

My point is not to advertise AAO, but to show that certain ideals for free communes, and cooperative association among free communes may be more feasible today than ever before. The growing size of the AAO movement is one factor. But more important, to my mind, is the creative growth and group cohesion which come about from the practice of Selbstdarstellung and Action Analysis.

We do not know where the future pathway of AAO and commune movement can take us, but at least, in the very present, those people following its course are finding more joy and consciousness in their everyday lives than they have ever known before.

The AAO publish a great deal of literature in English, which is obtainable from the addresses below.

AAO Centre, Friedrichshof, Postfach 3, A-7100 Neusiedl/see, Austria.

AAO Paris, 5-7 Rue du 14 juillet, F-94700 Maison-Alfort, France.

BOOK REVIEW

George Weinberg *Know Yourself, Help Yourself.*

'How do you change an inner state?' is the fundamental question asked by George Weinberg. His book *Know Yourself, Help Yourself* provides a respectable, if occasionally simplistic, answer.

His discussion of the connection between feelings and action informs us of the possibility of avoiding trauma by learning to identify feelings which have in the past heralded self-damaging situations. A directional approach then evolves where the therapist helps his client to react differently to feelings which have previously resulted in trauma. This very straightforward method is helpful when dealing with people whose professional orientation is technical or practical and who are perhaps unaccustomed to the indulgence of examining feelings in depth.

This approach may be compatible with the more client-centred view that an individual changes by first becoming more completely what he is and then developing in response to what is happening around him. Certainly Weinberg demonstrates that change is possible and he reinforces the belief that people can in fact change and are responsible for what happens to them. If people are helped to change even a small area of their lives through using this method they are assuring themselves of their potential for further change. A book which leaves one thinking this way seems worth our attention.

Mary Charleton

Book Reviews

Nancy M. Henley. *Body Politics : Power, Sex and non-verbal Communication*, Prentice-Hall 1977.

This is a book which covers much of the same ground as Desmond Morris' recent book *Manwatching*, but the difference could hardly be more marked. Whereas Morris presents his findings as pure description of the way things are, Henley is more interested in *why* things are as they are. And she is interested as a feminist - pointing out over and over again that many gestures and body movements express relations of domination and submission, and that it is usually men who are dominant and women who are put down and treated as inferior. Another title for this book might be *Womanwatching*.

She finds that men demand and are given more control over *space* than women are (one of her subheadings is "The incredible shrinking woman"); men demand and are given more control over *time* than women ("Women's time is unimportant"); men control the environment ("Women's environment is largely man-made and male-controlled"); men control language and speech (men outtalk women; only men are allowed to have forceful voices; language dismisses or ignores women, defies women, deprecates women); men control women by the use of touch as a power play (one of her most powerful and well-documented chapters); women communicate deference, inconsequentiality, helplessness and maternity-- visually, verbally and nonverbally; men's eye contact is quite different from women's; women smile much more than men, particularly when men are around. And so it goes on.

She sums up by saying that nonverbal behaviour is a major medium of communication in our everyday life, and that *power* is a major theme in that communication. These nonverbal power gestures provide the personal structure, the thousands of daily acts which underlie and support the patriarchal political structure. And they are of particular importance to women, who are more sensitive to its cues and probably more the targets for such control.

She states firmly that "the overwhelming bulk of sex-differentiated behaviour is learned and is developed to display otherwise unobtrusive differences," and further that much nonverbal behaviour that seems meaningless and non-power-related is in fact all about sex privilege or based on real social power differences. So apparently small things can really mean a lot. And she is also very clear that power ultimately means force. But "generally speaking, the mildest form of force which is effective will be used."

But possibly her strongest point, which affects many people in the growth movement, is that "much of women's behaviour which is interpreted as self-limiting may in reality be the end of a sequence in which assertion was attempted, and suppressed, on the nonverbal level." She quotes from Nicole Anthony:

Sometimes in the middle of a heated discussion with a man, a strong woman finds herself acting chimp-like

(submitting). I'm oppressing myself, she thinks, why do I act like a schmuck, I don't need to act like this, the psychiatrist says I oppress myself, I internalise.

If we filmed the scene we would see that what really happened was that he gave a gesture of dominance and she submitted in fear.

There is no need to submit, the psychiatrists say. Another lie If a woman refuses to respond to the gestures of dominance she is frequently physically attacked. A wife needs only to be hit by a husband larger and heavier than she. Thereafter the most fleeting subliminal gesture will serve to remind her of the costs of rebellion.

The moments of "internalisation" are really the moments when we respond to gestures of dominance. They are not inside our heads.

And she also has some doubts about assertiveness training programmes. She points out that the poorest women don't have the time, transport or fees to get the training - and even if they did, "uppity behaviour" loses jobs. And even the middle-class women who do get the training can't economically or politically afford to assert themselves to those more powerful than themselves. It's more likely, she says, that their assertiveness will be directed at those of equal or less power - for example, other women and service workers. "Indeed, many of the examples given from the training deal with just such people and often women are told to practice assertiveness in just such "low risk situations." So rather than making women powerful or changing the social structure, such a training programme may tend to divide women and strengthen the existing class structure.

So, at the end of all this, what are her own positive suggestions? They are :

Woman can stop : Smiling unless they are happy; lowering or averting their eyes when stared at; getting out of men's way in public; allowing interruption; restraining their body postures; accepting unwanted touch.

Women can start : Staring people in the eye; addressing men by their first name; being more relaxed in demeanour (seeing it's more related to status than to morality); touching when it feels appropriate.

Men can stop : invading women's personal space; touching them excessively; interrupting; taking up extra space; sending dominance signals to each other; staring.

Men can start : *smiling, losing their cool, displaying emotion; confiding in other men; sending gestures of support; being honest when they are unsure of something; condensing their bodies.*

She has some suggestion for parents and teachers too.

All in all, this is a strong, academically sound, well-researched book, which deserves the attention of anyone interested in body language or sexual politics.

Jean Starry

Andrew Collier. *R.D. Laing: The philosophy and politics of psychotherapy*, The Harvester Press 1977. £8.95. (£2.95 paperback)

This is a critique of Laing's writings by a Marxist lecturer in philosophy who also likes Freud. He warms to those bits of Laing which are reasonably close to psychoanalysis and Marxism, and dislikes those which go too far -such as for example *The Politics of Experience* and *The Bird of Paradise*.

It's all very erudite, with lots of references to Sartre and the rest. I found it all rather lukewarm and boring. Here is one of the brighter passages:

I once had to mark an exam paper in which one question asked whether the correct conclusion to draw from Laing's **The Politics of Experience** was to smash capitalism, to take LSD, or to join a Buddhist monastery. One student answered: first to take LSD (to rid one's mind of its conditioning); then to smash capitalism (to prevent such conditioning in the future); then to join a Buddhist monastery (to expand the new insights into the 'other worlds').

This is all good stuff, except for the idea of setting exam paper on *The Politics of Experience*, which is a bit grotesque, and *marking* it, which is perhaps even more grotesque and hideous.

But Collier, like other Freudian-Marxist-philosophers (three great drawbacks) has never allowed himself to experience his real self, and therefore finds it hard to believe that such a notion makes sense. His beliefs may, indeed, make it much harder for him to put himself in the way of having such an experience. He seems never to have heard of people like Maslow, Rogers, Perls, Janov, Assagioli, Moreno, Jackins, etc., etc., who explain very thoroughly the ways in which these experiences may be obtained and understood. It's

very sad. This book really does seem to me an example of using the intellect to hold reality away and cut off experience.

I think it's considerably overpriced, too.

James Crippledini

Joseph F. Rychlak. *The psychology of rigorous humanism*, Wiley 1977

One thing needs to be made clear at the start. Rychlak's definition of humanism in this context is - A theory of behaviour in which the theorist employs telic constructs. A telic construct, in case you were wondering, is any term which relies on teleology or final causes - doing something for the sake of fulfilling a goal or purpose.

So most of the book is taken up with explaining the justifying the notion of a final cause in psychology, and with details of research carried out by the author and his associates to check out the predictions of hypotheses organized along telic lines.

A great deal of research shows that people learn things they prefer, more easily than things that turn them off. Virtually all this research was carried out on the learning of nonsense syllables - thus for example some people might prefer the trigram CUD, but be turned off by the trigram POX. The research deals very thoroughly with objections along the lines that the preferred syllables might be more suggestive, or memorable, or frequently encountered, etc.

Rychlak introduces a whole new vocabulary so as to be able to use telic constructs unambiguously. One of the key new words is (instead of talking about stimulus and response) the telosponse.

A telosponse is the person's taking on (premising) of a meaningful item (image, word, judgmental comparison, etc.) relating to a referent acting as a purpose for the sake of which behaviour is then intended. . . . When the individual behaves "for the sake of" this purpose he is telosponding or acting intentionally, although this may be exclusively at the level of understanding and not seen in his overt actions. In this sense, concepts have purposes and human beings intend.

Using words like this and some of his other invented terms may appear to be jargoning and is rather offputting, but I think it is probably necessary and defensible.

However, Rychlak can be clear enough at times, and as I believe not using long words to cover up a lack of content. Here he is, for example, on the highly topical question of language:

Rather than placing language first and mind second, the humanist believes that mind comes first and language is itself a reflection of the logical patterning of mind.

There, that's not hard to follow, is it? Nor is it hard to follow his interesting remarks about learning and failure to learn. He says:

. . . not all errors reflect a lack of learning on the part of the subject. If a subject can learn to meet the criterion of a teacher or an experimenter, he should also be able to learn not to meet it. . . In fact learning how not to learn may be one of the major premises of so-called unmotivated student populations.

Ultimately I don't think Rychlak is very humanistic along the lines which would be understood by fans of this journal. And the book is a long and hard one - some 550 pages of dense argument and research results. But I think he has unearthed, in a very original way, some of the materials which are needed to build the complete psychology of the future..

John Rowan

Stewart & Shapiro (with **James Elliott**) *The selves inside you*, Exploration Institute, P.O. Box 1254, Berkeley, California 94701, U.S.A.

This is a short (128 page) book on how to use the idea of subselves in personal growth work, counselling and psychotherapy. It gives some theory, some practical examples, some exercises to use in groups, and some hints for using the ideas on your own.

It is a bit oversimplified, relying heavily on the idea of everyone having access to a Critic, an Observer and a Chairman subself. But at the end it does mention the Higher Self, and is not closed to the ideas of people like Assagioli. I feel it is a pity that more of the *depth* possible with this type of work is not revealed, but this is probably in the interests of the book being accessible to more people.

My own preference would be to talk of subpersonalities, and leave the term "Self" for the more central areas, and I hope this will be changed when a second edition is produced. In the meantime, it can be strongly recommended as very useful to anyone doing group work.

John Rowan