the search for a more complex integration.

One of the key characteristics Frank Barron found in creative individuals was that their entire approach to what are considered antinomies, polarities, or oppositions in society is quite unusual. It is almost as if, both in their personality and in their mental process, creative individuals take as their point of departure both/and rather than either/or. Let us take the example of the relationship between creativity and madness, one that always gets much attention and has been the subject of much Hollywood interest through

movies such as *Bird*, *Amadeus*, and, most recently, *A Beautiful Mind*. Creative individuals score higher on measures of psychopathology, which would suggest that yes, there is a clear link between creativity and what we might call, in popular language, “madness.” End of story? Not at all. Creative people also score higher on measures of psychological health. Now the situation gets a little bit more complex. In fact, a lot more complex. Because our natural tendency might be to say that you’re either crazy or you’re sane, but you can’t be both. Furthermore, how can you actually be saner than average because you’re crazier than average?

Here we find an aspect of Frank’s thinking that is truly key. From his perspective, human beings are not static systems in equilibrium but dynamic systems in a process of constant self-renewal and self-reorganization. The view that one is either crazy or healthy blinds us to the nature and effect of the relationship between the two. To give a simple example, any system that focuses on order at the exclusion of disorder soon becomes a rigid, homogeneous equilibrium system where no change is likely or even possible. What cybernetics and the systems sciences are showing us today is that disorder is needed for a system’s self-renewal and reorganization. Living systems create order out of chaos in the same way that integrating new and unexpected experiences, people, and encounters “keeps us alive,” and a steady diet of monotonous sameness can be stultifying. Frank showed that creative individuals alternate order and disorder, simplicity and complexity, sanity and craziness in an ongoing process and that a defining characteristic of their creativity is the capacity to engage in what Kazimier Dabrowski (1964) called “positive disintegration.” If creative persons are constantly engaged in a process of self-creation and self-renewal, then we have to accept that along with that self-renewal comes a breaking down of old structures and patterns.

Maslow (1971) argued that dichotomizing pathologizes, and Frank showed that connecting creates. But this connecting is not simple task: it is an ongoing process of navigating the edge of chaos. If you’re not either statically, “essentially” sane (or crazy) but in a dynamic equilibrium between the two, occasionally flopping over on one side and occasionally on the other, then life becomes a much more ambiguous, uncertain process—a creative process, with all that entails. Frank was inviting us to think differently—dare I say, creatively—about creativity and go beyond the traditional polarizing ways of thinking that so block the creative process.

ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Consistent with his creative spirit of embracing oppositions, Frank was both fiercely individualistic, committed to deeply researching human personality and personal freedom, and convinced that human personality should be studied ecologically, contextually. He even went as far as stating, in the title of a memorable essay (Barron, 1995), that “All creation is collaboration” (p. 69). Interestingly and quite appropriately given his cosmological approach to creativity, he began this essay by suggesting an alternative to the Biblical myth of the single (male) Creator, with the image of co-Creation involving both male and female.

Frank was a holist, in some sense of the word, but his interest in creativity and his deeply ingrained, existential individualism (I remember hearing him sing “You’ve got to walk that lonesome valley, you’ve got to walk it by yourself,” one particularly surreal evening at Esalen) led him to avoid the sort of holistic, whole-rather-than-parts thinking that came as a reaction to the parts-rather-than-whole it critiqued. Parsonian equilibrium systems theory had interpreted holistic approaches in a collectivistic as opposed to individualistic way, oriented toward system maintenance of the status quo as opposed to creativity and transformation. But it was abundantly clear that this was not the case in Frank’s work. He championed a holistic approach to emergent evolution. The emergent evolution brought in the factor of change, discontinuity, and creation that traditional holism was lacking. So Frank valued both part and whole, both change and constancy, and saw the individual as embedded in a larger ecology that he or she contributed to (re)creating. Complexity, coupled with differentiation and integration were key for him, leading to the kind of complex holism described by the French thinker Edgar Morin (1990), who argued not for whole or part, but for a “unitas multiplex,” a unity in diversity that recognizes difference and underlying unity. And indeed, Frank conceived of the self (and the whole) as a unity in diversity (Barron, 1995, p. 13).

With all this talk of holism and evolution and dynamical systems, one might wonder if reading Frank’s work might be some daunting affair requiring an encyclopedia of science by one’s side and having little, if anything, to do with humanistic psychology. This is not at all the case—on the contrary. Frank was not a reductionist at all. In fact, one of the most fascinating aspects of

Frank's work is that he did read human creativity in light of, and through, creation in nature but did not attempt to reduce human creativity to the creativity found in natural systems. What sets Frank apart from such biologism is that, for him, the enterprise went both ways, and he also sought to understand principles in nature through the psychology of creativity. The way he did this was by exploring the necessary correspondences for a theory of creativity, the pattern that connects.

One third of *No Rootless Flower* consists of autobiographical material, in keeping with Frank's focus on the study of human lives. These pages guide us through a narrative of part of Frank's life and the ecologies that sustained him during his early years. What is so vital about these pages is not just the insights into Frank's life that they provide, and the elegant demonstration of psycho-autobiography, but also the contextualizing of a life in its larger creative ecology. In this delightful autobiographical narrative, Frank seemingly sidesteps years of debate about individual versus society, environmental determinism versus autonomy, zeitgeist versus lone genius. It is patently obvious that the unique emerging voice of Frank Barron developed in a set of contexts, in creative ecologies that shaped him and were shaped by him, as we see him developing his own unique trajectory through cycles of integration and diffusion. Frank pays tribute to his major influences; acknowledges the effect of teachers, chance encounters, and books; and discusses figures like Henry Murray and Richard Elliott, with whom Frank took a course that was to change his life: biographical psychology. An important part of this contextualizing involves a profoundly ethical dimension because it allows Frank to acknowledge the sources of his own work and inspiration, a quality of humility and gratefulness that is perhaps all too often lacking these days.

FRANK TAKES ME TO THE MOVIES

I had the privilege of spending a fair bit of time with Frank, both socially and professionally, but I only ever took one class with him. It was a course on human personality at the University of California Santa Cruz in the late 1980s. Frank was known for his unusual and somewhat indirect teaching approach. In this particular

course, he used several movies about the lives of Freud and Jung but also Fellini's "8½" and Orson Wells's "Citizen Kane."

Frank was convinced that movies offered a remarkable opportunity to study human personality and likened the experience of watching a movie in a theater to "dreaming together." The discussions that followed these movies were enormously entertaining and insightful. The film "8½" became a study in creativity, with students following the travails of Marcello Mastroianni's blocked movie director looking for inspiration while faced with the pressures of critics, producers, actors, enormous and expensive sets, lover and wife showing up at inopportune times, and, most of all, his own internal pressures. The way Frank presented the whole thing was by no means art theory or criticism. Instead, he invited us—never explicitly, as far as I remember—to think of Fellini's masterpiece as a dream and to interpret it in the context of our lives. What does that dream mean to you? How does it relate to your life? I suspect that many of us came out of the experience not necessarily seeking a career in psychology but rather with an expanded sense of our own creativity, to be explored and applied in the ecologies we wanted to live in and create. Shortly after that, Frank ran a workshop at Esalen in which the participants created a movie based on their dreams. Once again, the participants were swept up in an altered state where their dreams somehow became a shared reality and joined up with other dreams and dreamers to form a larger whole.

A CATALYST, NOT AN EMPIRE BUILDER

A former student of Frank's, who was later to become a friend and mentor of mine, Isabella Conti, came to Esalen during that time to talk to us about her dissertation, which was on the subject of Fellini's movies. Isabella was deeply influenced by Frank but typically had gone her own way, incorporating Frank's thinking in her dissertation and later in her work consulting to industry, which drew heavily on her experience as Frank's research assistant at the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research. Frank was a catalyst, not an empire builder. He did not encourage his students to become "Barronians" following his research agenda, nor did he enlist them to further his career by spreading the good word.

On the contrary, Frank encouraged his students to find their own creative spark, cultivating ways to express their own interests and to develop their own voice.

While putting together a Festschrift in his honor, speaking to former students, friends, and colleagues, I came to realize that Frank was indeed, as Baker-Roshi noted in the title of his essay for that book, a “social alchemist” and an extremely subtle one, at that. The way he did it was almost like Milton Erickson, the great (and indirect) hypnotist: with a metaphor, an image, a suggestion, a seemingly chance meeting. Many of the people I spoke to mentioned how Frank had somehow been a catalyst in a major project, an important meeting, an insight, or a new direction, such as Claudio Naranjo speaking of the “providential blessings” that Frank brought to his life.

I know that, in my case, during my first meeting with Frank I wasn't even aware of his creativity research. I went to see Frank in 1984 to discuss the CIA with him because I was working on a paper on the psychology of the intelligence community. I had heard that Frank had twice been approached to work for the CIA in an important research role. (He declined both times.) On hindsight, this is not at all surprising given the connection between the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and psychological research, and, in fact, some of the preliminary research on the creative person originated in OSS research on identifying the personality characteristics of a person capable of being dropped behind enemy lines.

My first meeting with Frank, at a small restaurant in Santa Cruz called Zanzibar, where he told me he regularly used to have lunch with Gregory Bateson, was delightful. I came away from it with nothing at all to use for my paper but with a whole world of possibilities. I realize now on hindsight that it completely turned my attention inside out and set me on the road to creativity, theory, research, and experience but also to a different way of approaching inquiry. Frank's words and images provided no immediate gratification, no list of references or direction for my task at hand. But they sunk in, and to this day, I find new possibilities and insights in his words.

At the time, I was deeply interested in work on the authoritarian personality and the psychological dimensions of prejudice, racism, and intolerance. After visiting Frank, it became clear to me, in comparing the creative personality with the authoritarian personality, that they were in fact mirror images of each other. One could see

tolerance and intolerance of ambiguity, independence of judgment and conformity, openness to experience and closed-mindedness, breaking down of stereotypical gender traits and accentuating them, a preference for complexity and a preference for simplicity at the expense of complexity. In this light, creativity took on a different meaning for me, and later I immediately understood what Maslow (1971) meant when he said that he had come to believe that the self-actualizing and the creative personality were really one and the same.

Frank's vision of creativity did include what we typically think of as the study of genius—the great scientists and artists working in their rarified domains. But alongside that, there was a view of creativity as a key, central element of personality and society, one that pointed the way to a different conception of human nature and human potentialities. This view showed how the cultivation of “creativity and personal freedom,” as he put it in the title of his classic 1968 book, goes beyond the domain of the arts and sciences. It presents us with a blueprint for a different understanding of being human, from a closed, rigid system to an open, dynamical system, and to a different, much broader and infinitely richer experience of being human, one that transcends oppositions and polarizations between reason and emotion, objective and subjective, science and art, male and female, sane and crazy.

Frank's vision of psychology and of creativity was rooted in a deeply ethical view of the world. Forced to choose between career and integrity in the late 1950s, during the heyday of rabid anti-communism and accusations of un-American activities, he was dismissed from the University of California at Berkeley for not taking a “loyalty oath,” which he described as an agreement “in writing not to think certain possible thoughts about communism” (Barron, 1995, p. 85). Frank's politics were vehemently anti-authoritarian, and he felt sympathies for no system that attempted to regulate his, or anybody else's, thoughts.

His research addressed creativity as an antidote to authoritarianism and extended to work on the psychology of nuclear conflict and the study of the future. This led him to also develop a fascination with evil and the human capacity for power over others. He wrote a play about Hitler and Freud that was performed at Saybrook Institute, in which Freud, with the help of certain mind-altering substances, analyzed Hitler, reminding us also that the Nazis' manipulation of the mass psychology of fascism was influ-

enced by Freud's writings, by the study of mass psychology and hypnosis. Psychological research into human capacities and characteristics was being used as a force of evil to oppress people. For Frank, this illustrated the tremendous complexity and ambiguity of advances in knowledge and precluded any easy optimism about the human condition.

How do we use the power of the human potential? How do we channel our immense creative capacities for good and for evil? His use of "Citizen Kane" in the course on human personality was an attempt to confront us with the relationship between creativity and power and the enormous questions that it raises. How did we intend to use our creativity? Would we get caught up in a quest for power over others? Such questions were never far from his mind.

CRISIS, ALTERED STATES, AND PLACES

And how do human beings respond to crises, to the challenges to established ways of thinking, feeling, and acting, to breakdowns in existing orders, whether cognitive or social? In *No Rootless Flower* (1995), Frank discussed briefly the 1989 earthquake that affected the San Francisco Bay and the Central Coast so terribly: "Earthquake, selfshake," he wrote (p. xiv). Crisis is not unlike an altered state of consciousness—a trip perhaps—where we are called upon to exercise all our capacities intensely in order to survive, create, whatever it is that we are called upon to do. As the ordered structures of our consciousness and our social systems are challenged, and at times shattered, human beings find the need to dip deeply into their reserves and challenge established ways of doing things. "It is always the 'unexperienced' that presses for expression and calls for a resetting of the switches for the same old run" (Barron, 1995, p. 81). Frank and I were both in Santa Cruz for the quake, and it was an unusual experience to find complete strangers coming up to you to find out if you're OK, if you need anything.

Crises and altered states offered, for Frank, an opportunity to study human behavior in vivo, right there, and develop an understanding that could complement the more systematic research he enjoyed, using a variety of psychological tests and long interviews. During the human personality class, along with extensive readings, the movies on the lives of Freud and Jung, and Wells and Fellini, Frank also invited us to take a number of tests, including

the Rorschach and some sentence completion tests. The class was really a concise but multifaceted exploration of human personality, using a variety of approaches, engaging us as whole persons, in the same way that he approached such exalted subjects as Truman Capote, William Butler Yeats, or the eminent creatives of the IPAR research.

CREATIVITY AND THE EXPANSION OF CONSCIOUSNESS

Frank thought of his work on the creative personality not as the classification of a set of traits possessed by a lucky few but as the elucidation of a set of characteristics that were fundamentally present in everyone and could be cultivated with the right effort and attention. It was his view that we could all aspire to and be educated for creativity. In fact, he saw this as a step toward the expansion and evolution of consciousness, with creativity as the heart of the human potential for self-creation and world-creation.

Frank was known mostly for his work in creativity. All too often he was read simply in a psychometric key, perhaps because the numbers were what more conventional psychologists could latch onto. But Frank's entire work can be read as a study in the evolution of consciousness, something the last chapter of *No Rootless Flower* (1995) makes clear. Frank's work on emergent evolution and holism did continue throughout his life and found a home in the study of human lives. That is why, along with the specific research on creativity, Frank's work can also be thought of as a study in the existential dimensions of emergent evolution and holism and manifested in the study of the evolution of the whole human personality.

A key aspect in his study of the evolution of consciousness was his encounter with psychedelics. Frank went to UC Berkeley with Timothy Leary, and the two were, as is well known, extremely close. Frank, the established and respectable psychologist, is in fact the man who introduced (the equally respectable and established) Timothy Leary to the "magic mushroom," which Frank had sought out during a visit to Mexico. At the time, Frank was spending a year at the Center for the Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences studying the farther reaches of psychology. He had been reading exhaustively in works ranging from Swedenborg to Yeats's

A *Vision* to William James, and a lot of mystical writings from all traditions and eras. Frederic Myers's *Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death* had been an early and decisive influence on Frank, along with William James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*. There was always a spirit of openness in him that was not just unwilling to reject the unusual but actively courted it. This spirit also allowed him to see the existing limitations in psychology.

If the psychedelic experience has recently been trivialized, with serious research gone underground and popular accounts mostly either sensation-seeking, personal attacks on Leary and others or simply lurid press stories, Frank's approach demonstrated precisely what seems to be so lacking—and indeed unthinkable, in some circles—in much of today's discourse on mind-altering drugs. His approach was eminently sensible, informed, open, and aware both of the long history of use of mind-altering drugs and of their potential dangers. But he was vitally open to their potentials and determined to understand what was going on without preconception or polemical ideology. In 1964, Barron, Jarvik, and Bunnell published an article in *Scientific American* on hallucinogenic drugs, Frank's second appearance in those eminently respectable and establishment-worthy pages, pointing to the extent of his commitment and scholarship in this area.

Frank saw psychedelics as an opportunity to experience a wider range of consciousness and to access states that had previously been experienced only by mystics. But he was also very clear that the ultimate test was the effect on the person when he or she was not in an altered state, in everyday circumstances, and that what the church refers to as "spiritualism and related errors" is akin to exploring the collective unconscious without bringing to bear on the mass of perceptions and potentialities there the faculties of attention, discrimination, judgment, and the responsibility for shaping the nascent forms for entry into consciousness (Barron, 1995, p. 89).

In the last years of his life, Frank was working on (among other things) a book of tremendous importance. *The Sacred Mushroom and Harvard Yard* was an account of what preceded the work at Harvard by Leary, Alpert, and Metzner, and was an attempt to place psychedelics in a historical, philosophical, and psychological context, outlining the important precedents for the use of mind-

altering drugs in the study of human consciousness, with William James clearly emerging as the single most significant predecessor of such work in the United States. One can only hope that Frank completed enough of it for it to be published either as a series of articles in or in book form.

COSMOLOGICAL MOTIVE

A key ingredient of creativity, as Frank articulated it, was a deep motivation, so deep, in fact, that he called it “the cosmological motive,” “the desire to create one’s own universe of meaning, personally defined” (Barron, 1995, p. 75). This cosmological motive runs throughout Frank’s work, in his studies of creative individuals—particularly the psycho-biographical work, such as “Yeats as Self-Creator” (Barron, 1995, p. 294)—and in the very way that he approached creativity, creating his own universe of research, inquiry, memories, dreams, and reflections. Frank’s deep motivation did lead him to create his own universe, and a particularly complex and differentiated whole it was. In it, one could find discussions of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Adjective Check List, and the Thematic Apperception Test flowing seamlessly into C. S. Peirce and Samuel Butler’s views on evolution, psycho-biographies of Truman Capote and Philip Johnson, biomass and psychomass in creative ecologies, altered states of consciousness ranging from dreams to hypnosis to LSD to reverie and reminiscence. Particularly in *No Rootless Flower*, but also in his other works such as *The Shaping of Personality*, one can find his friends, mentors, and influences: Henry Murray and C. S. Peirce, Henri Bergson and Carl Jung, Frederico Fellini and Timothy Leary, Rollo May and Gregory Bateson, Claudio Naranjo and Harrison Gough, and, above all, his beloved wife Nancy and his children, Frank Jr., Brigid, and Anthea Rose. Unusual associates, indeed, certainly for traditional academic psychology, which typically does not encourage one to include photos of one’s family members in an academic work or, for that matter, to discuss evolutionary theory and its relationship to psychedelics. In his own words, Frank was always “less likely to throw out the baby with the bath water than to put another baby into the bath water and keep an eye on the whole scene” (Barron, 1996, p. 441).

OPPOSITION OR CREATIVE PROCREATION?

There seems to be an essential and continuing tension between the establishment and maintenance of environmental constancies and the interruption of achieved equilibria in the interest of new experience. The creative process itself embodies this tension, and persons who distinguish themselves in artistic and scientific creation exemplify an incessant dialectic between integration and diffusion. In the sequence of related acts which result in the creation of something new, there occurs consistently a rhythmic alteration and a genuine resolution or synthesis of certain common antinomies. Apparently contradictory principles of action, thought, and feeling, which usually must be sacrificed one to the other, are instead expressed fully in one sequence, the dialectic leading at special moments to an unusual integration. (Barron, 1995, p. 85)

Frank's own personality and his work demonstrated this process very well. His own comfort in many seemingly opposed worlds is one of the things that made Frank and his work unique. It separated him from the vast majority of academic psychologists for whom references to Yeats's poetry were simply meaningless, from the more woolly-minded transpersonalists and New Agers who recoiled at Frank's psychometrics, and from those who are obsessed with qualitative methodologies and feel that their use constitutes a blow for humanism against positivist scientism. None of this ideology seemed to bother Frank who was, in many ways, a pragmatist when it came to inquiry.

In his work, Frank brought together science and art, the quantitative and the qualitative, the mainstream and the leading edge, the objective and the subjective, reason and emotion, hard facts and inspired intuitions, poetry and prose. These "unusual associates" made it hard for people wedded too tightly to disciplinary categories to understand him and contributed perhaps to his work receiving less attention than it should have. Perhaps more accurately, given the enormous influence he did have in creativity research, I should say it contributed to many "partial" readings, whereas the overall thrust of his work was rarely understood.

As I write these words, I find myself wishing, of course, that I had the opportunity to share them with Frank, to dialogue about the endless subjects that fascinated him and see the way he managed to embody his knowledge in his everyday interactions. I am, of course, still dialoguing with Frank, and I invite the readers of this

article to join me. Frank's last words, I am told, were "amazing . . . amazing . . . amazing." There is perhaps no better way to describe Frank himself.

REFERENCES

- Barron, F. X. (1968). *Creativity and personal freedom*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Barron, F. X. (1995). *No rootless flower. An ecology of creativity*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Barron, F. X. (1996). Barron's ordinary wars. In A. Montuori (Ed.), *Unusual associates. A festschrift for Frank Barron* (pp. 438-446). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Barron, F. X., Jarvik, M., & Bunnell, S. (1964, April). The hallucinogenic drugs. *Scientific American*, pp. 29-37.
- Dabrowski, K. (1964). *Positive disintegration*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Maslow, A. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. London: Penguin.
- Montuori, A. (Ed.). (1995). *Unusual associates. A Festschrift for Frank Barron*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Morin, E. (1990). *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris: ESF.
- The New York Times*. (2002, October 13). Obituary of Frank Barron. p. 29.

Reprint requests: Alfonso Montuori, California Institute of Integral Studies, 1453 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94103; e-mail: amontuori@ciis.edu.