UC Irvine
UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title
Positive psychology: East and West

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3bb4f89t

Journal
American Psychologist, 56

Author
Walsh, RN

Publication Date
2001

Copyright Information

Peer reviewed

thors, no doubt. Their photos, however, seemed to offer only one kind of account: that which belongs to the dominant cultural group in the United States.

Where were all the authors who could reflect the manifold variety of the United States? Where in this issue were the writers who speak about the histories, courage, challenges, and success of people of color? The contributing authors deconstructed some of the major dominant theories on psychology, but little was offered toward deconstructing how, in hosting such a relevant theme, the major journal in the field simply kept the perspectives of psychologists of color silenced and invisible. The reader may have concluded that overcoming, struggling with, surviving, and thriving in adversity is a subject that belongs to White American authors and subjects.

Addressing issues of social justice from the perspective of a positive psychology cannot be replaced by a study about bio-cultural inheritance (Massimini & Delle Fave, January 2000) or a cross-cultural study that compares attributions of well-being by citizens from a selected group of countries (Diener, January 2000). Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) stated that they wanted to be "comprehensive without being redundant" (p. 8), but the results demonstrated the lack of inclusion that people of color so often experience when psychologists address themes that they construe as significant. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi suggested that the articles were intended to be "broad overviews with an eye turned to cross-disciplinary links and practical significance" (p. 9). Is it possible that there are no seasoned scholars of color or perspectives that use a positive psychology framework to speak about nondominant groups in the United States, not only within psychology but also across disciplines? A blind eye that continues to render large segments of society invisible cannot be compensated for by one informed eye turned only toward individuals and groups in mainstream psychology.

REFERENCES

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist, 55,* 34–43.
Massimini, F., & Delle Fave, A. (2000). Individual development in a bio-cultural perspective. *American Psychologist, 55,* 24–33.
Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55,* 5–14.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Gonzalo Bacigalupe, University of Massachusetts Boston, Graduate College of Education, Boston MA 02125-3393. Electronic mail may be sent to gonzalo.bacigalupe@umb.edu.

Positive Psychology: East and West

Roger Walsh
University of California, Irvine

I don't think I have ever been as excited by an issue of the *American Psychologist* as I was by the January 2000 issue on positive psychology edited by Martin E. P. Seligman and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. At last the leaders of the American Psychological Association are focusing on the positive rather than only the pathological and are discussing topics such as happiness, well-being, and creativity. I feel happier already, and I applaud their efforts.

At the same time, I feel compelled to point to an unfortunate gap: The issue is ethnocentric and lacks attention to, or even mention of, non-Western psychologies and therapies, as well as the field of transpersonal psychology, which has worked to integrate Western and non-Western approaches. This is especially unfortunate because it is now apparent that certain Asian psychologies are not only sophisticated systems with effective techniques—meditation and yoga being the best known—but also focus specifically on positive well-being and exceptional development.

For example, the Indian psychologies of Buddhism and yoga lack information on the nature and treatment of major psychopathology. However, they contain a wealth of information on exceptional psychological health, postconventional transpersonal development, exceptional abilities, and the methods for cultivating them (Tart, 1992; Walsh, 2000). A large body of research—several hundred studies on meditation alone—suggests that meditation and yoga have effects ranging across psychology, physiology, and biochemistry and can enhance both psychological and physical health, sometimes to exceptional degrees.

In the psychological arena, personality, performance, and perception may be enhanced. Intriguing findings include evidence for enhanced empathy, perceptual sensitivity, creativity, lucid dreaming, marital satisfaction, and a positive sense of self-control. Studies of transcendental meditation suggest that it can foster maturation as measured by scales of moral, ego, and cognitive development, intelligence, academic achievement, self-actualization, and states of consciousness (Alexander, Rainforth, & Gelderloos, 1991; Murphy & Donovan, 1997; Walsh & Vaughan, 1993; West, 1987). A variety of specific meditations exists to cultivate exceptional capacities such as concentration, compassion, and altruism, although little experimental work has been done on these (Walsh, 1999). Researchers of positive psychology have a theoretical and practical gold mine of more than 2,000 years of exploration of positive psychology on which to draw.

The field of transpersonal psychology draws on this data and has developed theories that integrate Asian ideas with Western concepts and research. As such, it has begun to develop the outlines of a global integral psychology, best exemplified in the writings of Ken Wilber. A valuable overview of his ideas can be found in Wilber (1996), and a denser survey can be found in Wilber (2000) or in his collected works.

In drawing attention to the omission of Asian perspectives and the work on them already done by transpersonal psychologists, I do not wish in any way to detract from the superb work done by contributors to the *American Psychologist* on positive psychology. I wish only to urge Western psychologists to look beyond Western psychology and culture to incorporate the best of all psychologies and cultures.

REFERENCES

Alexander, C., Rainforth, M., & Gelderloos, P. (1991). Transcendental meditation, self-actualization and psychological health: A conceptual overview and statistical meta-analysis. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 6,* 189–247.
Murphy, M., & Donovan, S. (1997). *The physical and psychological effects of meditation* (2nd ed.). Sausalito, CA: Institute of Noetic Sciences.
Tart, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Transpersonal psychologies* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins
Walsh, R. (1999). *Essential spirituality: The seven central practices.* New York: Wiley.
Walsh, R. (2000). Asian therapies. In R. Corsini & D. Wedding (Eds.), *Current psychotherapies* (6th ed., pp.407–444). Itasca, IL: Peacock.
Walsh, R., & Vaughan, F. (Eds.). (1993). *Paths beyond ego: The transpersonal vision.* New York: Tarcher/Putnam.
West, M. (Ed.). (1987). *The psychology of meditation.* Oxford, England: Clarenden Press.
Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything.* Boston: Shambhala.
Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral psychology.* Boston: Shambhala.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Roger Walsh, Depart-

ment of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-1675.

The Values Problem in Subjective Well-Being

William C. Compton
Middle Tennessee State University

The *American Psychologist* should be applauded for its January 2000 special issue on happiness. This area is an avenue for research and scholarship that deserves increased attention. The research in this area, however, is also complicated by a unique problem that was not sufficiently addressed in the special issue.

The problem is that any definition of well-being, happiness, or the good life is intricately tied to values. Over 40 years ago, M. Brewster Smith (1959) concluded that it is not possible to create a value-free definition of psychological well-being. The basic problem is that although human beings may have certain biologically given emotional responses (Plutchik, 1984), it is the psychological interpretation of those physiological reactions that provides meaning (Schachter & Singer, 1962). Messages about how people should create meaning, a sense of reality, and a sense of self are socially given and vary over time, within societies, and among cultures (Baumeister, 1987; Berger & Luckman, 1967; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997). All of these factors contribute to decisions about what kinds of experiences people should desire, as well as what kinds of relationships with other human beings may be ignored without consequence.

Over 2,500 years ago, Aristotle defined the good life as *eudaemonia*. This is not simply fulfilling one's potentials or having what is desirable. Rather, it is having and desiring that which one *should* desire. The explicit appeal to values was necessary to avoid that which is pleasurable or enjoyable but is ultimately destructive to the individual and the society. That is, for Aristotle, descriptions of the good are always teleological. They should point people toward those goals in life that are deemed the best, that illustrate the highest potential of the species, or that instill nobility and honor on the person. The problem for a psychological science of well-being is that science must exclude values in the search for presumed universal and ahistorical laws of human behavior.

The dangers of eliminating the influence of values from theories of well-being can be illustrated with an example. Evidence indicates that officers at Nazi concentration camps would probably score quite high on current measures of happiness and satisfaction with life. That is, they thought highly of themselves, felt in control of their lives, enjoyed evening concerts of Mozart with their friends, and believed they were involved in an important cause that gave their life meaning and purpose. Of course, their well-being was only possible by systematically ignoring the humanity of those they mercilessly sentenced to death.

Therefore, the recent special issue presents a wonderful first attempt at exploring the potentials for research in positive psychology. However, the fact that conceptualizations of well-being are inexorably tied to values presents psychology with a fascinating challenge. This unavoidable issue will require a different approach to research, one that will most likely not be entirely empirical. Historical, hermeneutic, phenomenological, and other modes of inquiry must inevitably be added to the research mix if this research area is to remain both valid and relevant to real-life struggles toward happiness.

REFERENCES

Baumeister, R. (1987). How the self became a problem: A psychological review of the historical research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 163–176.

Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality.* New York: Anchor Books.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunkit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 1245–1267.

Plutchik, R. (1984). Emotions: A general psychoevolutionary theory. In K. R. Scherer & P. Ekman (Eds.), *Approaches to emotion* (pp. 197–219). Hillsdale, NJ: Guilford Press.

Schachter, S., & Singer, J. E. (1962). Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological Review, 69,* 379–399.

Smith, M. B. (1959). Research strategies toward a conception of positive mental health. *American Psychologist, 14,* 673–681.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to William C. Compton, Department of Psychology, Box 87, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN 37132. Electronic mail may be sent to wcompton@mtsu.edu.

Prior Positive Psychologists Proposed Personality and Spiritual Growth

Charles L. McLafferty, Jr.,
and James D. Kiryło
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (January 2000) and the other authors in the January 2000 special issue of the *American Psychologist* should be applauded for opening a dialogue about a psychology of human health and well-being, one encompassing concepts such as hope, love, courage, optimism, faith, and flow. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi asserted that "humanistic psychology did not attract much of an empirical base . . . and encouraged a self-centeredness that played down concerns for a collective well-being" (p. 7). In this comment, I outline an overarching theoretical framework for a positive psychology, supported by psychoanalytic, existential, humanistic, and transpersonal theories. Jung, Frankl, Maslow, and Assagioli emphasized wholeness and wellness without encouraging narcissism, though admittedly with little empirical support. Each of these theorists implicitly or explicitly acknowledged *two* overlapping processes of growth: the emergence of personality and the alignment of that personality with a transcendent (spiritual) center.

For Jung (1933), every patient over 35 years old "fell ill because he had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook" (p. 229). He addressed narcissism when he stated, "man is never helped in his suffering by what he thinks for himself, but only by revelations of a wisdom greater than his own" (Jung, 1933, pp. 240–241). Jung acknowledged both processes of growth when he noted that it is in personality unfoldment (individuation) that a person develops a transcendent function that gives one the ability to move beyond the self-centered ego.

Abraham Maslow (1970) defined self-actualizing persons as being self-determined, self-organized, and self-directed. Their behavior is marked by a naturalness and spontaneity that is congruent with the "positive personality" of Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000, p. 8). Maslow (1971) noted two processes in his two types of self-actualizing people, nontranscenders and transcenders. Whereas nontranscenders are high achievers, transcenders are more spiritual, more ego transcendent, and have a greater number of