

# *Motivation and Personality*

---

THIRD EDITION

Abraham H. Maslow

*Late, Brandeis University*



LONGMAN

---

An imprint of Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

New York • Reading, Massachusetts • Menlo Park, California • Harlow, England  
Don Mills, Ontario • Sydney • Mexico City • Madrid • Amsterdam

*Sponsoring Editor:* Leslie Carr  
*Project Coordination:* R. David Newcomer Associates  
*Copy Editor:* Judith Hibbard  
*Proofreader:* Joseph Pascale  
*Cover Design:* ARCON  
*Composer:* Auto-Graphics, Inc.  
*Printer and Binder:* R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company

Motivation and Personality, Third Edition  
Copyright © 1954, 1987 by Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc.  
Copyright © 1970 by Abraham H. Maslow

All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Maslow, Abraham Harold.  
Motivation and personality.

Bibliography: p.  
Includes index.

1. Motivation (Psychology) 2. Self-actualization (Psychology) I. Title.  
BF503.M375 1987 153.8 86-27051  
ISBN 0-06-041987-3

13 14 15 16 17 DOH 02010099

# chapter 6

## Unmotivated Behavior

In this chapter we shall grope further toward a scientifically usable differentiation between striving (doing, coping, achieving, trying, purposiveness) and being-becoming (existing, expressing, growing, self-actualization). This distinction is, of course, a familiar one in Eastern cultures and religions, such as Taoism, and in our culture among some philosophers, theologians, aestheticians, students of mysticism, and increasingly among "humanistic psychologists," existential psychologists, and the like.

Western culture generally rests on the Judaic-Christian theology. The United States particularly is dominated by the Puritan and pragmatic spirit, which stresses work, struggle and striving, soberness and earnestness, and, above all, purposefulness.<sup>1</sup> Like any other social institution, science in general and psychology in particular are not exempt from these cultural climate and atmosphere effects. American psychology, by participation, is overpragmatic, over-Puritan, and over-

<sup>1</sup>"Idle associations, superfluous images, involved dreams, random explorations, play a part in development that could never be justified, in origin, on any principle of economy or by any direct expectation of usefulness. In a mechanistic culture like our own, these important activities have been either undervalued or overlooked. . . ."

"Once we rid ourselves of the unconscious bias of mechanism, we must recognize that the 'superfluous' is just as essential to human development as the economic: that beauty, for example, has played as large a part in evolution as use and cannot be explained, as Darwin sought to, merely as a practical device for courtship or fertilization. In short, it is just as permissible to conceive nature, mythologically, as a poet, working in metaphors and rhythms, as to think of nature as a cunning mechanic, trying to save material, make both ends meet, do the job efficiently and cheaply. The Mechanistic interpretation is quite as subjective as the poetic one; and up to a point each is useful" (Mumford, 1951, p. 35).

purposeful. This is evident not only in its effects and avowed purposes but also in its gaps, in what it neglects. No textbooks have chapters on fun and gaiety, on leisure and meditation, on loafing and puttering, on aimless, useless, and purposeless activity, on aesthetic creation or experience, or on unmotivated activity. That is to say, American psychology is busily occupying itself with only half of life to the neglect of the other—and perhaps more important—half!

From the point of view of values, this may be described as a preoccupation with means to the exclusion of concern with ends. This philosophy is implicit in practically all American psychology (including orthodox and revisionist psychoanalysis), which uniformly neglects per se activity and end experience (which gets nothing done) in favor of coping, changing, effective, purposeful activity that gets something useful done. The culmination of this philosophy may be found in a quite explicit form in John Dewey's *Theory of Valuation* (1939), in which the possibility of ends is in effect denied; they are themselves only means to other means, to other means . . . , and so on (although in other of his writings, he *does* accept the existence of ends).

Because contemporary psychology is overly pragmatic, it abdicates from certain areas that should be of great concern to it. In its preoccupation with practical results, with technology and means, it has notoriously little to say, for example, about beauty, art, fun, play, wonder, awe, joy, love, happiness, and other "useless" reactions and end experiences. It is therefore of little or no service to the artist, the musician, the poet, the novelist, to the humanist, the connoisseur, the axiologist, the theologian, or to other end- or enjoyment-oriented individuals. This is the equivalent of an accusation against psychology that it offers little to the modern person whose most desperate need is a naturalistic or humanistic end or value system.

The distinction between the expressive (noninstrumental) and the coping (instrumental, adaptive, functional, purposive) components of behavior has not yet been properly exploited as a basis for value psychology.<sup>2</sup> By exploring and applying the differentiation between expression and coping—which is simultaneously a differentiation between "useless" and "useful" behavior—we may help to extend the jurisdiction of psychology in these directions.

The first part of this chapter discusses the differences between expression and coping. The latter part examines several examples of behaviors of expression rather than of coping, which could be considered *unmotivated behaviors*.

### COPING VERSUS EXPRESSION

Here is a summary of the points of distinction between coping behaviors and expressive behaviors:

<sup>2</sup>We must be careful here to avoid sharp, either-or dichotomizing. Most acts of behavior have both an expressive and a coping component; for example, walking has simultaneously a purpose and a style. And yet we do not wish to exclude, as do Allport and Vernon (1933), the theoretical possibility of practically pure expressive acts, such as sauntering instead of walking; blushing; gracefulness; poor posture; whistling; a child's laughing in glee; private, noncommunicative artistic activity; pure self-actualization, and so on.

**Purposive or unpurposive** Coping is by definition purposive and motivated; expression is often unmotivated.

**Paradox of trying not to try** Coping is effortful; expression is effortless in most instances. Artistic expression is, of course, a special and in-between case because one *learns* to be spontaneous and expressive (if one is successful). One can *try* to relax.

**External and internal determinants** Coping is more determined by external environmental and cultural variables; expression is largely determined by the state of the organism. A corollary is the much higher correlation of expression with deep-lying character structure. So-called projective tests might more accurately be called expressive tests.

**Learned or unlearned** Coping is most often learned; expression is most often unlearned or released or disinhibited.

**Possibility of control** Coping is more easily controlled (repressed, suppressed, inhibited, or acculturated); expression is more often uncontrolled and sometimes even uncontrollable.

**Affecting the environment** Coping is usually designed to cause changes in the environment and often does; expression is not designed to do anything. If it causes environmental changes, it does so unwittingly.

**Means and ends** Coping is characteristically means behavior, the end being need gratification of threat reduction. Expression is often an end in itself.

**Conscious or unconscious** Typically, the coping component is conscious (although it may become unconscious); expression is more often not conscious.

### **Purposive or Unpurposive Behavior**

Coping behavior always has among its determinants drives, needs, goals, purposes, functions, or aims. It comes into existence to get something done, such as walking to some destination, shopping for food, going to mail a letter, building a set of bookshelves, or doing the work for which we get paid. The term *coping* itself (Maslow and Mittelman, 1951) implies the attempt to solve a problem or at least to deal with it. It therefore implies a reference to something beyond itself; it is not self-contained. This reference may be either to immediate or to basic needs, to means as well as ends, to frustration-induced behavior as well as to goal-seeking behavior.

Expressive behavior of the type so far discussed by psychologists is generally unmotivated, although, of course, it is determined. (That is, though expressive behavior has many determinants, need gratification need not be one of them.) It simply mirrors, reflects, signifies, or expresses some state of the organism. Indeed,

it most often is *part* of that state: the stupidity of the moron, the smile and the springy walk of the healthy person, the benevolent mien of the kind and affectionate, the beauty of the beautiful person, the slumping posture, lowered tonus, and hopeless expression of the depressed person, the style of handwriting, walking, gesturing, smiling, dancing, and so forth. These are nonpurposive. They have no aim or goal. They were not elaborated for the sake of need gratification.<sup>3</sup> They are epiphenomenal.

### **Paradox of Trying Not to Try**

While all this is true as far as it goes, a special problem is raised by what at first glance seems a paradox, namely, the concept of motivated self-expression. The more sophisticated person can *try* to be honest, graceful, kind, or even artless. People who have been through psychoanalysis as well as people at the highest motivational levels know well how this is.

Indeed, it is their most basic single problem. Self-acceptance and spontaneity are among the easiest achievements (e.g., in healthy children) and the most difficult (e.g., in self-questioning, self-improving adults, especially those who have been or still are neurotic). Indeed, for some it is an impossible achievement; for example, in certain types of neurosis the individual is an actor who has no self at all in the ordinary sense, but only a repertoire of roles from which to choose.

We may take two examples, one simple and the other complex, to demonstrate the (apparent) contradictions involved in the concept of motivated, purposeful spontaneity, of Taoistic yielding and letting go, as with tight muscles or sphincters. The most desirable way to dance, at least for the amateur, is to be spontaneous, fluid, automatically responsive to the rhythm of the music and the unconscious wishes of the partner. Good dancers can let themselves go, becoming passive instruments fashioned by the music and played upon by it. They need have no wish, no criticism, no direction, no will. In a very real and useful sense of the word, they may become passive, even as they dance to the point of exhaustion. Such passive spontaneity or willing abandon can yield some of life's greatest pleasures, as in allowing the surf to tumble one about, or allowing oneself to be cared for and nursed, massaged, barbered, as in being made love to, or as in the mother who passively allows her baby to suckle, to bite, and to crawl over her. But few people can dance as well as this. Most will try, will be directed, self-controlled, and purposeful, will listen carefully to the rhythm of the music, and by a conscious act of choice fall in with it. They will be poor dancers from the point of view of the onlooker and from the subjective point of view as well, for they will never enjoy dancing as a profound experience of self-forgetfulness and voluntary renunciation of control unless they finally transcend trying and become spontaneous.

Many dancers become good without training. And yet education can be a

<sup>3</sup>This statement is independent of any particular phrasing of motivation theory. For instance, it applies as well to simple hedonism; thus we may rephrase our statement to say: Coping behavior is responsive to praise or blame, reward or punishment; expressive behavior is ordinarily not, at least so long as it remains expressive.

help here too. But it must be a different kind, an education in spontaneity and eager abandon, in being natural, nonvoluntary, noncritical, and passive in the Taoist style, trying not to try. One must “learn” for such purposes to be able to drop inhibitions, self-consciousness, will, control, acculturation, and dignity. (“When once you are free from all seeming, from all craving and lusting, then will you move of your own impulse, without so much as knowing that you move”—Lao Tse.)

More difficult problems are raised by an examination of the nature of self-actualization. Of people who are at this level of motivational development, it may be said that their actions and creations are in a very high degree spontaneous, guileless, open, self-disclosing, and unedited and therefore expressive (the “Easy State” we might call it, after Asrani). Furthermore, their motivations change in quality so much, and are so different from the ordinary needs for safety or love or respect, that they ought not even to be called by the same name. (I have suggested the word *metaneeds* to describe the motivations of self-actualizing people.)

If the wish for love be called a need, the pressure to self-actualize ought to be called by some name other than need because it has so many different characteristics. The one main difference most pertinent to our present task is that love and respect and the like may be considered as external qualities that the organism lacks and therefore needs. Self-actualization is not a lack or deficiency in this sense. It is not something extrinsic that the organism needs for health as, for example, a tree needs water. Self-actualization is intrinsic growth of what is already in the organism, or more accurately of what *is* the organism itself. Just as our tree needs food, sun, water from the environment, so does the person need safety, love, and respect from the social environment. But as in the first case, so also in the second, this is just where real development (i.e., of individuality) begins. All trees need sunlight and all human beings need love, and yet, once satiated with these elementary necessities, each tree and each human being proceeds to develop in its own style, uniquely, using these universal necessities to its own private purposes. In a word, development then proceeds from within rather than from without, and paradoxically the highest motive is to be unmotivated and nonstriving, that is, to behave purely expressively. Or, to say it in another way, self-actualization is growth-motivated rather than deficiency-motivated. It is a “second naivete,” a wise innocence, an “Easy State.”

One can try to go in the direction of self-actualization by solving the lesser, prerequisite motivational problems. Thereby one consciously and purposefully seeks spontaneity. Thus at the highest levels of human development, the distinction between coping and expression, like so many other psychological dichotomies, is resolved and transcended, and trying becomes a path to nontrying.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup>Gordon Allport stresses strongly and correctly that “being” is as effortful and active as is striving. His suggestions would lead us to contrast striving-to-make-up-deficiencies with striving-to-self-actualize rather than striving with being. This correction also serves to remove the too easily acquired impression that “being,” unmotivated reactions and purposeless activity are easier, less energetic and less effortful than coping with external problems. That this *dolce far niente* interpretation of self-actualization is misleading is easily demonstrated by such examples of struggling self-development as Beethoven.

## External and Internal Determinants

Coping behavior is characteristically more determined by relatively external determinants than is expressive behavior. It is most often a functional response to an emergency, a problem, or a need whose solution or gratification comes from the physical and/or cultural world. Ultimately, as we have seen, it is an attempt to make up internal deficiencies by external satisfiers.

Expressive behavior contrasts with coping behavior in its more exclusively characterological determination (see below). We may say that coping behavior is essentially an interaction of the character with the nonpsychic world, adjusting each to the other with mutual effect; expression is essentially an epiphenomenon or by-product of the nature of the character structure. In the former, therefore, may be detected the working of both the laws of the physical world and of the inner character; in the latter one detects primarily psychological or characterological laws. An illustration could be the contrast between representational and nonrepresentational art.

Several corollaries follow. (1) It is certain that if one wishes to know about the character structure, the best behavior to study is expressive rather than coping behavior. This is supported by the now-extensive experience with projective (expressive) tests. (2) With reference to the perennial debate about what is psychology and what is the best approach to its study, it is clear that adjustmental, purposive, motivated, coping behavior is not the only kind of behavior there is. (3) Our distinction may have some bearing on the question of the continuity or discontinuity of psychology with the other sciences. In principle the study of the natural world should help us to understand coping behavior but probably not expression. The latter seems to be more purely psychological, probably having its own rules and laws and therefore best studied directly rather than through the physical and natural sciences.

## Learned or Unlearned Behavior

Ideal coping behavior is characteristically learned, while ideal expressive behavior is characteristically unlearned. We do not have to learn how to feel helpless or look healthy or be stupid or show anger, while we do ordinarily have to learn how to build bookshelves, ride a bicycle, or dress ourselves. This contrast may be clearly seen in the determinants of reaction to achievement tests on the one hand and to the Rorschach test on the other. Also, coping behavior tends to die out unless rewarded; expression often persists without reward or reinforcement. One is gratification-bent; the other is not.

## Possibility of Control

Differential determination by inner and outer determinants shows itself also in a varying susceptibility to conscious or unconscious control (inhibition, repression, suppression). Spontaneous expression is very difficult to manage, to change, to conceal, to control, or to influence in any way. Indeed, control and expression

## Being

The expressive behaviors tend to occur when people are being themselves, developing, growing and maturing, not going anywhere (in the sense, e.g., of social climbing), not striving in the ordinary sense of straining and trying for a state of affairs other than that in which they are.<sup>6</sup> As a jumping-off point for thinking about just being, the concept of *waiting* is useful. The cat in the sun does *not* wait any more than a tree waits. Waiting implies wasted, unappreciated time that is empty of significance for the organism and is a by-product of a too exclusively means-oriented attitude toward life. It is most often a stupid, inefficient, and wasteful response, since (1) impatience usually does no good, even from the point of view of efficiency, and (2) even means experiences and means behaviors can be enjoyed, savored, and appreciated for their own sake at, so to speak, no extra charge. Travel is an excellent example of the way in which a piece of time can be either enjoyed as end experience or completely wasted. Education is another instance. So also are interpersonal relations in general.

Involved here also is a certain inversion of the concept of wasted time. For the use-oriented, purposeful, need-reducing kind of person that time is wasted that achieves nothing and serves no purpose. While this is a perfectly legitimate usage, we may suggest that an equally legitimate usage might be to consider that time wasted that does not carry end experience with it, that is, that is not ultimately enjoyed. "Time you enjoy wasting is not wasted time." "Some things that are not necessary may yet be essential."

An excellent illustration of the way in which our culture is unable to take its end experiences straight may be seen in strolling, canoeing, golfing, and the like. Generally these activities are extolled because they get people into the open, close to nature, out into the sunshine, or into beautiful surroundings. In essence, these are ways in which what *should be* unmotivated end activities and end experiences are thrown into a purposeful, achieving, pragmatic framework in order to appease the Western conscience.

## Art

The creation of art may be relatively motivated (when it seeks to communicate, to arouse emotion, to show, to do something to another person) or it may be relatively unmotivated (when it is expressive rather than communicative, interpersonal rather than interpersonal). The fact that expression may have unforeseen interpersonal effects (secondary gain) is beside the point.

Very much to the point, however, is the question "Is there a *need* for expression?" If there is, then artistic expression, as well as cathartic and release phenomena, are as motivated as food seeking or love seeking. We have indicated at various points in earlier chapters that we think the evidence will soon force us to recognize such a need to express in action whatever impulses have been aroused in the organism. That this will make paradoxes is clear from the fact that *any*

<sup>6</sup>Chapter 11, "Self-actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health," documents this observation and elaborates it.

need or *any* capacity is an impulse and therefore seeks expression. Should it be called a separate need or impulse or should it rather be considered to be universal characteristic of *any* impulse?

At this point we need not opt for one or another of these alternatives, since our only purpose is to show that they are *all* neglected. Whichever one turns out to be most fruitful will force a recognition of (1) the category of unmotivation and (2) a tremendous reconstruction of all motivation theory.

Quite as important for the sophisticated person is the question of aesthetic experience. This is so rich and valuable an experience for so many people that they will simply scorn or sneer at any psychological theory that denies or neglects it, no matter what scientific grounds there may be for such neglect. Science must account for *all* reality, not only the impoverished and bloodless portions of it. The fact that the aesthetic response is useless and purposeless, and that we know nothing about its motivations, if indeed there *are* any in the ordinary sense, should indicate to us only the poverty of our official psychology.

Even the aesthetic perception, cognitively speaking, may be seen as relatively unmotivated by comparison with ordinary cognitions.<sup>7</sup> Taoistic, disinterested perceiving of the many-sidedness of a phenomenon (with especial reference not to usefulness but to its efficacy in producing end experiences) is one characteristic of the aesthetic perception.<sup>8</sup>

## Appreciation

Not only the aesthetic experience but many others also are passively received and enjoyed by the organism. This enjoyment itself can hardly be said to be motivated; if anything it is the end or purpose of motivated activity, the epiphenomenon of need gratification.

The mystic experience, the experience of awe, of delight, of wonder, of mystery, and of admiration are all subjectively rich experiences of the same passive, aesthetic sort, experiences that beat their way in upon the organism, flooding it as music does. These too are end experiences, ultimate rather than instrumental.

<sup>7</sup>In Chapter 17, "Stereotyping Versus True Cognition," we see that categorized perception is at best partial; it is not so much an examination of all the attributes of an object as a classification of it on the basis of those few attributes that are useful to us, relevant to our concerns, and not gratifying or need threatening.

<sup>8</sup>"The brain serves to bring about this choice: it actualizes the useful memories, it keeps in the lower strata of the consciousness those which are of no use. One could say as much for perceptual activity. The auxiliary of action, it isolates *that part of reality as a whole that interests us; it shows us the things themselves than the use we can make of them.* It classifies, it labels them beforehand; it scarcely looks at the object, it is enough for us to know to which category it belongs. But now, then, by a lucky accident, men arise whose senses or whose consciousness are less adherent to life. Nature has forgotten to *attach their faculty of perceiving to their faculty of acting.* When they look at a thing, *they see it for itself, and not for themselves. They do not perceive simply with a view to action; they perceive in order to perceive—for nothing, for the pleasure of doing so.* In regard to certain aspects of their nature, whether it be their consciousness or one of their senses, they are *detached*; and according to whether this detachment is that of a certain particular sense, or of consciousness, they are painters or sculptors, musicians or poets. It is therefore a much more direct vision of reality that we find in the different arts; and *it is because the artist is less intent on utilizing perception that he perceives a greater number of things*" (Bergson, 1944, pp. 162–163).

are by definition antithetical. This is true even for the motivated self-expression spoken of above, for this is the end product of a series of efforts to learn how not to control.

Control of style of handwriting, dancing, singing, speaking, or emotional reacting may at best be kept up for only a short time. Supervision or criticism of one's reactions cannot be continuous. Sooner or later because of fatigue, distraction, redirection, or attention control slips, and deeper, less conscious, more automatic, more characterological determinants take over (Allport, 1961). Expression is not, in the full sense, voluntary behavior. Another aspect of this contrast is the effortlessness of expression. Coping is in principle effortful. (Again, the artist is a special case.)

Some warnings are called for here. An easy mistake here is to think of spontaneity and expressiveness as good always and control of any kind as bad and undesirable. This is not so. Certainly, much of the time, expressiveness *feels* better, is more fun, more honest, effortless, and so on, than self-control, so is in this sense desirable both for the person himself and for his interpersonal relationships, as for instance Jourard (1968) has shown. And yet there are several meanings of self-control, or of inhibition, and some of them are quite desirable and healthy, even apart from what is necessary for dealing with the outside world. Control need not mean frustration or renunciation of basic need gratifications. What I would call the "Apollonizing controls" do *not* call the gratification of needs into question at all; they make them *more* rather than less enjoyable by suitable delay (as in sex), by gracefulness (as in dancing or swimming), by aestheticizing (as with food and drink), by stylizing (as in sonnets), by ceremonializing, sacralizing, dignifying, by doing something well rather than just doing it.

And then too—what has to be repeated again and again—is that healthy persons are not only expressive. They must be able to be expressive when they wish to be. They must be able to let themselves go. They must be able to drop controls, inhibitions, defenses when they deem this desirable. But equally they must have the ability to control themselves, to delay their pleasures, to be polite, to avoid hurting, to keep their mouths shut, and to rein their impulses. They must be able to be either Dionysian or Apollonian, Stoic or Epicurean, expressive or coping, controlled or uncontrolled, self-disclosing or self-concealing, able to have fun and able to give up fun, able to think of the future as well as the present. Healthy or self-actualizing persons are essentially versatile; they have lost fewer of the human capacities than the average person has. They have a larger armamentarium of responses and moves toward full humanness as a limit; that is they have *all* the human capacities.

### Affecting the Environment

Coping behavior characteristically originates as an attempt to change the world, and characteristically does so with more or less success. Expressive behavior, on the other hand, often has no effect on the environment. And where it does have such effect, it is not premeditated, willed, or purposed; it is unwitting.

As an example we may take a person in conversation. Conversation has

purpose; for example, he or she is a salesperson trying to get an order, and the conversation is consciously and avowedly brought into being for this reason. But his or her style of speaking may be unconsciously hostile or snobbish or supercilious and may cause him or her to lose the order. Thus the expressive aspects of behavior may have environmental effects, but it is to be noted that the speaker did not want these effects, did not try to be supercilious or hostile, and was not even aware of giving this impression. The environmental effects of expression, when there are any at all, are unmotivated, unpurposed, and epiphenomenal.

### Means and Ends

Coping behavior is always instrumental, always a means to a motivated end. Contrariwise, any means-end behavior (with the one exception, discussed above, of voluntarily giving up coping) must be coping behavior.

On the other hand, the various forms of expressive behavior either have nothing to do with either means or ends (e.g., style of handwriting), or else they come close to being ends-in-themselves behavior (e.g., singing, sauntering, painting, or extemporizing at the piano).<sup>5</sup>

### Conscious or Unconscious Behavior

Expression in its purest forms is unconscious, or at least not fully conscious. We are ordinarily unaware of our style of walking, standing, smiling, or laughing. It is true that we may be made aware of them by moving pictures, phonograph records, caricatures, or imitations. But such are apt to be exceptions or at least uncharacteristic. Expressive acts that are conscious—choosing our clothes, furniture, hair style—are seen as special, unusual, or intermediate cases. But coping may be and characteristically is fully conscious. When it is unconscious, this is seen as exceptional or unusual.

### EXPRESSIVE BEHAVIORS

Expression must be called relatively unmotivated and unpurposeful, in contrast with coping, which is both motivated and purposive. There are many examples of relatively unmotivated behaviors, and we shall now discuss some of them briefly. It should be observed that they are all relatively neglected areas of psychology, an excellent illustration for the student of science of the way in which a limited outlook on life creates a limited world. For the carpenter who is *only* a carpenter, the world is made of wood.

<sup>5</sup>In our overly pragmatic culture, the instrumental spirit can overtake even the end experiences: love ("It's the normal thing to do"), sport ("Good for the digestion"), ("Relaxation improves sleep"), beautiful weather ("Good for business"), reading ("I really should keep up with things"), affection ("Do you want your child to be neurotic?"), kindness ("Bread cast upon the waters . . ."), science ("National defense!"), art ("Has definitely improved American advertising"), kindness ("If you're not, they'll steal the silver").

changing the outside world not at all. All this is true for leisure as well, if it is properly defined (Pieper, 1964).

Perhaps it is appropriate to speak here of two such ultimate pleasures: (1) function pleasure and (2) the pleasure of sheer living (biopleasure, zestful experiencing). Especially can we see these in the child who repeats and repeats his newly perfected skill out of sheer delight that comes with good and skillful functioning. Dancing may also be a good example. As for the basic life pleasure, any ailing or dyspeptic or nauseated person can testify to the reality of that most ultimate biological pleasure (zestful experiencing) that is an automatic, unsought-for, unmotivated by-product of being alive and healthy.

### **Play**

Play may be either coping or expressive or both (see page 42) as is now quite clear from the literature on play therapy and play diagnosis. It seems quite probable that this general conclusion will supplant the various functional, purposive, and motivational theories of play put forward in the past. Since there is nothing to prevent us from using the coping-expressive dichotomy with animals, we may also reasonably look forward to more useful and realistic interpretations of animal play as well. All we have to do to open up this new area for research is to admit the possibility that play may be useless and unmotivated, a phenomenon of being rather than of striving, end rather than means. The same may probably be affirmed of laughter, hilarity, gaiety, having fun, joy, ecstasy, euphoria, and so on.

### **Intellectual Expression**

Intellectual expression—ideology, philosophy, theology, cognition, and so on—is another area that has resisted the tools of official psychology. We think this is partly so because thinking in general has been automatically regarded since Darwin and Dewey as problem solving, that is, as functional and as motivated. In the good life lived by the healthy person, thinking, like perceiving, may be spontaneous and passive reception or production, an unmotivated, effortless, happy expression of the nature and existence of the organism, a *letting* things happen rather than making them happen, as much an example of being as the perfume of a flower or the apples on a tree.