Foreword

Dan P. McAdams

Explorations in Personality by Henry A. Murray is one of the greatest books ever written on the psychology of personality. It provides a strikingly original psychological conception of the person that speaks eloquently and dramatically to questions about human nature, differences between people, and the mysteries of the individual human life. But, oh, what a strange book it is! "Illuminating and baffling," wrote one reviewer in 1939. A "striking and bewildering book," wrote another, who, upon reaching the shore after the 742-page voyage, steadied himself and remarked: "One book like this is enough!"

There never was another book like it, and for good reason. It is hard to imagine that another psychologist, aiming to provide a comprehensive new theory for understanding the whole of personality, would ever again write a book as long as Moby Dick that offers no systematic theory, no central findings, and no completed project—nothing, really, beyond some preliminary explorations. Why would anybody ever again assemble a group of 27 junior coauthors, many of whom went on to establish distinguished careers in psychology and psychiatry (and some, like Robert White, Erik Erikson, more than distinguished), to study the mundane habits and utterances of 51 relatively undistinguished college-aged men? The book promises to study human lives in their totality, but the totality of lives studied is one. All we get in the end is a single case study of an unexceptional young soul, named Earnst. (Murray had wanted more cases, but the publisher said the book was already too long.) As a preface to the case, Explorations offers over 600 pages of propositions, lists, quotes, incomplete reports, awkward neologisms, and sentences that just go on and on (like Faulkner and like Melville, but not as good). We hear a lot about studies
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the great biography of Herman Melville over which he labored for four decades—thousands of pages of text and notes, very few of which were ever published.\textsuperscript{9} He never finished the grand personal document that he and his not-so-secret lover of over 40 years, Christiana Morgan, were to write together as the celebration of their relationship and proclamation of a revolutionary new way for modern men and women to live and grow together.\textsuperscript{9} Murray took on only the grandest projects, assuring that they would remain unfinished, as they were in 1988, when he died.

Nonetheless, others often picked up where Murray left off. The esteemed social and personality psychologist M. Brewster Smith, a student of Murray’s in the 1940s, wrote that Explorations set into motion the entire field of personality psychology and the scientific study of lives. “By precept, example, and the charisma that he somehow managed to transmit by means of the printed page, he essentially launched the modern psychology of personality,” wrote Smith.\textsuperscript{10} In the first decade of twenty-first century, personality psychologists, and those in many other fields, still mine Murray’s Explorations for the gold it yields. The sequel to the book is still, in a sense, being written, as the field of personality psychology (and related fields of inquiry) continues to evolve. Murray’s striking and bewildering book continues to strike and inspire, even as it continues to bewilder, the students and professionals who read it today.

Henry Murray came to psychology by way of Carl Jung, Herman Melville, and Christiana Morgan. A popular and gregarious young man who grew up in a very wealthy New York family, Murray graduated from Harvard College in 1915, having majored in what he later named “the three Rs—Rum, Rowing, and Romanticism.”\textsuperscript{11} Hours after rowing in the Harvard/Yale regatta for his senior year, Murray proposed marriage to Josephine Lee Rantoul, a young woman from a very wealthy Boston family. The two celebrated their wedding in 1916 and remained married until her death in 1962. After leaving Harvard, Murray entered medical school at Columbia, where he finally became serious about his studies. After graduating at the top of his medical school class in 1919, he went on to receive an MA in biology in 1920, and then did a 20 month surgical internship at Presbyterian Hospital in New York City. From there, he embarked upon a career in research. While working on his PhD in biochemistry, however, Murray experienced what he later described as “a profound affectional upheaval.”\textsuperscript{12} It began with his reading, in 1923, of Jung’s Psychological Types. The book shook Murray up, both intellectually and emotionally, and it motivated him to read further in the psychoanalytic tradition. Around the same time, Murray met Christiana Morgan. A married woman four years his junior, Christiana was an amateur artist, intuitive and sensitive, fascinated with the inner world of the mind, and deeply interested in Jungian psychology. As their relationship developed, Morgan effectively became Murray’s guide to the unconscious and his femme inspiratrice for the psychological writings he would eventually undertake. A year later, Murray read and was swept away by Moby Dick. He came to believe that Melville’s literary explorations of the human unconscious were as compelling as Jung’s and Freud’s clinical writings. In 1925, Murray traveled to Switzerland to spend three weeks with Jung. He came back exhilarated, and resolved to pursue psychology as his career.

But how does a physician/biochemist with no formal training in psychology become a psychologist? Murray’s break came in 1926 when Morton Prince approached Harvard’s President Lowell with the idea of establishing a small clinic on campus where undergraduates would be taught courses and graduate students would conduct research on abnormal psychology. Well known in psychiatric circles for his studies of hypnosis, hysteria, and multiple personality (or what today is called dissociative identity disorder), the 72-year-old Prince made an especially convincing argument, even as academic psychologists at Harvard opposed it, because he had already raised $140,000 to support the venture. Once word got out that Prince was looking to hire a research assistant for the new Harvard Psychological Clinic, Professor Lawrence Henderson (a chemist with whom Murray
had worked closely for two years and a good friend of President Lowell) prevailed upon Prince to hire Murray. (Perhaps assuming Murray’s PhD was in experimental psychology, the academic psychologists on campus did not know enough to object.) Looking back on these developments today, the psychological historian Rodney Triplet offers this understatement: “Henderson’s involvement in Murray’s hiring provides an interesting example of how professional personnel matters were handled at Harvard during the early decades of this [the twentieth] century. Frequently, issues of social background and personal connections took priority over academic and research credentials.”

Murray assumed the position of director of the Harvard Psychological Clinic when Prince’s health began to fail in 1928. President Lowell also appointed him as assistant professor of abnormal and dynamic psychology. Murray redirected the clinic’s research efforts away from hypnosis and dissociation and toward the study of relatively normal personality functioning, and he introduced into the curriculum courses on psychoanalytic theory. Students read widely in Freud, Jung, Adler, and other depth psychologists. This was heady stuff around 1930, for psychoanalytic ideas were new and exciting and were forbidden fruit in most upper departments of psychology. Indeed, American academic psychology in the 1930s could not have been more opposed to what Murray was trying to do at the clinic. Eager to establish themselves as bona fide scientists, academic psychologists of the day emphasized quantitative laboratory methodologies and rigorous experimental control as they hunkered down to study basic processes of sensation, perception, and learning in animals and humans. Watson had already established behaviorism as the dominant psychological ethos, ruling the study of most complex mental processes out of scientific bounds. Hull and Skinner were launching their seminal studies of stimulus-response learning in rats and pigeons. At Harvard, academic psychology had finally broken away from the department of philosophy, and the new department’s chair, E. G. Boring, committed Harvard psychology to the most rigorous canons of empirical science. He took a jaundiced view of Freud, Jung, and Murray.

Finding little of human interest in most of their psychology courses, students flocked to the lectures and seminars held at the clinic. By the mid-1930s, Murray had as many graduate students working under him as did all the other professors in psychology combined. Murray attracted researchers with backgrounds in psychology, psychoanalysis, medicine, sociology, anthropology, and the arts. All could work together. Murray imagined, in the common enterprise of studying human lives in full. Because he was so wealthy and so well connected, Murray could furnish the clinic building with fine pieces of art, host elegant luncheons, and attract eminent visitors like Felix Frankfurter, Conrad Aiken, Bertrand Russell, Paul Rome, and Alfred North Whitehead. The clinic held an allure as a place where free-thinking humanists might discuss the most daring ideas of the day and consider, with both grace and sophistication, the largest questions about life and society.

Explorations provides a vivid account of what Murray, his students, and his coworkers at the clinic tried to accomplish in the early 1930s. Although Murray scorned the conventions of American academic psychology, he desperately wanted his work to be seen as scientific. He was, after all, a biochemist and a physician. He insisted that psychological phenomena, no matter how complex or irrational, needed to be understood as brain processes, the indirect manifestations of which might be observed in laboratory behavior, everyday actions, self-assessments of mental functioning, creative productions, and reports of fantasies, reveries, and dreams. The daring ideas offered in Freud, Jung, Adler, and even Melville could be examined in the laboratory. Murray believed, and through legitimate methods of scientific inquiry. Explorations could be seen, then, as an effort in reconciliation—an attempt to find a middle ground between the rigorous and mechanistic conventions of contemporary academic psychology on the one hand and the intuitively appealing but wildly speculative discourses of Freudian and Jungian psychology on the other. Characteristically, Murray’s operational metaphor here was a conjugal union: “In short, then, we might say that our work is the natural child of
the deep, significant, metaphorical, provocative and questionable
dspeulations of psycho-analysis and the precise, systematic, statistical,
trivial and artificial methods of academic personology. Our
hope is that we have inherited more of the virtues than the vices
of our parents."^{14}
Murray regularly used the term personology to depict the wide-
ranging, interdisciplinary study of persons that is at the center of
Explorations. He may have borrowed the term from the Right
Honorable Jan Christiaan Smuts, a famous South African
soldier and politician, who was also something of a philosopher.
Between stints as prime minister and deputy minister of justice,
Smuts found time in 1926 to write a curious book called Holism
and Evolution. The book argues that a broad, synthetic func-
tion governs all natural processes. From single-cell organisms to
humankind, life tends toward wholeness, structure, and integra-
tion. Personality itself, Smuts avers, is a complexly organized, self-
regulating, integrated whole—"personal holism, as the whole
in its human fullness of development."^{15} Smuts wrote: "I would
suggest Personology as the name for the science of Personality,
which will not be a mere subdivision of psychology but an
independent science or discipline of its own, with its roots not
only in psychology but also in all the sciences which deal with
human mind and human body."^{16} Smuts suggests that person-
ology concern itself with broad individual differences between
people, as well as general principles of personality development,
and that personologists examine the biographies of both famous
and common people. Smuts makes no mention of Jung or Freud.
His view of the human mind seems rather more majestic and
Apollonian than Murray or Melville would ever endorse. But
the grandeur of his vision for personology was surely consistent
with Murray's always-expansive view.

Explorations set forth some of the basic principles, concepts,
and methods that a productive personology—a viable science of
human lives—would require. Persons should be seen as complex,
self-regulating, integrated wholes evolving over time. Each episode
of life brings to the fore a panoply of internal, interacting needs
that are expressed according to the constraints and opportunities
provided by the environmental press. In Explorations, Murray
famously described the vicissitudes of at least 20 psychological
needs, including the needs for achievement, affiliation, order, and
"Islamavoidance." Episodes follow one after the other over time,
out of which a full life, a biography, comes to be made. "The his-
tory of the organism is the organism," Murray proclaimed. "This
proposition calls for biographical studies."^{17} Episodic behavior
and full lives are energized, directed, and organized by physi-
cal and psychological needs, as they are shaped and modified by
environments (press) over time. While some needs are consciously
construed, many need tendencies are unconscious or at least not
readily available to awareness. Recurrent interactions of certain
needs, both conscious and unconscious, with certain environmen-
tal situations constitute characteristic themes in a given life. Some
themes recruit so much emotion and attach to such a wide range
of psychodynamic activity that they take on a self-defining pro-
minence within a particular personality. We may call these unity
themes or complexes.

In Explorations, Murray and his coauthors described a dazz-
lng array of techniques for collecting and analyzing data on
human lives. Included are physiological and behavioral indices
observed in the laboratory, self-report questionnaires, interviews
about sexual behavior, mock psychoanalytic procedures, autobi-
oraphical exercises, tests of music reverie and artistic apprecia-
tion, social dilemmas, inkblots, and many procedures designed to
elicit imagination and fantasy. Most famously, Murray and Morgan
described the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), a procedure by
which individuals construct imaginative fantasies in response to picture cues.^{18} TAT stories could be analyzed for needs, current
concerns, themes, conflicts, values, sentiments, and the like. Each
of the 51 young men who participated in the main body of stud-
ies described in Explorations was subjected to many, in some cases
all, of the techniques developed, requiring as much as 35 hours
of individual participation. Different experimenters shared notes
from different procedures, in order to understand the results of
their own studies in the context of the others’ work. In one of the most novel innovations, Murray appointed a Diagnostic Council of five relatively senior investigators who interviewed all of the participants individually and synthesized the voluminous results of all of the studies into various personality ratings and full case reports for each of the participants. The case study of Earnst was presented in full.

Since its publication in 1938, what influence has Explorations exerted on personality psychology in particular and psychology more generally? The profound impact of Murray’s book can be seen in at least six important areas.

First, the TAT became one of the most widely used assessment tools in clinical psychology and in personality research. In a famous scene from Moby Dick, Captain Ahab and several of his men gaze upon a gold doubloon and tell each other what they see in the images on the coin. For Ahab, the doubloon is a projective test: “The firm tower, that is Ahab; the volcano, that is Ahab; the courageous, the undaunted, and victorious fowl, that too, is Ahab; all are Ahab; and this round gold is but the image of the rounder globe, which, like the magician’s glass, to each and every man in turn but mirrors back his own mysterious self.”19 Like Ahab seeing himself everywhere in the images of the coin, Murray and Morgan believed, so too do Harvard undergraduates, therapy patients, and other ordinary people project their personal wishes, feelings, conflicts, and implicit understandings of self and world into the imaginative stories they tell in response to the TAT picture cues.20 Even those psychologists who doubt the projective hypothesis upon which Murray staked his claims are familiar with the iconic images that make up the classic TAT set. Volumes have been written on the clinical use of the TAT. Numerous scoring systems have been developed. Seven decades after the publication of Explorations, the TAT still enjoys substantial popularity among clinicians and still stimulates creative research programs in personality and clinical psychology.21

Second, Explorations identified a host of personality variables that have become central constructs in personality and social psychological research. Most important here is Murray’s definitive list of psychogenic needs. Self-report assessments of individual differences on many of the needs can be obtained from instruments like Douglas Jackson’s Personality Research Form (PRF), which is one of the most well-designed and extensively validated personality inventories in the world.22 Beginning in the late 1940s, David McClelland and his students revised Murray’s TAT procedure and drew creatively from his taxonomy of needs to assess individual differences in fantasy-based motives for achievement, power, and intimacy/affiliation.23 Research on these constructs continues to generate interesting findings in the first decade of the twenty-first century. In general, psychologists who favor dynamic approaches to personality, over and against more structural approaches afforded by trait theories, have tended to look upon Explorations as a canonical text. Whereas his colleague at Harvard Gordon Allport argued that dispositional traits were the essential features of human individuality (a view that evolved through the work of Raymond Cattell and Hans Eysenck after World War II and has come down to us today in the Big Five taxonomy of personality traits), Murray emphasized instead the energizing and directing motivational forces behind human behavior. Needs for achievement, dominance, affiliation, play, order, sex, nurturance, succorance, blamavoidance, and so on wax and wane from one episode to the next as people move through situations and encounter new challenges in life. Yet, dispositional tendencies with respect to the strength and range of these many needs constitute the prime factors for organizing and directing individual lives as they evolve over time.

Third, along with Kurt Lewin, Murray described an interactionist approach to psychology wherein internal variables interact with environmental variables to produce human behavior. In Explorations, Murray defined a press (plural: press) as an actual or perceived situation that exerts some kind of influence on the person. In the 1960s and 1970s, Walter Mischel and other social-learning theorists criticized conventional personality research
for ignoring situational variables in favor of internal dispositions. They called for a renewal of interest in the social ecology of lives and for more explicitly interactionist formulations that expressed how personal variables interact with the many features of human environments. Yet, Murray paid very careful attention to environmental contingencies, going so far as to formulate an elaborate taxonomy of press as manifested in the lives of his young research subjects, spelled out in chapter 5 of *Explorations*. Furthermore, his concept of the theme proposed recurrent and complex interactions between particular needs and particular press in specific lives. Murray remarked that between the time he began and the time he finished writing *Explorations*, the concept of the theme rose dramatically in importance. The full, biographical analyses of his subjects revealed that lives could often be organized in terms of a handful of dominant themes, as Robert White showed beautifully in the case of Earnst. This kind of contextualized approach to understanding the motivational dynamics in lives over time is consistent with those contemporary research trends that underscore the importance of current concerns, personal strivings, personal projects, and developmental life tasks in personality.

The fourth area of profound influence concerned Murray’s revolutionary approach to personality assessment. *Explorations* championed a multiform, multimethod assessment strategy wherein individuals participate in a wide range of procedures, from laboratory experiments involving galvanic skin responses to writing their autobiographies, and investigators combine the varied results into a personological formulation that attempts to capture the individual personality in toto. Murray may have seen this feature of his work at the clinic to be the most important contribution *Explorations* had to offer. Toward the end of the book, he wrote: “If we have made any contribution to personality it is probably to be found in our general plan of action: numerous sessions, of which as many as possible are controlled experiments, conducted by different examiners who work independently until at a final session they meet to exchange their findings and interpretations.” During World War II, Murray brought this general approach to the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), a forerunner to the CIA. In order to choose the right men for sensitive positions in foreign espionage, Murray and his staff developed a series of tests and assessment activities measuring a wide range of abilities, competencies, traits, interests, opinions, and other personal characteristics assumed to predict human performance under often dangerous conditions. After the war, Murray and his colleagues reported their procedures and results in *Assessment of Men*. Like *Explorations*, this landmark volume from the OSS staff offered a goldmine of assessment ideas and discussed the many problems, pitfalls, and challenges involved in trying to predict human behavior from personality tests. Murray hoped that after the war psychology departments in other universities would set up collaborative research centers that might adopt the assessment principles he illustrated in *Explorations* and in *Assessment of Men*. For the most part, his hope did not translate into reality. One notable exception, however, was Donald MacKinnon’s postwar success in establishing the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR) at the University of California, Berkeley, which implemented many of Murray’s ideas on multiform assessment. The ideas also had strong impacts in industrial-organizational psychology and other arenas concerned with personnel selection. Murray’s efforts to find a common nomenclature that expert observers on the Diagnostic Council could use to combine their ratings foreshadowed Jack Block’s seminal research program with the Q-sort method and the longitudinal studies of adult personality development conducted by personologists like Ravenna Henson and Abigail Stewart.

Fifth is the study of the single case. Like Allport, Murray believed that personality psychology should endeavor to produce insightful, theoretically-guided case studies that describe and explain the complexities of the individual life. Science typically seeks to generalize beyond the individual case, Murray acknowledged, but the “proof of the pudding” when it comes to personality constructs is their utility in making sense of the individual life history. After the war, Robert White illustrated
the power of case studies to illuminate personality in his classic *Lives in Progress*, through which he followed the lives of three people—Harley Hale, Joseph Kidd, and Joyce Kingsley—as they moved from early adulthood through middle age.⁴¹ Erik Erikson published his monumental psychobiographies of Martin Luther and Mohandas Gandhi decades after he left the Harvard Psychological Clinic.⁴² Classic studies of individual human lives have been published by many personality psychologists since the days of *Explorations*, including McClelland (1951); Smith, Bruner, and White (1956); Keniston (1964); Alexander (1990); Elms (1994); Nasby and Read (1997); Wiggins (2003); Ogilvie (2004); and Schultz (2005).⁴³ Many psychologists routinely criticize the case study method for, among other things, its inability to produce general laws of human behavior. However, the forceful arguments and elegant case histories produced over the years by Murray’s followers and admirers have proven to be testaments to the belief, held by many psychologists, that personality makes best sense when it is viewed in the fullness of the individual human life. The long-term influence of *Explorations*, moreover, can be seen in the current increase in interest among psychologists and other social scientists, dating from the mid-1980s, in psychological biography, life narratives, and qualitative approaches for studying human lives.⁴⁴

Finally, *Explorations* helped to build bridges between the worlds of psychoanalysis and American experimental psychology. Following Murray’s lead, behavioral scientists in personality, social, and developmental psychology began to consider the possibility that certain psychoanalytic ideas might be amenable to empirical scrutiny. The 1940s and 1950s witnessed important efforts on the part of a number of research teams to translate ideas such as repression, defense mechanisms, ego strength, intrapsychic conflict, and the like into measurable constructs and testable hypotheses. Prominent examples include the New Look studies in perception, Neal Miller and John Dollard’s social learning theory, culture and personality studies, and postwar work on the authoritarian personality.⁴⁵ While some of these efforts turned out, like *Explorations*, to be more notable for what they attempted rather than what they actually achieved, the lively exchange between psychoanalysis and empirical psychology clearly enriched the latter. Whether it enriched psychoanalysis to the same degree is less clear. Murray’s selective appropriation of the psychoanalytic literature suggests one possible area of influence. Perhaps due to his early reading of Jung and his own Promethean temperament, Murray implicitly rejected those aspects of the Freudian orthodoxy that viewed humans as helpless, even paralyzed, in the face of overwhelming conflicts and overmastering id impulses. Like the ego psychologists of the 1940s and 1950s, Murray’s *Explorations* presented a more hopeful view for modern human life. Even in the face of conflicting needs and difficult environmental demands, the ego could often adapt to, synthesize, control, and even master the world around it. In this sense, *Explorations* reflected and may have even helped to promote the move in psychoanalytic thinking from id-based to ego-based conceptions.⁴⁶

As I read *Explorations* today, I find passages that still take my breath away. On page 609, Murray begins one of his most stirring paragraphs with the question: “What is the best form for an abstract biography?” He suggests that this question leads readily to another: “What indeed is personality?” He and his coworkers at the clinic have obsessed over these questions for years, he admits, for they believe that answering them correctly could help to bring together the fields of psychology and sociology. The person is embedded in the social world and in culture, Murray goes on to say. Yet, the person is not merely the recipient of cultural input but instead works to conserve, represent, convey, modify, and create culture. This leads Murray to comment on the many intellectual and cultural trends of the day—that is, the mid-1930s—that seem to him to celebrate the creative powers of the self and the integrity of individual human lives. Which leads him to child-rearing practices and then to religion: These developments parallel “the growing conviction that the religious vision is the ecstatic creation of the suffering, frustrated, longing human soul; that Deity is not something ‘up there’ but something in personality—in the most unconscious depths
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this more tempered and nuanced understanding of autobiography seems missing from Murray’s analysis. Ironically, the data from chapter 5, if read from the standpoint of contemporary theories regarding the relations between life narrative and personality dispositions, may be even more fascinating for readers today than the accounts were in 1938. Rather than reading the vivid autobiographical accounts as causal histories, one may see them more profitably as scenes from life stories, the stories themselves being creative reconstructions of the past in light of current concerns and future goals. From the standpoint, for instance, of Silvan Tomkins’s (1979) script theory and this author’s own life-story model of adult identity (2006), childhood stories of danger may be as much the psychological result as the psychological cause of strong needs for harmavoidance. Narrative conceptions of personality suggest that life stories express how people make meaning in life today—he and now. The internalized and evolving stories of the self are as much about who I am today and who I want to be as they are about what I might once have been.  

If Murray failed to anticipate later research on autobiographical memory and the rise of narrative theories of personality, he was prescient about another interesting development from the later decades of the twentieth century. I am thinking here of the idea of the distributed, postmodern self. Rather than seeing the self as a stable, consistent, and coherent center for the personality, many social psychological conceptions of the past 30 years or so tend to emphasize the extent to which selves seem inconsistent, contingent, shifting, strategic, and even multiple. The extreme positions in this regard are occupied by Erving Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical conception of the self (a self that is nothing more than the different roles it plays) and Kenneth Gergen’s saturated self (1991), which shifts its expressions, discourses, and very being from one moment of postmodern time to the next. Another very important line of theory in this tradition is Hubert J. M. Hermans’s dialogical self, conceived as a developing conversation among different internalized voices.

Murray saw persons as integrated wholes, for sure. But the integration is dynamic and shifting, and it is not altogether clear that personality is anchored to a stable core. Whereas Allport and later humanistic theorists like Carl Rogers conceived of personality as oriented around a fundamental center or essence, Murray’s conception in Explorations was decidedly de-centered and, in this sense, surprisingly similar to those more recent conceptions of a fluid, malleable, and multiply distributed self. For Murray, psychological states come and go, expressing a temporal succession of personality subsystems, or what he termed regimens. A given state of mind reigns for a short period—that is, it manifests a particular regnant process—and then is dethroned by the next. Different psychological conglomerates and coalitions vie for influence over time in response to changing environmental demands. Personality is full of many different players, different voices. When I see a person, Murray once wrote, I see a flow of powerful subjective life, conscious and unconscious; a whispering gallery in which voices echo from the distant past; a gulf stream of fantasies with floating memories of past events, currents of contending complexes, plots and counterplots, hopeful intimations and ideals…. A personality is a full Congress of orators and pressure groups, of children, demagogues, communists, isolationists, war-mongers, mugwumps, grafters, log-rollers, lobbyists, Caesars and Christ, Machiavellis and Judases, Tories and Prometheus revolutionists. Given Murray’s conception of personality as a whispering gallery of multiple voices, it is perhaps fitting that Explorations should come to us from a team of 28 coauthors. The book itself is an unruly conglomerate, a full congress of orators and at least one Prometheus revolutionist. Let us listen to the many different voices in Murray’s strange and inspiring book.

There are the voices of the 31 college-aged participants themselves. About three quarters of these men were undergraduates at Harvard College, and the others were local men of the same age. In the worst days of the Great Depression, all of the participants apparently needed money, for they were recruited at the Harvard
while or to whom they refer. The second is that of a formal classification of terms by which subjects may be divided.

Science, Psychology, and the Social Sciences

Science and Psychology are the two main fields of study in the social sciences, and the social sciences are a broad category of disciplines that include psychology, sociology, anthropology, and many others.

Psychology

Psychology is the study of behavior and mental processes. It seeks to understand how the mind works, how thoughts are formed, and how emotions are experienced. Through research and experimentation, psychologists seek to identify the underlying principles that govern human behavior.

Sociology

Sociology is the study of social behavior, focusing on the structure and dynamics of human societies. It examines how individuals interact with each other in groups and how these interactions shape the larger social structures that exist within society.

Anthropology

Anthropology is the study of human societies and cultures across time and space. It seeks to understand the diverse ways that people live, think, and interact with each other, and to explore how these ways have changed over time.

Public Policy

Public policy refers to the decisions made by governments regarding the allocation of resources and the regulation of behavior. It can be seen as the application of the principles of the social sciences to address societal problems and improve the lives of citizens.

Implications of the Study

The implications of this study for psychology include a deeper understanding of the factors that influence behavior and the potential for developing interventions to address behavioral issues. For sociology, the study provides insights into the dynamics of social interactions and the ways in which societies are structured and change over time.

Knowledge and Practice

The study also has implications for knowledge and practice in the field of public policy, as it highlights the need for evidence-based decision-making and the importance of considering the social and behavioral factors that influence policy outcomes.
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Preface

This is a book of many authors. But in writing it our purpose was to make an integrated whole, not a mere collection of articles on special topics. The planned procedure for achieving unity was this: to have all experimenters study the same series of individuals with the same concepts actively in mind, and then in assembly—a meeting being devoted to each case—to report their findings and collaborate in accomplishing a common purpose: the formulation of the personality of every subject. The degree of unity attained is for others, not us, to judge. Diversity is certainly conspicuous in spots; so difficult is it, particularly in psychology, for a group of men to reach and hold a common outlook. Indeed, what is now so hard for us to realize is that the job was done at all, that for three years the many authors of this book were able to work, think and talk together with enjoyment and some measure of productiveness.

Four years ago every investigator at the Harvard Psychological Clinic was a pioneer with his own chosen area of wilderness to map. Each area was an aspect of human personality—a virgin forest of peculiar problems. Here he lost and sometimes found himself. Though there were plenty of opportunities for communication, his obligations to other experimenters were minimal and he was free to follow the wilful drifts of his own elusive thought. He enjoyed, in other words, relative autonomy in a Jeffersonian democracy of researchers—an atmosphere that is breath to the nostrils of every seeker after hidden truth.

All we workers were bound by a common compulsion: to inquire into the nature of man; and by a common faith: that experiment would prove fruitful. We devoted ourselves, therefore, to the observation of human beings responding to a variety of controlled conditions, conditions which resembled as nearly as