

The Division of Counseling Psychology

of the

American Psychological Association

presents to

C. H. Patterson

The Leona Tyler Award

1994

(*The Counseling Psychologist*, 1996, 24, 338-347.)

For outstanding contributions to education, training, supervision, and practice in counseling psychology; for enhancement of our profession's professional stature; and for continued efforts to articulate and emphasize the importance of philosophy and theory for counseling and psychotherapy. His works have enriched the science and art of counseling. He has served as mentor and exemplar for generations of students, his standards of excellence have inspired many, and his dedication to the best of counseling psychology has placed him among the leaders of our specialty for decades. He has earned the highest respect from his peers, who present him with this award as a symbol of their highest regard.

The 1994 Leona Tyler Award Address:

Some Thoughts on Reaching the End of a Career

C. H. Patterson, Asheville, North Carolina

When one reads the achievements of those who have received the various awards of the American Psychological Association (APA) and its divisions, one feels very humble about one's accomplishments. Mine pale in comparison. How could they have done so much in research, writing, and professional service?

The receipt of the Leona Tyler Award leads me to a review of my life's work and a consideration of whether I could have done more. (Don't worry, I'm not going to subject you to my review). But the award does constitute a capstone to 55 years of association with the field of psychology. It has brought me to my first convention in over 20 years. I suspect that most of you here today have never seen me before. My last convention was in 1971. I was scheduled to give my division

presidential address at the 1972 convention, but I was on my way to England on a Fulbright. Leona Tyler gave an invited address in my time slot (Tyler, 1972).

I am reminded of a comment by Hans Eysenck when he was named in 1994 as a William James Fellow by the American Psychological Society:

"For a scientist, appreciation of fellow scientists is about the best thing he can hope for. And I'm very grateful to you all for giving me this honor. It means a lot to me as it must to anybody who is so honored by his fellow citizens and scientists. Of course, age is a very important variable in it. It's a very chancy business. If you choose somebody too young, he may blot his copy book; if he is too old, he may die before he gets here." (Eysenck, 1994, p. 15)

And I might add, there is also the danger he or she might be senile. You and I are both fortunate that senility has not yet overtaken me, although I can feel it gaining on me.

Although I travel to California frequently to visit my children, I felt I needed a caretaker to accompany me to the big city. My daughter Jenifer, from Asheville, is here with me. Some time ago she introduced me to Tai Chi and more recently Qigong. I do not believe it is customary to specify what one does with the monetary award associated with this honor. But I will donate mine to my favorite charity, the Gorilla Foundation, of which my daughter Francine (Penny), who is also here with me, is the founder, president, and research director. She has devoted the past 23 years to the study of primate language, with the gorillas Koko and Michael, who communicate in sign language. We have two publications together (Patterson & Patterson, 1988; Patterson, Patterson, & Brentari, 1987). Unfortunately, Koko could not get a seat on the plane to join us here.

My first publication was with a nutritionist colleague in my first position as a psychologist at the Fels Research Institute (Patterson & Spano, 1941). It was stimulated by my first period of graduate study, a summer at Harvard where I studied psychoanalysis with Robert White; the study was an early test of psychoanalytic theory. During my period at Fels (1939-1941) I learned to administer the WAIS and the Rorschach. My colleague was one of my subjects. When I discovered that she was more intelligent than I was, I decided to marry her.

So I did not begin as a counseling psychologist but at the bottom, as a child psychologist. Along the way I have been an aviation psychologist, a clinical psychologist, a rehabilitation psychologist, and an educational psychologist. I am sure that to some I am an abnormal psychologist. I became a counseling psychologist when the Veterans Administration established the position in 1951 or 1952. My career has been less than a single-minded, consistent, narrow path following one theme. Diversity may be desirable in investing, but it is not usually desirable in a professional or scientific career. One must specialize.

In the spring of 1977, just before my retirement from the University of Illinois, I was in England for 2 weeks, doing workshops for the National Health Service and lecturing at a couple of universities, including University College in Dublin. Before returning, I spent the weekend with Richard Nelson-Jones, with whom I had worked during a Fulbright in 1972-1973. As he played golf one morning, I found something to read in his library: *Jonathan Livingston Seagull* and *The*

Sayings of Dag Hammerskjold. One saying struck me: "You have not done enough, you have never done enough, so long as it is possible that you have something to contribute."

I began to feel I still had something to contribute, and I began to regret that I was retiring. But I have not been idle since my retirement. I revised my *Theories* book for the fourth edition (Patterson, 1986) and wrote *The Therapeutic Relationship* (Patterson, 1985). From 1983 to 1994, I taught an Advanced Theories of Counseling course and supervised interns at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The fifth edition of the *Theories* book, co-authored with Ed Watkins, is in press (Patterson &: Watkins, 1996)

The first edition was published almost 30 years ago, in 1966, shortly after the death of my wife. A second book, co-authored with Suzanne Hidore, a former student at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, has been completed, entitled *Psychotherapy: A Caring, Loving Relationship* (Patterson & Hidore, 1997).

So much for reminiscing and reviewing. This is not an Oscar or an Academy Award, so I will refrain from naming all those who have contributed to my career. So on to the topic. A couple of years ago, I set up a folder in my file labeled "Some Thoughts" and tossed in notes that I did not think would become papers, but might serve as part of a final statement, with two possible titles: *Some Thoughts on Nearing the End of a Career* or *Some Thoughts on Reaching the End of a Career*. The second seems more appropriate at this time.

THE CURRENT STATE AND THE FUTURE OF PSYCHOTHERAPY

For most of my professional life I have found myself in disagreement with some of the contributions to the professional literature. I am comforted by a saying of Mark Twain: "Whenever you find yourself on the side of the majority, it is time to pause and reflect." One of my fantasies is to see myself standing beside a bandwagon, asking those who are scrambling to get on, "Do you know where you are going?"

One of my earliest articles, published in the *American Psychologist* (Patterson, 1948), was entitled, "Is Diagnosis Necessary for Psychotherapy?" It might not be accepted for publication today, although the argument is still valid. I became client centered in 1947, after spending some time with Rogers at the University of Chicago. I have stated that I became inoculated against directive systems of psychotherapy, and I have continued to be protected without a booster shot. I have suggested that I have been to Carl Rogers as Paul was to Christ. I have preached one gospel, the gospel of Carl Rogers. I apparently have not been a very effective disciple. I sometimes feel more like John the Baptist, a voice crying in the wilderness. The name of Carl Rogers is revered, but few, if any, graduate students now read any of his writings. At the 1985 Phoenix Conference on the Evolution of Psychotherapy (Zeig, 1987) he was the only one honored with a standing ovation, lasting 5 minutes. Yet one searches in vain for signs of his influence on the other presenters. It is true that the importance of the therapist-client relationship is being recognized by many theorists, including the psychoanalysts (e.g. Lomas, 1993; Meissner, 1991; Rowe & Mac Isaac, 1991). Yet there is not a single reference to Rogers in the psychoanalytic literature I have perused. It appears to be a case of the reinvention of the wheel.

My focus of interest in the past several years has been psychotherapy. Over 30 years ago, Rogers (1963) wrote: "The field of psychotherapy is in a state of chaos" (p. 5) Others have echoed that conclusion since, and it appears to describe the field today. In 1985, Leo, reporting on the Phoenix Conference for *Time* magazine, reported one participant as saying that none of the experts present agreed. Joseph Wolpe (1987) in his presentation, called the conference "a babble of conflicting voices" (p. 134). Prochaska (1988) titled his review of the report of the conference "The Devolution of Psychotherapy" and quoted from Zeig's (1987) introduction: "Here were the reigning experts on psychotherapy and I could see no way they could agree on defining the territory. Can anyone dispute, then, that the field is in disarray" (p.305).

The implications of this situation are significant:

1. If there is no agreement on what psychotherapy is, how can we license or control its practice? How can it be packaged and sold to consumers? Yet it is being marketed through providers of cost-effective services of health care, who are monitored for quality control and accountability. Just what are consumers getting? If psychotherapy were a drug, it could not be approved by the Federal Drug Administration (see Patterson, 1994).
2. If there is no agreement on what psychotherapy is, how are psychotherapists educated? Every training program decides for itself how its students are educated. Every faculty member teaches his or her own approach to psychotherapy. Education in psychotherapy is where the education of physicians was before the Flexner report in 1910 (Flexner, 1910/1960).
3. Psychotherapy is being reduced to a multitude of techniques--skills, or interventions, as they are now called. Psychotherapy is being moved from a profession to a trade complete with manuals and handbooks. The specific treatments paradigm, following Paul's (1967) dictum, attempts to prescribe specific treatments for specific diagnoses, following the medical model (see Patterson & Watkins, 1996, Chap. 15, for a critique of this model). And the multicultural movement attempts to prescribe specific treatments for each culture, subculture, ethnic group, race, sex, etceteras, etceteras (see Patterson, 1996 for a critique of this movement).

It is a paradox that as medicine has been moving away from invasive to noninvasive procedures, psychotherapy is moving toward more invasive procedures.

Of course, there have been those interested in integration in psychotherapy, going back to Dollard and Miller's (1950) classic joining of behavior theory and psychoanalysis. The current movement, however, does not have as its goal the development of a single, universal system. Rather, the movement has focused on the combination of methods and techniques in what I have called the eclectic solution. Numerous eclectic positions have been proposed. Paradoxically, eclecticism as an integrating force actually appears to be fostering divergence. Again, I must refer you to *Theories of Psychotherapy* (Patterson & Watkins, 1996, Chap. 15) for a fuller discussion.

I have proposed what I call the common elements solution to the problem of integration (see Patterson & Watkins, 1996, Chap. 16). It appears that any attempt at integration must be based on those elements present in all the major systems or theories. These factors are those involved in the relationship between the therapist and the client. The major elements were identified and

defined by Rogers (1957) in his classic article, "The Necessary and Sufficient Conditions of Therapeutic Personality Change." They consist of the well-known therapist conditions of empathic understanding, respect or warmth, and therapeutic genuineness, as well as the client conditions of vulnerability, anxiousness, and perception of the therapist conditions. These are now widely recognized and accepted as common elements in psychotherapy.

There is all but universal agreement that the relationship--or the therapeutic alliance as some now prefer to call it--is a necessary condition for progress in psychotherapy. My position is that the relationship *is* psychotherapy and that the therapist conditions can be summed up as agape--or love. A few years ago, I visited Changua University in Taiwan. In a group of undergraduate students in a counseling course, one student asked, "What is the most important thing for a counselor to do?" After a few moments reflection I replied, "Love your client." So, if you ask me, "Is that all there is to psychotherapy?" my answer is, "Yes, my friends, that is all there is to psychotherapy." Love is the most potent reinforcer of behavior change, or as Martin Luther King is reported to have said, "Whom we wish to change we must first love." Gordon Allport (1950), over 40 years ago, wrote, "Love is incomparably the greatest psychotherapeutic agent" (p. 80). Almost 30 years ago, Burton (1967) said that "after all research on psychotherapy is accounted for, psychotherapy still resolves itself into a relationship best subsumed by the word love" (pp. 102-103). This is the essence of my "A Universal System of Psychotherapy." It would have been an appropriate article for today, but when I was informed of the award, it had already been accepted for publication (Patterson, 1995). Earlier, it had been rejected by the *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, whose reviewers contended that there could be no such thing as a universal system. There are many who share this view.

THE CURRENT STATE AND THE FUTURE OF CIVILIZATION

Psychotherapy is concerned with mitigating individual psychological pain and suffering. But there is the broader question of the state and future of our civilization. It is not, of course, a new problem. Over 20 years ago, Rogers (1973) referred to his "concerns about our very sick society and the near fatal illnesses of our culture" (p. 378). We are clearly not living in the best of all possible worlds. There are a number of indications of the decline of our civilization. It has been said that each society contains within itself the seeds of its demise. I can do little more here than to enumerate some of these.

1. *Overpopulation.* There is no question that without control, sooner or later we will reach a condition where the world's resources will no longer be able to support its people. The debate can only concern the time when this occurs. The planet's resources are limited, and science cannot make something out of nothing. In the past, disease, wars, famines, and pestilence have controlled population. Henry Kendall (1994), a Nobel Laureate in physics, has said that if population was not controlled in a humanitarian way nature would do so in its inhumane way. It appears that nature is being aided by genocide in some areas of the world.

2. *Pollution.* We are polluting our environment at an increasing rate. Providing clean air and water will become a growing problem. And again, the question is not whether or not this is a major problem but when the earth will become uninhabitable if we do not now begin to control pollution.

3. *Global warming.* The greenhouse effect, leading to global warming, is real. The industrialized nations, using fossil fuel, are filling the atmosphere with an increasing layer of carbon dioxide, but efforts at reducing the emissions are blocked by the energy and automobile lobbies. Again, it is only a matter of time before climatic changes will disastrously affect millions of people.

4. *Extreme diversity.* In addition to environmental problems, we are beset by increasing social problems. Diversity is the theme of the day and is being praised and encouraged. But there can be too much of a good thing. Our society is splintering and polarizing into innumerable racial, ethnic, tribal, national, social, religious, political, and other groups, many of them in extreme opposition to each other. Extreme diversity leads to divisiveness; we are experiencing this in many areas, leading to legislative gridlock, ethnic cleansing, and other violence between groups. Extreme multiculturalism focuses on, and magnifies, differences, polarizing and pitting one group against another. Yet we are all of the same species, fundamentally like one another, and we live in one world. With instant communication and world trade we could become one community, a global village, if the common good replaced efforts of separate groups to monopolize our resources.

5. *Increasing violence.* The increase of violent crime and personal and group violence in our society is well documented. Terrorism is widespread in the world. Violence of group against group, including genocide, is almost of epidemic proportions. There is no single world war, but a series of wars throughout the world. Ethnic, racial, and national hatreds appear to be deep-seated, ready to break out with minimal provocation. And violence of individual against individual is widespread.

6. *Our criminal justice system* is overloaded and ineffective, costing billions of dollars a year. Our adversarial legal system was devised to discover the truth and provide justice. In practice, it has evolved into an elaborate game, with the goal of each side to win at all costs, including the suppression of the truth. A juror dismissed from the O. J. Simpson case is reported to have said, "I see a situation where truth is not the issue." One of the prosecution lawyers, Christopher Darden, disgusted and ashamed of the spectacle, referred to "this supposed truth-seeking process." The selection of jurors is manipulated to attempt to seat those who might be easily influenced. Our juries are hardly composed of peers. The most competent persons are exempt from, or are able to avoid, jury duty (Adler, 1994a,b). Issues are settled by technicalities. Criminal lawyers build their reputations by winning jury verdicts for clients whom they know are guilty.

7. *Our system of representative democracy* has deteriorated to a struggle for legislation favorable to particular interest groups. virtually all legislation is compromised to benefit particular groups. Government is corrupted by the money of special interest groups. It might be said that we have a government of the political action committees (PACs), by the PACs, and for the PACs. It is often said that we have the best government money can buy. Local, state, and regional groups are benefited rather than the country as a whole.

8. *Our vaunted economic system* of capitalism fails us in many ways. It can only continue to exist with increasing consumption and greater use and destruction of our resources. We are urged to buy more, use more, and discard more, so that industry can show increasing production, sales,

and profits. We fluctuate between feast and famine--prosperity and depression. The gap between the rich and the poor increases. Business and industry do not provide enough jobs paying living wages, above the poverty line. The result is that society must take on the support of the jobless through welfare. One out of every three people on the planet lives in abject poverty.

Adam Smith declared that the engine of capitalism is self-interest. He used the wrong term--the correct one is greed. The government spends billions of dollars a year regulating business and industry to protect consumers from dishonesty and fraud, and to preserve competition. With the advent of capitalism in Russia and China, greed is becoming endemic in those countries. Fraud and corruption are rampant in business, industry, and government throughout the world.

This is only a sketch of the problems facing our society and our civilization. It is a disturbing picture. The barbarians are not at the gate--they are here among us. Economic considerations--money--take precedence over preservation of the environment and health, and of human survival. The four horsemen of the apocalypse are here: War (or violence), famine, pestilence, and disease. Add to them three more--poverty, pollution, and greed.

The future looks bleak indeed. There are two scenarios for the end of the world, in addition to the second coming of Christ that some believe in. The first involves the destruction of our environment, of the planet on which we depend for our lives. We are well on the way to killing our world. Carl Sagan (1994) has said that "due to our own actions and inactions and the misuse of technology, we live in an extraordinary moment--the first time that a species on Earth has become able to wipe itself out." His suggestion that we colonize other planets is fantasy. We would have to export everything necessary for life from the earth--even our air and water.

Nor can we depend on science to save us. Science cannot provide air, water, and food when the natural sources of these are exhausted. Pollution and global warming can be solved, but only if action is taken in time. But science is conservative. It is bound to the 5% or 1% solution. That is, it will reject the null hypothesis only at the 99% or 95% level of certainty. There is great danger in accepting the null hypothesis when it is false. More research, more evidence, is required, it is said. So we procrastinate. But by the time enough evidence is available, it could well be too late to reverse the processes of pollution and global warming. We have the intelligence but not the will to act when we are not immediately threatened.

This scenario appears to be moving toward its conclusion. We are rapidly depleting the earth's resources. Its flora and fauna are being decimated. As my daughter's gorilla T-shirt puts it, "Extinction is forever."

The second scenario for the end of the world involves humanity's self-destruction. We seem to be on the way to this, with racial and ethnic hatreds leading to undeclared wars and genocide. Add to this the acts of terrorism by religious and political fanatics. Violence is endemic in our society. Is there any hope for a future in which all beings can live together? "Can't we," as Rodney King asked, "all just get along?"

The seventh horseman of the apocalypse, greed, runs rife among us. One columnist (Terrell, 1994) wrote that "greed is the thing that will destroy the world, not the bomb." Human inhumanity suggests that the human race has not evolved far enough for us to live together

peaceably. Are violence and greed inherent in human nature, as it has evolved in the struggle for existence?

Certainly the potential is there. But the expressions of violence and greed are fostered by certain environmental conditions. Early primitive societies were characterized by cooperation when struggling against the environment to obtain sufficient food in both hunting and fishing and agricultural societies. Violence, aggression, and greed occur under conditions of deprivation, frustration, and threat, when there are those who have and those who have not. It appears that violence and greed could be minimized in a society in which the necessities of life are distributed equitably, when the needs of all of its members for food, clothing, shelter, and health are met.

However, besides the potentially negative elements in human nature there are positive elements. Evidence for such elements surfaces in times of natural and human-caused disasters. Barbra Streisand, in the final concert of her 1994 tour introduced the song "People Who Need People" as follows; "This has been a year filled with natural disasters. And it has been amazing how in times of catastrophe people come together and forget their differences and help one another." Then she ended by saying: "Do we always need a catastrophe to remind us that we are all just people?" Will it be necessary that we end up huddled together facing the extinction of the human race by a natural or human-made catastrophe in order to reach the tie that binds?

We need not end that way. Roger Sperry (who died in April 1993) was a physiological psychologist and also a humanistic psychologist. He wrote about a cognitive revolution (Sperry, 1993, 1994). He quoted Skinner as saying that "the more we learn about human behavior the less and less promising appear the prospects" (Sperry, 1993, p. 878). But Sperry then continued: "I see a possible ray of hope in psychology's cognitive revolution and what it could mean in bringing new perspectives, beliefs and values--in short new mind sets and a new way of thinking--much needed if humanity is to survive the next century." (Sperry, 1993, p. 878)

"Today's mounting global ills," he wrote, "including the vicious spiral of mounting population, pollution, energy demands, environmental degradation, urban overcrowding and associated crime . . . will not be cured merely by applying more and better science and technology.... A major reconception of the human venture is called for." (p.883)

In Sperry's new paradigm, causation is turned upside down or, rather, it becomes a reciprocal process. Brain activity leads to emergent mental states that become new elements in consciousness. They, in turn, have a primacy in determining what a person is and does.

"These renovations of the cognitive revolution provide a new way of knowing and understanding, a unifying new vision in which some see a rational solution to our global predicament in the form of more realistic guidelines, beliefs and values to live and govern by" (Sperry, 1993, p. 880)

"The great challenge ahead . . . is to take this paradigm gained, put it into action, and turn humankind's self-destructive course around before it is too late" (Sperry, 1994, p. 10).

This paradigm is not really new. It is inherent in the humanistic psychology movement of the past few decades. However, Sperry's argument is convincing and provides an answer to a strict behaviorism and a theoretical physiological-neurological foundation for humanistic psychology.

Nevertheless, if Sperry is correct, this process has been in operation for some time, in fact, over the history of the human race. So far it has not led to the kind of world Sperry and others desire. Can we hope that it will lead to the necessary changes in human beliefs and behaviors in the near future?

Something more is needed. Cognition is not enough. In addition to the potential for violence and greed in human beings, there is also the potential for positive behaviors. Human beings are social animals, and an essential element for being social, and thus human, is concern for others. A concern for others was essential in the development of the race. Early primitive societies, both hunting and fishing and agrarian societies, depended on cooperation and sharing for survival. The infant depends on others, parents or parent surrogates, for survival, requiring parental love and compassion.

Thus it is argued that altruism is a part of human nature (Batson, 1990). Humans are not entirely egoistic but have the capacity for being caring and compassionate without getting anything tangible in return. Empathy appears to develop naturally in children at 3 to 4 years of age.

So we have come full circle, from the idea that the essence of psychotherapy is love to the recognition that the preservation of life and our civilization depends on love. Over 75 years ago, Maria Montessori (1917) wrote that "it is love which preserves the human species, and not the struggle for existence" (p. 326). Viktor Frankl (1985) has said that "the salvation of man is through love and in love" (Man's Search for Meaning, p. 57). Eric Hoffer (1979) argued that the survival of the species depends on human compassion. The popular song of a few years ago had it right: "What the World Needs Now is Love Sweet Love."

Let us hope that William James (1902) was being prophetic when over 90 years ago he wrote, "I saw that the foundation principle of the worlds, of all the worlds, is what we call love" (p. 391).

REFERENCES

- Adler, S. J. (1994). *The jury*. New York: Times Books.
- Adler, S. J. (1994b). Lawyers' poker: Stacking the Marcos jury. *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 14, pp. B1, B12.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York: Macmillan.
- Batson, C. D. (1990). How social an animal? The human capacity for caring. *American Psychologist*, 45, 336-346.
- Burton, A. (1967). *Modern humanistic psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dollard, J., & Miller, N. E. (1950). *Personality and psychotherapy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eysenck, H. (1994, July/August). Quoted in *APS Observer*, 1, pp. 1416.

Flexner, A. (1960). *Medical education in the United States and Canada: A Report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Washington, DC: Author. (Original work published 1910)

Frankl V. E. (1985). *Mans search for meaning*. New York Washington Square Press.

Hoffer, B. (1979, November 11). In *Saturday Review*, November 11.

James, W. (1902). *Varieties of religious experience*. New York: Modern Library.

Kendall, H. (1994, September 5). In *Time*, p. 53.

Leo, J. (1985, December 23). A therapist in every corner. *Time*, p. 59.

Lomas, R (1993). *Cultivating intuition: An introduction to psychotherapy*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Meissner, W. W. (1991). *What is effective in psychoanalytic therapy: The move from interpretation to relation*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Montessori, M. (1917). *Spontaneous activity in education*. New York: Stokes.

Patterson, C. H. (1948). Is diagnosis necessary for psychotherapy? *American Psychologist*, 3, 155-159.

Patterson, C. H. (1985). *The therapeutic relationship*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Patterson, C. H. (1986). *Theories of counseling and psychotherapy* (4th ed.). New York: Harper/Collins.

Patterson, C. H. (1994). Are consumers of psychotherapy able to make an informed choice? Or do they have a choice? *Psychotherapy Bulletin*, 29(4), 40-41.

Patterson, C. H. (1995). A universal system of psychotherapy. *Person-Centered Journal*, 2, 54-62.

Patterson, C. H. (1996). Multicultural counseling: From diversity to universality. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 74, 227-231.

Patterson, C. H., Hidore, S. (1997). *Successful psychotherapy: A caring, loving relationship*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Patterson, C. H., Spano, F. L. (1941). Breastfeeding, maternal rejection and child personality. *Character & Personality*, 10, 62-68.

Patterson, F. G., & Patterson, C. H. (1988). Review of "Ape language: From conditional response to symbol," by E. Sue Savage-Rumbaugh. *American Journal of Psychology*, 101, 582-590.

Patterson, F. G., Patterson, C. H., & Brentari, D. K (1987). Language in child, chimp and gorilla. *American Psychologist*, 42, 270-272.

Patterson, C. H. & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1996). *Theories of psychotherapy*. New York: Harper/Collins.

Paul, G (1967). Outcome research in psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 31, 109-118.

Prochaska, J. O. (1988). The devolution of psychotherapy. Review of J. K Zeig (Ed.), "The evolution of psychotherapy." *Contemporary Psychology*, 33, 305-306.

Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95-103.

Rogers, C. R. (1963). Psychotherapy today: Or where do we go from here? *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 17, 5-16.

Rogers, C. R. (1973). Some new challenges. *American Psychologist*, 28 379-387.

Rowe, C. E., Mac Isaac, D. S. (1991). *Empathic attunement: The technique of psychoanalytic self-psychology*. Northvale, N J: Jason Aronson.

Sagan, C. (1994). *Pale blue dot: A vision of the human future in space*. New York: Random

Sperry, R W. (1993). The impact and promise of the cognitive revolution. *American Psychologist*, 48, 878-885.

Sperry, R. W. (1994, October). A powerful paradigm made stronger. *Psychological Science Agenda*, pp. 111, 13.

Terrell, B. (1994, October 18). *Asheville Citizen-Times*, p. IC.

Tyler, L. E. (1972). Reflections on counseling. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 3, 6-11.

Wolpe, J. (1987). The promotion of a scientific psychotherapy. In J. K Zeig (Ed.), *The evolution of psychotherapy* (pp. 133-142). New York: Brunner/Mazel

Zeig, J. K. (1987). *The evolution of psychotherapy*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.