

6

Script Theory

Silvan S. Tomkins

If personology is to fulfill the aspirations of Murray's *Explorations in Personality*, it must match the depth and scope of that pioneering vision. It must ground personality in an evolutionary biological base that provides the foundations for a model of the human being at a general psychological level, which is in turn embedded in a historical, sociocultural, and civilizational matrix. The human being is born a biological entity, whose destiny it is to die a socialized, acculturated advocate or adversary of a civilization at a particular historical moment. If personology is to become a science for all seasons it must assume the daunting burden of analyzing and resynthesizing the particular and the abstract, the historic and the ahistoric, the micro components and the macro fields and contexts, origins and terminals, continuities and discontinuities, rapid changes and slow changes, stable equilibria and unstable equilibria. We must study personality not only the long way developmentally, but also the deep way biologically and the broad way historically (Tomkins, 1979, 1981a, b). I offer script theory as a first approximation in such a quest.

OVERVIEW OF SCRIPT THEORY

Script theory, as a theory of personality, is built upon a particular theory of the innately endowed nature of the human being (Tomkins, 1962, 1963a, b, 1979). Script theory assumes that the basic unit of analysis for understanding

Inasmuch as I object equally to gender bias and to gender blindness, but even more to the impersonal, neutered, and abstract circumlocution, I have adopted the less than optimal device of alternating attribution of gender in succeeding sections of this chapter.

persons, as distinguished from human beings, is the scene and the relationships between scenes, as ordered by sets of rules I have defined as scripts.

Some scripts are innate, but most are innate and learned. The learned scripts originate in innate scripts but characteristically radically transform the simpler, innate scripts.

The earliest (neonatal) observed script is the birth distress cry and flailing arms and limbs, in response either to the excessive stimulation of change of scene or to the slap on the behind. The second observed innate script is the excitement-driven visual tracking of the utterly novel face of the mother. Much later to be observed is the enjoyment-driven scene of relaxation of the face (in a smile) and of the body, in correlated reduction in tonus, to the reappearance of that new face, suddenly recognized as the same, familiar face. Next to be observed are the rage scripts driven by excessive stimulation, e.g., from hunger, which are similar to the distress scripts except that they are more intense in both stimulus and in response. We are so accustomed to regard motivation as goal-directed responsiveness that it is difficult to regard the crying, flailing, just-born neonate either as motivated or as emitting rule-governed responses. I describe these as innate scripts, because they connect stimuli and responses by imprinting *both* with the same abstract analogic quality and thus amplify both, as well as amplify, connect, and make similar to each other.

The innate affect mechanisms structurally embody rules for differential resonance to every major *abstract* profile of neural firing in terms of its *level* of change or its *rate* of change. Thus, we inherit a variety of ways of caring about every major contingency within the internal environment that is correlated by transmission with the external environment. It is a change-amplifying mechanism and a correlating mechanism, imprinting, as it does, both its own activator (making it more-so) and *whatever* response is recruited or being executed at that time. So, the angering stimulus is guaranteed an enraged response equal in amplification to its origin. That response is originally not necessarily either instrumental or goal-directed; nor is it necessarily motor; but whether that response is motor or cognitive, it is amplified, enhanced, and *made* more analogous to its stimulus, as the stimulus is made more similar to the response it evokes as amplified by the same affect. So, an angering stimulus is also made a "hittable" stimulus.

We are richly endowed with a number of variously scripted alternative scenes that we do not have to learn, but from which we continue to learn. It is extraordinarily improbable that *any* human being will emerge from his/her earliest years innocent of having enacted *exciting scenes*, responded to rapidly and with increased tonus; *enjoyment scenes*, responded to with equally rapid but relaxed responses, with decreased tonus; *surprise scenes*, responded to with the most rapid increase of startle; *terrifying scenes*, responded to with very rapid increased tonus in escape or avoidance; *distress-*

ing scenes, responded to with increased level of tonus; *enraging scenes*, with an even more increased level of tonus; *disgusting scenes*, responded to with literal or analogous distaste responses and expulsion; *dismelling scenes*, responded to with literal or analogous removing the nose from the offending bad-smelling source; and finally, *shaming (and/or guilt-inducing) scenes*, responded to with partial and temporary reduction in either the increase or decrease in the rate of response (i.e. in interrupted excitement or enjoyment).

But to respond with excitement to "something happening quickly" with "some equally quick response" may strike the reader as at once too vague or general or abstract or incomplete to be properly defined as a script, or a set of rules for the interpretation and response to sets of scenes. One wonders what precisely it *is* that is so exciting and precisely *how* one does respond to that specific sense of excitement. Despite the speed of exciting stimuli and the speed of exciting responses, surely there is much more going on in different kinds of exciting scenes that is *not* innately scripted. This is of course true, but also irrelevant. Scripts may vary radically in their completeness of specification of rules or in their particularity or abstractness of rules, as well as in an indefinitely large number of other possible distinctive features of rules for dealing with scenes. All scripts are incomplete in varying degrees and depend on auxiliary information to particularize the script. What is distinctive about innate scripts is not the incompleteness and abstractness of their rules, but rather the imposed identity and similarity of their strict *correlation* between stimulus and response. Not even a reflex has *this* property. This invariance has been masked by the variable learned particularities in which these scripts are co-assembled and embedded.

But if it is improbable that anyone will not have enacted any of the innate scripts—amplifying scene and response equally and in kind—it is equally improbable that anyone will have experienced them alike either in their frequency or in all their particularity. The innate scripts are enacted momentarily in specific scenes. Learned scripts have been generated to deal with *sets* of scenes. This entails a difference I have defined as that between *amplification* and *magnification*. A single affect is scripted innately to amplify its own activator in a single momentary scene. But when amplified scenes are *co-assembled*, as repeated, the resulting responses to such a set represent magnification, or amplification, of the already separately amplified scenes. Now it is the *set* of such co-assembled scenes that is then amplified by fresh affect, and which I am defining as magnification, in contrast to the simpler script involved in any innate amplification of the single scene. Co-assembly of scenes need not be limited to either repeated scenes or to repeated scenes of the same affect, and the affect to co-assembled scenes need not be identical with the affect of the co-assembled scenes. Further, the co-assembled scenes include scenes projected as possibilities in the future, with or without co-

assembly of past scenes, repeated or sharply contrasted in quality. What is essential for magnification is the *ordering* of sets of scenes by rules for their interpretation, or evaluation, or production, or prediction, or their control, so that these scenes *and* their rules are themselves amplified by affect.

Consider one of the earliest human scenes, the hungry infant in the arms of her mother. As a human being, she carries as standard equipment the rooting reflex—by which she turns her head from side to side in front of the breast—and the sucking reflex—by which she manages to get the milk from her mother's breast once her lips have found and locked onto her nipple. By any conception, this is a good scene. She appears to herself, as to her mother, to be utterly competent (and that without even trying), to make the world her oyster, to reduce and appease her hunger, and at the same time to reap the rewards of drive satisfaction. As a bonus, this reward is further amplified by bursts of the positive affects of excitement followed by the positive affect of enjoyment at satiety.

Is there any reason to expect trouble in such a paradise? Everything is in the best imaginable working order. And yet the newborn infant is *not* fundamentally happy with this state of affairs. Her behavior, soon after birth, seems to tell us, "I'd rather do it myself! I may not be able to do it as well as those reflexes do it, but I might be able to do it better, and I'm going to try." The experiments of Bruner (1968) have shown that very early on, the infant will replace the reflex sucking by beginning to suck voluntarily, and this is discriminably different from reflex sucking. If she succeeds, she will continue. If it doesn't work too well, she falls back on reflex sucking. This is a prime example of what I have called *autosimulation* or imitation of one's own reflexes. The same phenomenon occurs with the orienting reflex and the several supporting ocular motor reflexes. Although the eye is innately equipped to track any moving stimulus in a reflex way, I have observed apparently voluntary moving of the head and neck very early on to bring visual tracking under voluntary control.

Psychological magnification begins, then, in earliest infancy when the infant imagines, via co-assembly, a possible improvement in what is already a rewarding scene, attempts to do what may be necessary to bring it about, and so produces and connects a set of scenes that continue to reward her with food and its excitement and enjoyment and also with the excitement and enjoyment of remaking the world closer to the heart's desire. She is doing what she will continue to try to do all her life—to command the scenes she wishes to play. Like Charlie Chaplin, she will try to write, direct, produce, criticize, and promote the scenes in which she casts herself as hero.

Not all amplified scenes are magnified. I have defined transients as scenes that occur with varying degrees of amplification, but zero or minimal magnification. Thus, the sound of a passing automobile blowing its horn loudly and unexpectedly may startle but never again enter into the plot of a life. The number of transients in the course of an individual's lifetime might

be very large. As craft union scientists, we have had minimal interest in the density of transients. The individual who suffers an excessive density of unconnected transients may however suffer from the experience of lacking connectedness and/or magnification in her life.

The major difference between how an individual governs herself in an isolated scene without script, and with a script, is that in the former case she may experiment with alternative responses to the scene until she is either more satisfied or less dissatisfied than with the scene at its beginning. But such an amplified scene may have no consequences for her future, in fact or in intention. It is only when a set of such scenes is co-assembled, thought about, and used as a base for designing strategies and/or tactics for increasing or decreasing and/or for changing the responses to that family of scenes that we have a script and its magnification. The script is itself subject to plurideterminate experimentation and confirmation or disconfirmation or change, but it is the script itself that is increasingly at issue rather than any individual scene.

I define magnification as the advantaged ratio of the simplicity of ordering information to the power of ordered information times its affect density:

$$\text{Magnification Advantage} = (\text{Power of Ordered Information} \times \text{Affect Density}) / \text{Simplicity of Ordering Information}$$

The concept of magnification advantage is the product of information advantage and affect density (intensity \times duration \times frequency). Information advantage as I am defining it is that part of the above formula minus the affect. It is fashioned after the concept of mechanical advantage in which the lever enables a small force to move a larger force or, as with a valve, by which small energy forces are used to control a flow of much larger forces, as in a water distribution system. Informational advantage is an analogue. Any highly developed theory possesses great informational advantage, being able to account for much with little via the ratio of a small number of simple assumptions to a much larger number of phenomena described and explained that constitutes its power. The helix possesses very great informational advantage capable as it is of vast expansion properties of guidance and control.

But information advantage is not identical with magnification. Consider the difference between the information advantage of what I have described as the valley of perceptual skill, the ability of an individual to "recognize" the presence of a familiar face at varying distances or directions, with varying alternative small samples of the whole. To see the chin, or the nose, or the forehead, or any combination is quite enough to enable skilled expansion of these bits of information so that one "knows" who the other is. It is an "as if" information with minimal (but accurate) awareness *and* minimal affect. All habitual skills operate via *compressed* information with minimal ratio of conscious reports to messages and with minimal affect. Thus, one may cross a

busy intersection "as if" afraid, looking up and down, for possible danger from passing automobiles, but characteristically without *any* fear, and with minimal awareness of scanning. Contrast the informational advantage of a husband and wife "recognizing" the face of the other with the recognition of the same face in the midst of their initial love affair. When the lover detects the face of the beloved as a figure in a sea of other faces as ground, there is no less informational advantage involved in that recognition of the newly familiar face, but there is a radical magnification of consciousness and affect that together with all the significances attributed to the other make it an unforgettable moment.

In our proposed ratio for script magnification, the denominator represents the compressed (smaller) number of rules for *ordering* scenes, whereas the numerator represents the expanded (much larger) number of scenes, both from the past and into the indefinite future, which are *ordered* by the smaller number of compressed rules. In the numerator, there are represented both the scenes that gave rise to the necessity for the script as well as all the scenes that are generated as responses to deal with the initial co-assembly of scenes, either to guarantee the continuation of good scenes, their improvement, or the decontamination of bad scenes, or the avoidance of threatening scenes. The compressed smaller number of rules guide responses that, in turn, recruit amplifying affect as well as samples of the family of scenes either sought, interpreted, evaluated, produced, and expanded.

Because there is a *mixture* of informational advantage and affect-driven amplification, the individual is characteristically much less conscious of the compressed rules than of their expansion scenes, just as one is less aware of one's grammar than of the sentences one utters. Although the compression of rule information in the denominator always involves information reduction and simplification, there may be varying quantities of information in the number of co-assembled scenes that gave rise to the scripted responses in scenes yet to be played, as well as varying intensities, durations, and frequencies of affect assigned to these scenes and to the scripted response scenes. Thus, a low degree of magnification script may involve a small number of scenes to be responded to by a small number of scripted scenes with moderate, relatively brief, affect. In contrast, a high degree of magnification script may involve a large number of scenes to be responded to by a large number of scripted scenes with intense and enduring affect. The magnification *advantage* ratio of either script might nonetheless be low or high, depending on the ratio of ordering rules to rules ordered.

Further, any of the values in such equations are susceptible to change. Thus, in the midst of a heart attack (in a case reported to me by an English physician about himself), there was a rapid review of many scenes of his past life, their relationship to the present and future, a deep awareness that his life could never again be quite the same, and gradually a return to the status quo

in which that whole series of reevaluations became attenuated and eventually segregated to exert diminishing instructions on how he conducted his life. Again, a central much magnified script involving someone of vital importance may be first magnified to the utmost via death and mourning and by that very process be ultimately attenuated, producing a series of habitually skilled reminiscences that eventually become segregated and less and less retrieved. Mourning thus retraces in reverse the love affair and is a second edition of it, similar in some ways to the mini-version of these sequences in jealousy, when a long quiescent valley of perceptual skill may be ignited by an unexpected rival.

The most magnified scripts require minimal reminders that the present is vitally connected to much of our past life and to our future and that we must attend with urgency to continually act in such a way that the totality will be as we very much wish it to be and not as we fear it might be. Between such a script and scripts I have labeled "doable" (in which one may pay one's bills as a moratorium in the midst of a task that is critical but, for the time being, "undoable" by any conceivable path) are a large number of scripts of every degree of magnification and type, which we will presently examine in more detail.

GENERAL FEATURES OF SCRIPTS

Before examining specific scripts I will now present some of the general features of all scripts:

1. Scripts are *sets of ordering rules* for the interpretation, evaluation, prediction, production or control of scenes.
2. They are *selective* in the number and types of scenes which they order.
3. They are *incomplete* rules even within the scenes they attempt to order.
4. They are in varying degrees *accurate* and *inaccurate* in their interpretation, evaluation, prediction, control, or production.
5. Because of their selectivity, incompleteness, and inaccuracy, they are *continually reordered* and changing, at varying rates, depending on their type and the type and magnitude of disconfirmation.
6. The coexistence of different competing scripts requires the formation of *interscript*, scripts.
7. Most scripts are *more self-validating than self-fulfilling*. Thus, a mourning script validates the importance of the lost relationship, but in the end frees the individual from that relationship. A nuclear script that attempts to reduce shame validates the self as appropriately shame-worthy more than it succeeds in freeing the individual of his burden. A commitment script validates the importance and necessity of the struggle, but the achievement of the commitment may erode it or require its redefinition to continue. A

hoarding script validates the danger of insufficiency more than it guarantees against its possibility. A power script validates the danger of powerlessness more than it guarantees the adequacy and perpetuation of power. A purity script validates the impurity of the individual more than it guarantees his purity.

8. The incompleteness of scripts necessarily requires *auxiliary* augmentation. This may be gained via *media mechanisms* (e.g., vision), which provide relevant contemporary information that cannot be entirely written into any script except in a general way. Even the simplest habitual skilled scripts require them; e.g., shaving requires a mirror; driving a car requires constant monitoring no matter how skilled the driver. One cannot begin to use any script without much information that cannot be scripted in advance. Further, one normally requires auxiliary media information gained by use of the arms and legs to reach further information as well as to alter perspectives. Again one requires *speech* and/or *written* language as auxiliary sources of information, past as well as present. These are also media mechanisms, but culturally inherited media. Next one requires as auxiliaries, compressed information in the form of *theories*, lay and professional, about causal relationships, signs or omens, intentions, and consequences. Next, one requires the memorially supported *plot*, which is a sequentially organized series of scenes of the life one has led and the lives others have led. Next, one requires *maps*, which are spatio-temporal schematics that enable the plots to be handled more economically. We possess maps of varying degrees of fineness of texture, normally generated by their usefulness for different scripts. The difference between a duffer and professional tennis player is reflected not only in the differences between their families of tennis scripts, but also in the detail of the maps of their opponent's past performances. Finally, one script may use another *script as auxiliary*. Thus, Calvinism used the entrepreneurial activity of the economic competition script to increase the probability of grace in warding off the hell fires of their vivid version of the life hereafter.

9. Scripts contain *variables as alternatives*. Variables are those rules that as alternatives depend on auxiliary information to further specify. A script, thus may, for example, differentiate strategy and tactics, conditional upon variable auxiliary information. Thus, a child may learn to script a relationship with a parent in which he extorts as much as is possible just within the limits of the patience and power of the indulgent but irascible other. The auxiliary information need, however, not be limited to external information. Thus, an otherwise deeply committed individual may nonetheless exempt himself from his major concern should he become ill or seriously disturbed or depressed. Very few scripts are conceived as completely unconditional, since they are designed to deal with variable selected features of selected scenes. When unanticipated conditions are encountered, the individual has the option of further adding to the script "not when I'm sick" or "no matter what I

must keep at it." Indeed, as we shall presently see, it is just such encounters and their absorption that are critical in the deepening of a commitment script.

10. Scripts have the property of *modularity*. They are variously combinable, recombining, and decomposable. The separate scripts may be aggregated and *fused*, as when a career choice combines scripts that enable an individual to explore nature, to be alone, and to express himself through writing, as in the case of Eugene O'Neill who chose to live at the ocean's edge in solitude as he wrote his plays. Compare such a set of component subscrip- tions with that of a lumberjack who enjoys nature, but in the company of others and also in exercising his large muscles. Contrast both with an archaeologist who is enchanted with the rediscovery of the past, with others, in very special remote nature sites. Not only is each component of a single script endlessly combinable and recombining, but so are scripts themselves, as when addictive scripts for cigarettes, eating, and drinking are combined in a bottoming-out nuclear script.

Scripts may also be *partitioned*, as in the classic neurotic split libido and in the characteristically French separation of family and mistress, one cherished for enjoyment and continuity, the other for novelty and excitement.

If scripts are combinations of modular components, we will now describe some of the major modular components of any script. Not all scripts include all kinds of component rules, although many different kinds of scripts may include the same distinctive kinds of component rules, but with different particular values, as two sentences might include similar and different letters or words. Following is a sample of modular rule components.

(a) Specifications of quantities, ratios, and directionality of positive and negative affects. How much positive and how much negative affect is anticipated and enacted and in what ratio? How much are scripted scenes rewarding and punishing, how optimistic and how pessimistic are expectations, and in what ratio and in what sequential direction?

(b) Specification of quantities, ratios, and directionality of specific positive and negative affects. For example, is excitement greater than enjoyment? Does distress lead to anger?

(c) Specification of different loci of affect magnification. Is there excitement about time, place, people, psychological functions (such as thinking, feeling, perceiving, imagining, remembering, speaking, acting), events, props, specific settings (such as work, family, church, army, school), near or remote settings?

(d) Specifications of affect salience. Is there a quest for pure excitement as such or for excitement as a *scene derivative*, e.g., to hear an exciting symphony, or for excitement as a *scene system derivative*, e.g., on the whole an exciting way of life?

(e) Specifications of relations between origin-source-affect-response-target in families of script sequences. Which parts of a sequence in a script are

defined as dependent, which as independent, which as interdependent? Thus, if anger is defined as independent, then neither its source (e.g., the anger of another) nor the origin of that (a careless remark by the self) will influence the individuals' aggressive response, which is defined as dependent. Such an individual will warn others not to make him angry, because he is scripted to strike out in aggressive response to his own anger. In contrast if it is the anger of the other as source that is scripted as independent then one's own response might be scripted as dependent and conciliatory in aim, whether or not one was angry, if the script had been formed in response to overwhelming anger and aggression brought to bear upon an intimidated child. In socialization that was more democratic, more interdependence and systematic tradeoffs might eventually be scripted in mutually angering scenes.

(f) Specifications of different strategies of relating risks, costs, and benefits such that they are either minimized/maximized, optimized, or satisfied. In the first case, one strives for the greatest benefits and least costs at least risks. In the second case, one strives for the optimal benefits and costs at a moderate level of risk. In the final case, one strives for modest benefits with modest costs and modest risks.

(g) Specifications of clarity of distance and direction of scripted responses. In the monistic script, there may be complete clarity about what must be done or varying degrees of uncertainty about directionality and distance of how to proceed. In the dualistic script, there is conflict in distance and direction such that approach in one direction increases the distance from the other wish. In the pluralistic turbulent script, there is ambiguity and multiple conflicts of distances and directions, as, e.g., in the identity problem of plural "selves," or in schizophrenic confusional states.

(h) Specification of interscript relations. Scripts are defined as much by their explicit relations to other scripts as by their rules for ordering their own family of scenes. Is the script entirely orthogonal, e.g., a hobby, in that no other script is presumed to have any jurisdiction over these scenes? Is it in a hierarchical relationship of priority over some scripts and subordination to other scripts, e.g., in family and work scripts? Is it mutually supportive and supported by other scripts, e.g., so that one works to support a family and the family works together in a farm or business?

These components of scripts are a sample of some of the major modules that form scripts, but they are necessarily as incomplete as would be any attempt to exhaustively enumerate all possible words, phrases, and sentences in a language, or for that matter all elementary molecules, atoms, and elementary particles in physics and chemistry. Psychological reality is inherently more complex and, therefore, more modular than either the physical or biological reality in which it is nested. According to the quantum principle in physics, there exists a threshold of excitation for any dynamical system, whose threshold becomes higher as the dimensions of the system

decrease, thus accounting for the apparent independence of the laws of atomic nuclear and subnuclear particle physics. Complexity arises from any increase in dimensionality, which represents an increase in independent variability within and between components of a complex system. Any script modular component therefore coexists with more elementary modular components and with more complex contextual modular components in ever changing coassemblies.

The consequences of such complexity for understanding and describing the scripts within any single personality or between personalities, or between a single personality at different developmental phases, or under variations in inner or outer environmental conditions are therefore both daunting and inherently capable of progress but without determinable limit, what Kant called a *Grenzbegriff*, a limiting concept.

Any script theoretical description is *inherently* too abstract or too particular, too analytic or too contextual to finally converge on the reality of our concern, but it is *also* capable of approaching closer and closer to convergence on that reality or going off in a less promising direction and to be so demonstrated. We can ask for no more, and script theory will offer no more guarantees against limited imagination and blatant error than will any other type of personality theory. Its structure would, however, protect us against both overevaluation and underevaluation of the validity and power of our constructs. It would render moot many of the classic concerns of personality theory, the reality of traits, of interactionism, of cognitive versus perceptual versus behavioral versus affective versus drive imperialisms, of historic versus ahistoric controversies, of analytic versus contextual priorities. It is not that these are unimportant issues but rather that they must be incorporated into script models and integrated rather than posed as either/or polarities or as eclecticism.

Thus, to describe a personality in terms of the modular component of the ratio of positive to negative affect is neither entirely appropriate nor inappropriate. *Some* personalities *are* very optimistic or very pessimistic in general, but some are neither, because these rules are dependent on too many other rules themselves dependent on and responsive to auxiliary information that is not itself scripted, as in the case of unpredictable good or bad luck, gratuities, or accidents. Or because the variance of good or bad outcomes is controlled by scripted partitioning, such that if he is optimistic only if alone or with others; or with elders or with peers; or with large groups or with small groups; or in intimate or distant interaction; or with same or with opposite sex; or with angry scenes or with distressing scenes; or in the past or in the present or in the projected future, in his home town or away; or when he is reading or when he is speaking; or when he is perceiving or when he is acting, or when he is imagining; or when he is with his family or at school, or at business, or in the army; when he is reaching for the moon or

for more reachable goals or for very modest goals; when he is single-mindedly pursuing one goal, or two or many; when he is in quest of pure affect, e.g., "kicks" or when he is pursuing an exciting person or idea, or when he is balancing several scripts; or focused on one particular script at a time, in hot pursuit of a scene, or the morning after when the disregarded weight of the rest of his scripts reasserts itself. Any modular rule has the properties of a word or phrase in a sentence.

It may be as complete as in the one word sentence "Stop," but more often its meaning will depend on the other modules with which it is variously co-assembled. As any particular modular component *becomes* magnified, its consequences for other modular components as dependent and less magnified are fateful and constitute the central features of the personality. *What* rules *are* so consequential, is the major question for any theory of personality. It is the advantage of script theory to provide the framework for the pursuit of such rules and to caution against the perennial vulnerability to prematurity of closure of these questions.

DIFFERENTIAL MAGNIFICATION OF RATIO OF POSITIVE-NEGATIVE AFFECT

I will now examine some of the consequences of the differential magnification of the modular component of the quantity, ratio, and directionality of positive and negative affect *for* the differential magnification of other modular components. What happens when we *fix* this quantity, this ratio, at particular values of extreme or intermediate density and ratio of positive to negative affects?

First, let us briefly address the question of how varying values of the density and ratio of positive to negative affect may be fixed. There is no royal road to psychological affluence or poverty, although there are many alternative roads. Neither the biological inheritance of a vigorous healthy, agile, beautiful, intelligent nervous system and body will guarantee a happy life, nor their opposite a miserable life. Neither the psychosociocultural inheritances or achievements of individual and national economic wealth, political status and privilege, social privileged status, knowledge and literacy, social stability and tolerable rates of change, openness of opportunity for age, gender, and class, or rewarding socialization via optimal mutuality, modeling, and/or mirroring will guarantee an optimal balance of positive over negative affect, nor will their opposites guarantee the reverse ratio.

One must however inherit and achieve *some* gratuities in sufficient quantities to attain a critical mass for a good and rewarding or bad and punishing life, or for some intermediate mixture thereof. Note that we have contrasted a good life and rewarding life with a bad life and a punishing life. This is

because of the variable interdependence of judgments of evaluation and effectiveness (by the self and by others) and the experienced ratio of the density of positive and negative affect. If one has enjoyed one's life it is more probable that one (and others) will also judge that it has been good, effective, and fulfilling. But nothing is more common than the judgment and evaluation of a life as good and effective but which failed to yield the expected and believed deserved rewards of excitement and enjoyment. Similarly if one has suffered excessively, one is likely to judge one's life ineffective and bad, but one may judge one's life to have been relatively ineffective and bad but not to have suffered negative affect in equal amount. Hence suicide among the "affluent" and joy among the "impoverished" is by no means rare, whether that affluence be measured in economic, political, social, psychological, or biological terms.

Not only must there be an optimal *set* of inheritances and achievements of affluence of many but not all kinds, but there must be an optimal interdependence between "causes" and "effects" of affluence or of poverty. The rich must learn to *become* and *remain* richer, as the poor must learn the other skills. This is a special case of what I have called plurideterminacy, that the effects of any cause are indeterminate until they are continually validated by further magnification or attenuated. Any gratuity must be built upon to reward in the long run; any threat must be elaborated by further action to become traumatic. Thus, a mugging may be shrugged off as a transient or built upon as a way of life if one elects to hire a bodyguard. Thus, some of the major kinds of modular script components, e.g., the clarity of distance and direction, the quantity strategies of optimizing versus satisficing versus mini-maximizing are at once criteria of positive and negative scripts as well as their causes and supports. When, however, the density of the ratio of positive to negative affect reaches a critical level, then it can become a relatively *stable equilibrium*, both self-validating and self-fulfilling. At that point the possibility of radical change, though always present, becomes a diminishing probability requiring ever more densely magnified countervailing forces of positive or negative affect.

Let us now briefly examine the consequences of affluence over poverty for a sample of the major varieties of scripts.

All human beings require and generate scripts of *orientation* consisting of abstract spatiotemporal *maps*, more dense *theories*, and special *instrumental skills* of how to talk, move, persuade, construct, what we must, to live in the world whatever its reward or punishments. The more affluent we are, however, the more such instrumental skills, maps, and theories are both rewarding rather than punishing and the more positive features of that world are differentiated in texture and generalized in scope. Because scripted sources of orientation are more positive in reward, they also enable the development of greater skill. It is much more difficult for the very frightened, ashamed,

disgusted, distressed, or enraged to write, speak, move, manipulate, or observe with great skill.

Consider next scripts of *evaluation*. All human beings in all societies must acquire not only orientation but also discriminate moral, aesthetic, and truth values, what to believe is good and bad, beautiful and ugly, true or false. These are *ideological* scripts, widely inherited, first of all, as religious scripts as well as a variety of national secular ideologies. These are scripts of great scope that attempt an account, guidance, and sanctions for how life should be lived and the place of human beings in the cosmos. They conjoin affect, values, the actual, and the possible in a picture of the "real." As such they represent *faith*, whether religious or secular.

Since all ideologies contain evaluation *and* orientation and delineation of both positive and negative scenes, their relative salience in the life of the affluent is biased toward the positive components compared with the life of the impoverished, even when they inherit the *same* ideology. Some Calvinists were more certain they would be elected, and others more certain that they would suffer eternal damnation. Still other Christians believed themselves destined for the midway of Purgatory before entering heaven.

Next are *affect* scripts, concerned primarily with the control, management, and salience of affect. No society and no human being can be indifferent to the vicissitudes of affect per se, quite apart from other human functions and other characteristics of the world in which we live. This is because of their extraordinary potency for amplification and magnification of *anything*, their seductiveness, their threat, and not least their potentiality for contagion and escalation. *Affect control* scripts regulate the consciousness of affects, their density, display, communication, consequences, and their conditionality. The affluent are characteristically the recipients of rewarding socialization of both positive and negative affects, which is tolerant rather than intolerant toward consciousness of affect, toward the density of affect rather than its attenuation (e.g., "simmer down"); toward the display of affect rather than its suppression (e.g., "stop whining"); toward the communication of affect rather than its suppression (e.g., "don't ever raise your voice to me"); toward affect-based action rather than its suppression (e.g., "don't ever hit me again"); toward the tolerable consequences of affect based action rather than the intolerable consequences (e.g., "when you get so excited you give Mommy a headache"); toward their specificity and conditionality rather than their abstractness and generality (e.g., "don't get too loud and excited when we have guests" versus "nobody likes a noisy kid").

In *affect management* scripts, negative affects are sedated by specific actions quite apart from their instrumental consequences. Thus, cigarettes are smoked to "feel better" whether they help otherwise or not. As sedation becomes more urgent it is transformed into an addictive script in which smoking becomes an end in itself and displaces all its original sources as the

primary source of deprivation affect. As the density of negative to positive affect grows, such dependences shift from purely positive savouring scripts to sedative scripts, to preaddictive scripts (e.g., "I cannot answer the telephone without a cigarette"), to addictive scripts, with fateful consequence for their compulsion and freedom to relinquish, which we will trace later.

Affect salience scripts address the questions of how directly or indirectly one should aim at affect and how much weight one should assign to affect in the whole family of scripts. When affect per se becomes focal as a script, we seek "kicks" or "peace" or "terror" or "rage" or "sadness." Persons and activities are judged primarily by their affect payoff. In contrast, in derivative affect scripts, a person, a place, or an activity is rewarding *because* that one is a competent or nurturant or good person, because that activity is socially productive, because that place has extraordinary vistas or architecture. In affect systematic scripts, affect becomes one of *many* criteria for script guidance and many scripts are considered as part of one system for evaluation. As affluence increases, focal affect scripts are subordinated to derivative affect scripts, which are in turn subordinated to affect systematic scripts.

Finally, consider that large class of scripts defined by *risk, cost, benefit components*. Here we have distinguished four general types of script, with several subtypes within each general type. First are *affluence* scripts, which are those which govern predominately positive affect scenes. Second are *limitation-remediation* scripts, which govern negative affect scenes that are attempted to be transformed into positive affect scenes, with varying degrees of success. Third are *contamination scripts*, which govern ambivalent and plurivalent scenes that resist complete and enduring decontamination. Fourth are *antitoxic scripts*, which govern purely negative affect scripts with limited success. The basis of this classification is the varying ratios of density of positive to negative affect and the assumption that the effectiveness of coping with this ratio is dependent upon its absolute and relative *quantities* of positive and negative affect. As negative affect density increases, scripts move from affluence to remediation to enduring ambivalence and plurivalence to limited antitoxic outcomes, with recurrent threats and dangers.

All individuals enjoy *some* scenes via scripts of affluence, remedy some negative scenes, are plagued with some continuing ambivalence and plurivalence, and are threatened with toxic scenes via scripts that are precarious and fragile at best. The critical question raised by the modular component of the relative density and ratio of positive to negative affect is how general and extreme this ratio is and how it may be partitioned.

Risk, cost, benefit scripts address the systematic tradeoffs in specific scenes, or for families of scenes or for all scenes, about what relative quantities of probability there may be for quantities of costs versus benefits of payoff, of script enactment that are to govern choices, decisions, and planning for one's

life—whether in a family, or in work, or in solitude, or as a citizen, as a friend, as actor, observer, critic, or producer.

Although these scripts may be characterized by their decisions concerning the risks one intends to take for varying probabilities of reward and punishment (and therefore also for positive and negative affect), their complete set of rules would necessarily include the specification of the *specific* positive and negative affects differentiated, so that one individual might be committed to a script of creative *excitement* of discovery, as a scientist, whereas another might be committed to a script of the *enjoyment* of teaching science to a younger generation. Further, the same commitment script must be differentiated not only by the specific affects involved, but also by the specific *loci* of affect investment, such that one is committed to science, another to art, another to business, another to politics, all equally committed to risk for a gain of benefit over costs to be absorbed. When we speak of a commitment script as one type of limitation remediation script, we do not prejudge its more specific affects nor its more particular loci of affect investment.

Let us now consider some varieties of scripts of affluence and their interaction with a high ratio of dense positive over negative affect. As this ratio becomes more positive it becomes a more stable equilibrium so that scripts of affluence assume a central influence in the personality. Empirically this is a relatively rare state of affairs, as is its mirror image: the inverse ratio and the consequent centrality of scripts of toxicity for some individuals.

There are numerous types of affluence scripts, apart from their varieties of specific positive affects, and apart from their varieties of specific loci of positive affect investment. A very high density and magnification of positive affect could *not* be achieved from a life lived as a series of unconnected transient positive, even "peak" scenes, since magnification, in contrast to amplification, requires co-assembly of *sets* of scenes and scripted *further responses* to them, either to be repeated, to be sought, to be improved upon, to be produced, or created anew. Magnification of scripts of affluence can neither consist of isolated scenes nor of scenes sought exclusively for pure positive affect, such as pure excitement or pure enjoyment without regard to their source. The irrelevance and absence of evaluation (other than pure affect as criterial) would impoverish the critical and discriminating skills of the individual to such an extent that the magnification of positive affect would itself be jeopardized. Such a one could only say, "I know what excites or pleases me," but not exactly why, or why it ceases to excite or please if and when it does so. Such an individual would be too easily uninterested, bored, or displeased to sustain a high density of positive to negative affect. It would be analogous to the difficulty of producing experimental neuroses in some of the simple animals used in laboratory experimentation. They could not sufficiently connect and elaborate "traumatic" conditioning to become "neurotic."

By the same logic, an *exclusive* reliance on particular, scene-derivative positive affect would not sustain a stable equilibrium of high positive over negative affect, since it would inevitably confront the individual with underrepresented scripts in her personality. Such an individual would be like a lover who disregards too much and too long her other scripts of affluence, such as her parents, her children, her career, her friends, her health, her zest for food, for music, for travel, for nature, even for her daily routines, pallid though they seem in the midst of her obsession. The maintenance of a stable high positive affect over negative affect might *include* both pure affect scripts and scene-derivative affect scripts, but must also include systematic interscript, scripts of affluence, so that the scope and depth of the varieties of reward are guaranteed against either excessive diffusion and unconnectedness or against excessive concentration and alienation from the remainder of the inner and outer world.

From the viewpoint of strategy, the individual must neither attempt to minimize negative affect nor to maximize positive affect nor satisfice, but rather attempt to optimize positive affect to achieve the optimal stable equilibrium. The distance between the ideal and the actual must not be so great as to demoralize, nor so small as to trivialize.

Some balance must also be achieved between the several basic functions of perceiving, thinking, remembering, feeling, and acting, lest serious underdevelopment jeopardize the more magnified specialized functions that necessarily require all functions as auxiliaries at the very least.

Every differential magnification of scripted affluence is capable, if unbalanced, of jeopardizing the system of affluence scripts. Unless excitement affluence is balanced by some compensatory relaxation of enjoyment (as in the suburbs or wilderness, against overstimulation from the city) the individual is in jeopardy of being drained. Unless enjoyment affluence is balanced by some compensatory risk and excitement (as in the tendency to introduce gambling into predominantly stable, enjoyment societies) the individual will become restive and bored in her excessive enjoyment. Similar constraints appear with respect to affluence scripts located in different time frames. There cannot be fixation on the past, present, or future, or on brief durations, middle durations, or long durations without some compensatory balance lest the system of scripts of affluence be at risk.

Excessive breadth or depth of interest must be balanced by compensation at the least, though both might be optimized if neither is maximized.

Since scripts of affluence must be optimized rather than maximized, the *exclusive* magnification of scripts of affluence is invulnerable to serious disruption by what might have been easily absorbed except for *too little* exposure to, and immunization against, negative affect. The classic case is Buddha, the overly affluent prince, completely traumatized by his first exposure to the illness and suffering of an old man he happened to encounter by

chance. The maintenance of affluence demands the capacity to understand and absorb negative affect when it is encountered. One cannot afford excessive specialization even of rewarding affluence without some capacity for the compensation of and absorption of the confrontation with the inevitable suffering by the self and by others. Indeed what I have called the "rewarding" program of the socialization of affect (Tomkins, 1963a, b) requires that the child be exposed to quantities and varieties of negative affect in sufficiently graded doses that she can learn both to confront them and to discover how she may find her way back from such bruising encounters.

Specialization of affluence is the rule, but it is ever vulnerable to disregard of neglected and underrepresented specialization unless there is provision for *some* compensatory magnification, even though it continues to be a minor script. The other alternative consistent with a stable equilibrium of high positive over negative affect is a more even, optimized balance between plural scripts of affluence.

There are numerous varieties of affluence scripts, and a stable high ratio of positive affect requires *many* such scripts. These include *repetition* scripts in which the individual seeks to reexperience either what was once rewarding or what has (sometimes years later) *become* rewarding. Such scenes, e.g., the attempt to revisit the past (which may indeed have been and is still remembered as having been painful), may become deeply rewarding as a possible reexperience from the vantage point of adulthood. These may in fact disappoint but nonetheless be compelling as a unique scene that one must recover in its particularity. One may discover, with Wolfe, that one cannot go home again, but nonetheless cherish the experience. It represents the perennial fascination of human beings with "origins."

These scripts are somewhat different from *repetition with exploration* scripts. The young man who wishes to see the young woman he has just met, once again, and then again, wishes to repeat for the exploration of more of the same. Any budding interest requires for magnification, further acquaintance and exploration. When such exploration has run its course, such scripts enter what I have called the valley of perceptual skill, in which the once beloved is daily *recognized* but without affect. Any affluence script of repetition with exploration is vulnerable to such attenuation if it is not magnified by continuing, further exploration in repetition, or by further shared enjoyment or celebration, or anticipation or by participation.

There are also *repetition with improvement* affluence scripts in which the major aim is to increase one's skill not to a plateau, but to continually redefined peaks, common among professional athletes and performing artists. Such improvement scripts include affluence commitment species in which the individual is excited by and enjoys the development of her talents and her skills of discrimination, and of generalization, whether as a connoisseur or gourmet or gourmand or as a critic, as a mathematician, com-

poser, conductor, or linguist. In many such cases, the individual early on is excited by inherited talents for special kinds of achievement and becomes committed to development on a purely positive affect basis. This is to be distinguished from commitment scripts of limitation remediation, in which the individual feels she must remedy a scene that is punishing as a felt lack, or loss, evil, or false or ugly.

There are also affluence *production* scripts in which one attempts to produce, again and again, a rewarding scene. A comedian or actor's major script may consist in the successful evocation of audience response to the scene *she* has *produced*.

There are also affluence *creation* scripts that aim at the creation of a product and/or a response toward that product by the other and/or by the self. It is the uniqueness of the product, and of the response to it, that is criterial in such scripts. This is notably involved in the sensitivity to priority in artistic and scientific creation or discovery.

There are also affluence *responsiveness* scripts in which the aim is not to seek rewarding experiences, but rather to be open *to* them, should they occur or reoccur. These sometimes occur poignantly among the elderly who feel they have cheated themselves of what they might have found exciting or enjoyable in their youth and attempt a first, never experienced childhood.

These shade imperceptibly into *responsiveness quest* scripts in which the individual travels or frequents places where she believes she is more likely to be the target of others who will evoke deep positive responses in herself that she is incapable of either seeking directly or of initiating. Art, especially drama, is sought by many as one form of a responsiveness quest for a "good cry," as well as for excitement or enjoyment. Some will even seek the possibility of an attack for the enjoyment and excitement of the release of suppressed rage, distress, terror, or shame. These may be considered affluence scripts *if* the excitement or enjoyment is the primary aim, and the released negative affects are the instrumental vehicle for such rewards. Just as puritanical scripts seek to punish for pleasure, sadomasochistic scripts may seek pleasure from punishment.

There are also *positive celebratory* affluence scripts, in which there may be rituals for birth, recovery, progress, or victory or for anniversaries of beginnings or memorable scenes, or for rehearsals, as with old friends, or for revisiting cherished places or people, or comment on some admirable characteristic or behavior by the self or other or by a dyad or groups. Next are *instrumental-aesthetic affluence* scripts. These address the enrichment of the purely instrumental with varying admixtures of the aesthetic, beginning with singing at work, socializing at work, embellishing one's work, taking pride in it, savoring and celebrating it. Next are *positive anticipatory* affluence scripts in which the individual neither celebrates nor rehearses, but scripts future-

oriented scenes of great reward that offer the *bonus* of positive affect in the present, in a manner similar to the bonus of good scenes remembered.

Next are *cross-referenced interscripted* affluence scripts, which order relationships between scripts advantageously. Thus, a career may be scripted as a way of supporting a family, hobby, travel, self-development, and contribution to citizenship, while the family may be scripted as a way of training and preparing for future careers, citizens, hobbies, or personality development.

There are, finally, also *aggregation* affluence scripts in which multiple sources of positive affect are conjoined in new scripts such as the choice of a mate, friend, career, or residence. When the individual has achieved a stable positive over negative affect equilibrium she is capable of increasing her demandingness so that her choice of a mate, friend, career, or place to live is based upon the *conjoint* several features of scenes she finds most deeply rewarding. Thus, such a choice will not represent a partitioning of values but an aggregation approaching a summum bonum in which she aggregates not only what kind of a person she will marry, what kind of a friend she will cultivate, what kind of a career she will pursue, what kind of a place she will choose to live in, but insists that these most wanted choices themselves be aggregated, so that she lives with her mate in a place they cherish, surrounded by mutual friends they cherish, pursuing shared or complementary careers together in a family and friend business or profession.

In the middle ages, the convergence on the building of great Christian cathedrals often represented the aggregation of the deepest motives and best energies of all members of a community in a celebratory, sacred, aesthetic, and educational enterprise.

When the ratio of positive over negative affect is great there are not only an abundance of types of rewarding scenes, but there is a general strategy of optimizing costs, benefits, and probabilities so that such affluence is not only achieved, but maintained at a stable equilibrium. Disadvantageous shifts in costs, benefits, or probabilities are countered by scripted shifts in tactics to maintain the optimizing strategy against both overweening demands and against unavoidable disappointments.

Next are the cost-benefit risk scripts of *limitation remediation*. These address those aspects of the human condition perceived to be imperfect, to which some enduring long-term response *must* be made and which it is believed *can* be remedied, with varying degrees of success, risk, effort, costs, and benefits. These scripts involve an optimizing strategy; though compared with scripts of affluence the positive benefits won involve much more absorption of negative affect as a necessary risk and cost of benefits. They are relatively clear in distance and direction, with little conflict or plurivalence. They bifurcate scenes into good and bad scenes and know which are good and which are evil and that one must strive for one at the same time one strives against the other. Limitation remediation scripts range from scripts

of *commitment* to *acceptance*, to *conformity*, to *opportunism*, to *hope*, to *resignation*.

Commitment scripts involve the courage and endurance to invest and bind the person to long-term activity and to magnify positive affect in such activity by absorbing and neutralizing the various negative costs of such committed activity. Commitment may be altruistic or narcissistic or both. These scripts may be economic, political, artistic, religious, scientific, familial, or self-improving. Although these scripts of remediation vary radically in the apparent quantity of remediation over risks and costs and in their pretensions to making the world closer to the heart's desire, nonetheless when the individual's ratio of positive to negative affect is advantageous, though never so much as in scripts of affluence, even the resignation involved in willing, e.g., the obligatory state of slavery, which one may have inherited, and which one accepts because it is a choice of living against dying, may nonetheless provide the rewards of hope (e.g., in a Christian heaven), of evoking some positive affect for being a "good" slave, of a rewarding family life, of sharing a common fate with other slaves. Further, even the most miserable wage slavery of the very poor, as described by Lewis (1961) in *The Children of Sanchez*, reveals that the culture of poverty may co-exist with some psychological affluence in the opportunistic remediation of severe limitation. Thus, Jesus Sanchez regards very hard work for very little money as much better than being without money or being given welfare. He is quite prepared to give up play and games and his "childhood" in preparation for the severities of life he anticipates from seeing how hard his own father works. Though he has had little education he sees some opportunities for learning in the course of discharging his duties as an employee. He wishes to be like his father who also had no one to help him. Like his father he is not given to showing affection to his own children, since they too must be prepared for the same hard work. He likes his work, and he likes his boss (who "permits" him to work overtime on holidays). His reasons for liking his work are multiple. First, he must if he is to eat and to support his family. Second, he is neither passive nor controlled. Third, he is not abandoned when he has money. Nor is he spoiled. Like his father he exhibits his endurance and perseverance through his work. Next, it provides him with such education as he has ever had, and develops his skills in buying. Also, it satisfies his wish to be with many different kinds of people and to work for an admired father surrogate. Next, it enables generativity in providing him with money so that he can build a house, which he can leave as his inheritance to his children. Finally, as he describes it, it is his "medicine," making him forget his "troubles." This "poor man" is psychologically rewarded by his forced labor through which he remedies an inheritance which he has accepted but determined to remedy within the limits of possibility as he perceives them.

Historically many of the major religions have scripted limitation remedia-

tion via sacrifice (Hebraic), confession (Christian), resignation (Hindu), and cessation of desire (Buddhism). All of these enjoin acceptance, in varying ways, of the negative affects inherent in human existence. They are quite different than the secular ideals of the Enlightenment in subordinating pride in human effort to the cosmic and the divine power and perfection. Nonetheless, such limitation remediation scripts have provided, and continue to provide, hope, solace, and community for those who believe.

A more active set of limitation remediation scripts was propounded in the prescription of cultivation and integration of good heartedness and discipline by Confucius. In contrast, such complexity was rejected by Taoism in its classic prescription of the *simple way* of living in contact with and in accordance with nature.

There are a great variety of remediation scripts that vary significantly in their proposed balance of rewards, and benefits versus costs, versus risks, but all are alike in promising some reward over suffering.

Next are scripts of *contamination*, chief among which are the *nuclear scripts*, which are conjointly believed necessary to solve but are nonetheless insoluble. They exemplify the conjunction of greed and cowardice because of equally dense positive and negative affect. They utilize a self-defeating double strategy of *both* minimizing negative affect and of maximizing positive affect, and so do neither. Contamination takes the form of deep conflict, or turbulent multiple conflict and plurivalence, such that the individual suffers ambiguity and disorientation, as well as conflict, frustration, and threat. However she also enjoys scenes of the deepest excitement and enjoyment whenever she achieves a victory in her life-long struggles to resolve her conflicts, by purification or by integration, to resolve her plurivalences by simplification or by unification, to resolve her alienation by recovery of the promised land.

But though she runs, she cannot hide for long, though she may win battles she loses the war, though she may see the promised land she may never live in it. Her great benefits are paid for with great suffering and at great risk, which she has no choice but to accept for the benefits she can neither permanently possess nor renounce.

Although the formation of a nuclear script requires and maintains a less than optimal ratio of positive to negative affect, nonetheless variations in this ratio favor variations in the ratios of defensive, counteractive, and reparative nuclear subscripts. The more positive affect, the more the reparative subscript is magnified. The more negative affect, the more the defensive subscript is magnified, with the counteractive subscript magnification occupying an intermediate position.

Less punishing are *culture conflicted* scripts, in which an individual is at the same time possessed by one cultural inheritance while tempted by another alternative. Such is the case in Third World modernizing cultures and

in the centuries old love-hate relations between the Judeo and Christian cultures, and between the Moslem, Christian, and Hebraic civilizations. Each appears at once divine and satanic to the other and so can neither live with or without each other. Although such conflicts and tensions have been deeply creative for all parties, the perennial warfare of such culture conflict has also radically magnified self-love and self-disgust as well as other love and disgust of the other. While such conflict is not quite as severe as nuclear conflict, it is not too different in its tragic destiny. The price of bonding by ideology is as severe as the benefits it endows.

The greater the ratio of positive to negative affect in the individual, as in the society, the more such severe conflict may be attenuated if not completely reduced.

Next are scripts of *toxicity*, which address scenes of sufficient negative affect density and threat that they must be opposed, or excluded, attenuated, escaped or avoided, or confronted or defeated, but which by virtue of their density and the disadvantage of a stable ratio of negative over positive affect limit the ability of the individual to permanently rid herself of experienced threat or of experienced negative affect. This is the mirror image of scripts of affluence. The equilibrium is equally stable, but self-validating and self-fulfilling of costs over benefits, of risks over security and affluence, of the greatest distance between actuality and the individual's ideals. She must struggle excessively for the most meager benefits achieved at excessive costs. She is neither ambivalent or plurivalent, but rather frustrated, threatened, and defeated. Her general strategy is neither an optimizing one, nor one of minimizing negative affect, nor of maximizing positive affect, but rather of *satisficing* by reducing suffering as much as she can. This suffering includes much distress, rage, terror, shame, guilt, disgust, and dismay. For *reductions* in any of these negative affects she must be uncertain, but pay excessive prices in effort to remain alive. She is one of the many millions of refugees who have suffered exile from a land that in idealization has become a remote and barely promised land.

She is also one of those who would wish to be exiled, but are imprisoned and abused either in their homes (as in child abuse) or in their homeland (as political prisoners who are tortured). They have only two options: to avenge themselves by reversing and recasting future scenes, so that it is they who abuse and torture the other (in murder) or a surrogate (e.g., a helpless animal). Secondly, even such victims seek and find refuge within their prison, as in a loved pet who reciprocates the desperate love of the victim or in a beloved sibling who is equally victimized. But these can never quite neutralize the overwhelming mass of intimidation and humiliation inherent in scripts of toxicity.

We turn now to a more detailed account of some of the major types of scripts.

IDEOLOGICAL SCRIPTS

Ideological scripts attempt to provide general orientation of the place of human beings in the cosmos and in the society in which they live, an account of their central values, guidance for their realization, sanctions for their fulfillment, their violation, and their justification, and celebration of how life should be lived from here to eternity. Though ideology begins in cosmology and religion, it ends in social criticism. Although ideology reaches for coherence and consensus, shared ideologies, as in religious or political sects, are at the same time fractionated and partitioned into conflict and polarity.

Ideological scripts are those we inherit by virtue of being a member of a civilization, a nation, a religion, a gender, an age, an institution, a class, a region, a family, a profession, or school. They represent the various faiths by which human beings live and, alas, die. They are the chief agents of bonding and of differentiation and division.

They are the most important single class of scripts because of their conjoint scope, abstractness and specificity, stability and volatility, past, present, and future orientation, shared and exclusive features, spatial as well as temporal references, guidance as well as rewarding and punishing sanctions, actuality and possibility concerns, and above all because they endow fact with value and affect. It deals not with truth per se but with the domain of the "real." As such, it is a matter of faith, without which human beings appear unable to live. It is the location of actuality and possibility in a world of affect and value. These scripts are at once self-validating and self-fulfilling. They are lived out as if true and good against others as false and bad, though just how tolerant they may be of competitors is generally included in the ideological script.

Twenty years ago (Tomkins, 1963a, b, 1965), I presented a theory of the structure of ideology in Western thought and a theory of the relationship between ideology and personality. I traced a recurrent polarity between the humanistic and normative orientations, between left and right, in fields as diverse as theology, metaphysics, the foundations of mathematics, the theory of aesthetics, political theory, epistemology, theory of perception, theory of value, theory of childrearing, theory of psychotherapy, and the theories of personality and personality testing.

This polarity appeared first in Greek philosophy between Protagoras, affirming that "man is the measure," and Plato, affirming the priority of the realm of essence. This polarity represents an idealization, positive idealization in the humanistic ideology and negative idealization in the normative ideology. Human beings in western civilization have tended toward self-celebration, positive or negative.

I further assumed that an individual resonates to any organized ideology because of an underlying ideoaffective posture (or script as I would now call it), which is a set of feelings and ideas about feelings that is more *loosely*

organized than any highly organized ideology. An example from my Polarity scale would be the items "It is disgusting to see an adult cry" versus "It is distressing to see an adult cry." I further assumed that the script or ideoaffective posture was the resultant of systematic differences in the socialization of affects, in which affects were more punitively socialized on the right and more rewardingly socialized on the left. I outlined a systematic program of differential socialization of each of the nine primary affects that together produced an ideoaffective posture that inclined the individual to resonate differentially to ideology.

The postulated relationships between personality and ideology have proved reasonably robust over several years of systematic research (Tomkins, 1975, 1982) in which quite different methods were employed on samples of subjects varying broadly in age, educational status, intelligence, and sex, as well as normality and pathology. The consistent finding is that the ideological humanist is positively disposed towards human beings, in his displayed affect, in his perceptions, and in his cognitions. The ideological normative is negatively disposed towards human beings in his displayed affect, in his perceptions, and in his cognitions.

We first standardized (Tomkins & McCarter, 1964) a series of posed affect photographs in accordance with my theory of the nine primary innate affects. These produced an average intercorrelation of 0.86 between intended judgments and the obtained judgments. Many of these same photographs were later used by Ekman (1972) to demonstrate a worldwide, pancultural consensus in the recognition of affect from posed photographs, thus reconfirming with more sophisticated methods what Darwin (1965) had demonstrated a century before. Using these photographs, we selected one face showing the different affects for presentation in a stereoscope. The subject was presented, in each trial, with one affect on the right eye and another affect on the left eye, in conflict with each other. Each affect was pitted in turn against every other affect, e.g., the sad face of the subject presented to one eye, while the other eye saw a happy face. When the brain is thus confronted with two incompatible faces, the response is either a suppression of one face, a fusion of both faces, or a rivalry and alternation between the two faces. We predicted and confirmed that the left-oriented subjects would unconsciously select a dominance of the smiling face over all other affects (correlations 0.42, $N = 247$). We predicted and confirmed that right wing subjects would unconsciously produce a dominance of the contemptuous face (correlation of 0.60). The ideological orientation had been tested by use of my Polarity scale.

Next in a series of studies of 500 subjects, we compared the humanistic and normative positions with the scores on the Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test. This is a broad spectrum projective type personality test that had been standardized (Tomkins & Miner, 1956) on a representative sample (1,500) of the United States population. This was designed to be computer

scored with separate norms for age, intelligence, education, sex, and a variety of demographic characteristics. The results again confirmed the same predictions we had made for stereoscopic resolution. The humanistic ideology is significantly related to general sociophilia, whereas the normative ideology is significantly related to sociophobia in which there is avoidance of physical contact between men, an expectation of general aggression from others, and, finally, an elevated social restlessness, which maximizes the number of changes from social to nonsocial situations.

Finally, Vasquez (1975) predicted and confirmed differential facial affective responses in left- and right-wing subjects. The videotaped subjects were previously selected on the basis of their Polarity scale scores. The questions here tested concerned the use of the face, whether conscious or unconscious, whether voluntary or involuntary, as a communication of affect. Again we predicted that humanists would smile more than normative subjects. It was confirmed that humanist subjects actually smiled more frequently while talking with an experimenter than did normative subjects. There was no such difference, however, when subjects were alone, displaying affect spontaneously. Our prediction was based, not only on the previously confirmed dominance of the smiling face in the resolution of stereoscopic conflict and on the dominance of general sociophilia over sociophobia in the Picture Arrangement Test, but also on the grounds both that they had experienced the smile of enjoyment more frequently during their socialization and because they have internalized the ideoaffective posture that one should attempt to increase positive affect for the other as well as for the self. The learned smile does not, of course, always mean that the individual *feels* happy. As often as not, it is a consequence of a wish to communicate to the other that one wishes him to feel smiled upon and to evoke the smile from the other. It is often that which extinguishes the fires of distress, hate, and shame.

We also predicted that humanists would frequently respond with shame and that normatives would respond less frequently with shame but more frequently with disgust and contempt. Our rationale was that shame represents an impunitive response to what is interpreted as an interruption to communion (e.g., in shyness) and that it will ultimately be replaced by full communication. In contrast, contempt and disgust are responses to a bad other, and the termination of intimacy with such a one is assumed to be permanent unless that other changes significantly. These hypotheses were confirmed for shame and disgust but not for contempt. The humanist subjects do respond more frequently with shame if there is any perceived barrier to intimacy. The normative subjects not only smile less frequently, but display disgust on their face more frequently to the other who is tested and found wanting.

Thus, whether we put the question to the brain faced unconsciously with conflicting perceptual information or to the fully conscious subject asked to

decide in what order to place three different scenes to make sense of them, or whether unbeknownst to the subject we take moving pictures of his complex and ever changing facial displays, the individual continues to respond as though he lives in one world, consistent in behavior, cognition, perception, and affect. It is, however, one world that is systematically different if he views it from the left or from the right.

I have demonstrated (Tomkins, 1965) a deep coherence between the differential magnification of specific affects and quite remote ideological derivatives. Thus, if you believe it is distressing to see an adult cry rather than disgusting to see an adult cry, you also believe human beings are basically good rather than evil, that numbers were created rather than discovered, that the mind is like a lamp rather than a mirror, that when life is disappointing it leaves a bad taste in the mouth rather than leaving a bad smell, that the promotion of social welfare by government is more important than the maintenance of law and order, and that play is important for all human beings rather than childish. This polarity did not exist before social specialization and stratification. If one is primarily a herbivore, one has no need either of massive energy output nor of ferocity nor of cunning. Thus, the Semang, who according to Sanday (1981, p. 19) have a "plant oriented mentality," wander through their forest "lightfooted, singing and wreathed with flowers" searching the treetops for game or honey. Women gather wild plant food, which is the dietary staple. Men occasionally hunt small game, but not large game, nor do they engage in any kind of warfare, but are more involved with their families and childrearing. Everyone joins in harvesting fruit. They place a high value on freedom of movement and disdain the sedentary life of agriculture. The dieties are male and female. There is sexual differentiation without stratification. According to Sanday (1981, p. 21), "The earth mother is perhaps closer to human affairs and the sky father more distant. He makes the thunder and she helps the people to appease him. She is the nurturant figure and he the commanding figure." Under such benign physical and cultural conditions, there is both a zest for life and no stratification either between the affects or between the sexes. Both the excitement of mobility and the enjoyment of cyclical seasonal harvest are valued, as are men *and* women.

I would suggest that this polarity is a sublimated derivative of social stratification and exploitation. The left represented then as now the oppressed and exploited against their warrior oppressors.

Over time this debate shifted to classes, which protested their inferior status, who looked to expropriate the expropriators, aristocrats against kings, bourgeoisie against landed gentry, proletariat against bourgeoisie, peasants against all.

The most important ideological transformations in civilization occurred when small game hunting became large game hunting and nomadic and when gathering become settled agriculture. In one, origins and deities be-

came masculine, skyward transcendent, aggressive, possessive, intolerant, competing with men, taking sides in covenants with elected men against their enemies, punishing their favored men whenever they contested for divine power. In the other, origins and deities became immanent earth or sea mothers, indulgent if sometimes capricious, a plenum that contracts and expands slowly (rather than quickly and destructively), more fixed than mobile, more conservative than radical and discontinuously creative, more cyclical than linear. In one, men dominate the society. In the other, women dominate. One represents a magnification of excitement, the other a magnification of enjoyment. The ideological magnification of excitement versus enjoyment did not occur because the sexes differed in their preferences, but rather because two very different ways of acquiring food became more and more differentiated. When the relatively undifferentiated hunter gatherers split into predatory big game hunters and sedentary agriculturalists, differentiation ultimately became increasingly specialized and finally stratified into warrior nomads who subjugated peasant agriculturalists, in the formation of states, empires, and civilizations.

According to Rustow (1980, p. 29), "where conquering drivers or mounted nomads ran into a population of sedentary plow-peasants, they installed themselves as the ruling stratum and thenceforth lived on the labor, dues, and services of the subjugated." The conquerors "now needed only to devote themselves to ruling, to fighting, and to the knightly way of life" in castles as "petrified horse" and the horse as "an itinerant castle." It was further elaborated as part of religious ideology "as in heaven also on earth"—as Genghis Khan said "One God in heaven, one Ruler on earth." Nomads were sometimes transformed into conquerors by religious enthusiasm. Thus, the Bedouins of Arabia had for centuries led a circumscribed existence until they were electrified into domination and conquest as a religious duty of Holy War by Muhammad about 650 A.D. They set the patriarchy of the stock breeders in the place of the matriarchy of the plow peasants. The settled peoples characteristically lamented the barbaric crudeness and rapacious aggressiveness of the nomads who rejected the culture of the settlers as degenerate and seductive, as well as overly invested in arduous physical labor.

As Tacitus (1901) had said of the German invaders, "they think it base and spiritless to earn by sweat what they might purchase with blood."

This invidious comparison was much magnified by the appearance of the war chariot and the horse. The rider appeared on the stage of history as a new breed of man, terrifying in his intoxication with speed and his ability to effect concentrated mass formations in concert with his fellow horsemen. Their superiority over the panicked settled peasantry was enormous and irresistible.

It was the intensification of violence and warfare, first against big game animals and then against human beings, that ultimately produced the now

universal bifurcation, polarity, and stratification of the innate affects into excitement, surprise, anger, disgust, and dismay versus enjoyment, distress, shame, and fear. This polarity in families of affects not only appeared in cosmology and the nature of the gods but also in the relationship between the sexes and finally in secular ideological conflict.

The major dynamic of ideological differentiation and stratification arises from perceived scarcity and the reliance upon violence to reduce such scarcity to allocate scarce resources disproportionately to the victors in adversarial contests. Nor is this a uniquely human phenomenon. Many animals begin stratification in contests between males for exclusive *possession* of females. The paradox in this is that the prize of the contest, the female, is diminished to a position of lower status.

Sanday (1981) in her survey of 150 societies found balanced authority and power between the sexes in the absence of forces perceived to threaten social survival. Invidious stratification of the sexes appears to begin in environments perceived to be unfavorable (e.g., famine) and responded to by masculine violence. There appears to be a close link between using enemy *others* violently and stratification *within* beginning with gender stratification and then spreading to age and class stratification.

Consider what must happen when the world turns more negative than positive. First, feeling as such is confused with the predominant, unwanted negative affects. To the extent that anger and violence appear to offer the favored solution to a world turned bad many other consequences follow. The first is that of the believed benefits of slavery from warfare. One can thereby convert enemies to means to one's own happiness, as well as rob the other of whatever territory, property, or food he may possess. Second, anger is increased because the innate determinant of anger is a considerable increase in neural firing that is prompted by a variety of nonoptimal scenes of the now problematic world. Third, the conjunction of superior masculine strength and superior life-bearing feminine capabilities predispose the male to violence and death and the female against it. If the die is cast toward violence, then excitement and risk-taking must be elevated against the more pacific relaxation of enjoyment and communion. Fourth, surprise must be elevated against fear. Fear is a deadly affect for successful warfare, being the most serious enemy within. It is assigned to the enemies to be defeated. One should try to terrorize one's enemy. Fifth, anger must be elevated above distress. Distress must be born manfully. A man must not weep, but rather make his enemy cry out in surrender. Sixth, the warrior must above all be proud, elevating disgust, dismay, and contempt (the fusion of anger and dismay) above the humble hanging of the head in shame. Shame is what the proud warrior should inflict on his enemy. He as warrior should rather die than surrender in shame.

Notice that we have now partitioned the full spectrum of the innate affects

into two and that these sets are now invidiously stratified. The successful man warrior is excited, ready for surprise, angry and proud, contemptuous and fearless. The loser has given up and is relaxed in dubious enjoyment, crying in distress, terrified and humble and ashamed. It is a very small step to assign these demeaned affects to women inasmuch as they are readily defeated by men in physical combat. It is also a small step to regard children as little slaves and little women, and to regard lower classes in the same way. Boy children then must prove themselves to become men in rites de passage. A variety of trials involve the mastery of the masculine over the feminine affects. I am suggesting that social stratification rests upon the affect stratification inherent in adversarial contests.

Women and lower status individuals are then pictured as loving, timid, distressed, shy, and humble. An effeminate man is a loser, but even warriors capable of seizing and possessing women necessarily remain deeply ambivalent about mothers and mother surrogates who are loving and tender rather than risk-taking, capable of distressed empathy rather than hostile, modest and shy rather than judgmental, distancing in disgust, dismell, and contempt, timid and fearful rather than competitive and dangerous. The very powerful magnification of the warrior affects guarantees that the feminine affects will become as alien as they are seductive. A masculine female becomes as repellent as an effeminate male.

Large-scale societies are necessarily stratified to the extent that they require government from centralized authority. The origin of both state and government appears to have been primarily adversarial in recorded history. Most large societies began either in subjugation or much less frequently in confederation against the threat of it. The resultant stratification, though responsible for "high culture" and "civilization," has exacted severe prices from the exploited populations ranging from the terror of mass killings, through severe privation and distress, through the shame of caste and class derogation, the reduction of autonomy and freedom of expression via imprisonment, to the reduction of opportunity for self-development via reduction of social mobility, and the acceptance of the exploiters as "superior" and of the exploited as "lower."

Stratification has inevitably generated a polarity of ideologies in defense of itself and in protest against itself. The defensive ideologies vary as a function of the nature of the society they defend, and so change as these societies are changed via ideological challenge. These are the normative, right-wing ideologies. Locked into polarized conflict with them are humanistic, left-wing ideologies, which also change as societies change. They inevitably address three somewhat independent, somewhat interdependent problematic social conditions. First of all, they emphasize the intolerable *costs* in one or another negative affect of the prevailing ideology. There is too much violence, too much terror, too much distress, too much shame, too much disgust or

dismell. Second, they place the blame for the problematic on the established normative authority, which must then change itself or be changed by those who suffer. The ideological polarity arises because the normative ideology places the blame for the problematic squarely upon those who suffer and complain. It is thus the welfare "cheats" who are to blame for their own problems. Third, it inevitably represents not only the protests of those defeated in adversarial contests and who wish to win but in varying degrees the feminine affects diminished by the adversarial stratification. The left is constituted in varying ratios of outraged masculinity and suppressed femininity, the militants and the flower children. The right is much less complex, apologist as it is of primarily masculine, adversarial stratification, buttressed by "tradition"—"If it isn't broken, don't fix it."

Since different societies vary in their degree of stratification, in the costliness of exploitation, in the type of cost, in their degree of modulation and mixture of the masculine-feminine principles, the normative humanistic polarity is *both* universal and idiosyncratic for each society and historical moment.

Hertz (1973) and later Needham (1973) have shown that this polarity has appeared in many preliterate societies. The left and the right appeared to be a distinction about a family of analogs with a very large number of members. Left was widely believed to be related to right, as woman is to man, as profane is to sacred, as impetuous is to reflective, as dark is to light, as death is to life, as sin is to virtue, as falsity is to truth, as hell is to heaven, as the sky is to the underworld.

Every society and every civilization confronts somewhat distinctive sets of problems with a family of shared assumptions that is a larger family than the polarized differences in projected solutions to these shared problems. Variation and contest is around the major central tendency. Civilizations and their ideologies are at once orthogonal to each other in their central values and similar to each other in the range of polarized alternative solutions to these central problems. Thus, in early China, from the eighth to the third centuries B.C., there was increasing social anarchy with the collapse of the Chou Dynasty. Whole populations were put to death in mass executions. The problem forced upon Confucius and others was, how can such violent human beings live together? The major responses were, first, the classical right-wing position of the legalists or Realists. Han Fei Tzu's answer was massive and certain use of law and force. Human beings are inherently evil but they can be contained by a large militia and effective police force. Second was the classic left-wing response of Mohism. Mo Tzu proposed love, not force. Five hundred years before Christ, Mo Tzu argued "But whence did these calamities arise? They arise out of want of mutual love . . . It is to be altered by way of universal love and mutual aid." Confucius rejected both love and force, defending what appears to be the classic middle-of-the-road position. Both

Jen, the source of good heartedness in the person, and li, order, are needed for individuals to live together in harmony. Harmony is the primary aim for both the individual and the society. Only via great respect and love, filial piety in the family, can inner greatness and outer greatness be achieved. The good life is a hard-won achievement that results from the cultivation of the tradition that had existed in China's past, in the period of Grand Harmony.

There was another middle-of-the-road position in Taoism. Taoism, like Confucianism and Mohism and Realism, was for harmony and against strife, but it was *also* against Confucianism and its emphasis on regulation and tradition. It was for Nature and the easy way. The ideal life is the simple life, not the cultivated life. There is harmony and perfection in nature. Both man and society must be in tune with Nature.

Here we have then left, right, and two alternative versions of the center. It was not only a concern with social rather than individual problems, but also a concern with the finite and the immanence of this world and not with the transcendence of the infinite and otherworldliness.

Finally, it is a concern with the maintenance of tranquility, enjoyment, and stability, not with the guarantee of excitement, risk, competition, growth, and progress.

The Chinese conjoined the affect of enjoyment with its investment of sameness, particularly, and tradition in contrast to the Western investment in excitement, abstraction, transformation, and change. They loved the here and now and particularly the land that they inherited from their ancestors who had loved it before them. Their science was applied to satisfy present needs rather than pursuing a remote, never-to-be attained final truth. Their worship of learning stressed the mastery of particular texts. Their gods were their ancestors, not remote and out of space and time. Their interpersonal relations stressed the importance of affection and piety for their parents, their mates, and their children rather than the quest for the perfect romantic love and lover. Similarly, their political life included rebellions, but no revolutions in the Western sense. They would kick the rascals out, but expect no utopia as a result.

But all of these ideologies shared the same basic central problem of how to restore harmony to a society that had been torn asunder by violence and great disorder. This is quite a different problem than that which confronted Buddha in India. His was the sudden confrontation with the *individual* suffering the ravages of disease, old age, and death. And so China resisted the intrusion of the deeply introversive Buddhism until it had been tailored to meet the Chinese concern with social problems. India was not torn by violence. It was a much more stable caste society, which paid an excessive price in individual suffering as Buddha discovered when he first confronted the ravages of disease, old age, and death. It was also a much more introversive culture than China as well as more feminine than China. A favored

solution to this complex was an introversive asceticism in which distress was to be reduced not by violence, but by renunciation of desire and individuality and fusion with Nirvana. One hundred years after Buddha's death, "Buddhism" divided into a left- and right-wing schism of Theravada versus Mahayana, each defending a polarized interpretation. For one sect, Buddha had been a "kind and compassionate" man. For the other Buddha had been a "disciplined" man.

In radical contrast, the focus in the United States is on individualism, egalitarianism, freedom, the pursuit of money in a capitalistic competitive economy coupled with the transcendental Christian good works for those who fall behind, and the Christian sense of sin for both winners and losers, and the endless hot pursuit of the infinite and the transcendental in science, politics, love, and religion. The left-right polarity now centers on the relative importance of big business versus big government, the relative importance of the environment versus the need for economic growth, the relative importance of nuclear energy versus "natural" energy sources, the relative importance of military power versus peace, the relative importance of caring for the sick, the aged, the poor, versus self-help or turning the responsibility over to business, presumably more "efficient" than government.

But a left-wing American is more like a right-wing American than either is to any member of Confucian China. A Protestant is more like a Catholic than either are similar to a Hindu. A Marxist is more like a capitalist than either are to a hunter-gatherer. Polarities occur within extended families of ideologies, which characteristically are more orthogonal than polarized. The polarity appears to function as a universal *moderator* of widely differing ideologies. It is the variations *within* ideologies that are best described by the polarity.

COMMITMENT SCRIPTS

Commitment scripts are a species of *limitation* scripts, which address those aspects of the human condition perceived to be imperfect to which some enduring long-term response must be made. Limitation scripts are based on an assessment of what is desirable and undesirable, the ratio of positive to negative affect, and what and how much it would be desirable and possible to change for the better. Limitation scripts range from scripts of commitment, to acceptance, to opportunism, to hope, and to scripts of resignation.

The limitation script may elect to *accept* and *conform* to socially inherited limitations (e.g., class or ethnic), or individually inherited limitation (e.g., psychological or physical) and try to profit as much as is possible within these limitations, as in the English Victorian script described by the philosopher Bradley as "my station and its duties." It may elect a *resignation* script, as in slavery, when resistance would have been perceived as guaranteeing death.

Limitation might prompt a script of *opportunism* in the case of a peasantry that perceives itself to be exploited and intimidated, but capable of exploiting its limited freedom in the interstices of a feudal society via effective cunning. The trickster exemplifies such an opportunistic script. A later born child who is governed by primogeniture, actual or psychological, often elects an opportunistic script.

A limitation script need not represent resignation or acceptance alone. It may combine these with a script of *hope*, the great engine of the religions of the oppressed, from the days of the early Christians in Rome through the plantations in the United States South. The opiate of Christianity offered not only the promise of a life hereafter, but a counter culture in the here and now. Limitation shared becomes limitation attenuated under such circumstances. The lottery is yet another antidote for limitation to be overcome via hope.

If ideology reflects the orientation and faith that supports a way of life, commitment scripts represent the courage and endurance to invest and bind the person to long-term activity and to magnify positive affect in such activity by absorbing and neutralizing the various negative affect costs of such committed activity.

Although all limitation scripts are based on an assessment of the overall ratio of positive to negative affect, commitment scripts are distinctive in their bias toward positive affect. They originate in a favorable ratio of positive over negative affect and aim at increasing that advantage.

Both sources and aims of commitment are varied and complex combinations of components. Consider three distinct committed career choices each of which shares a passion for nature. Eugene O'Neill chose to live at the ocean's edge, in solitude, as he expressed himself in the plays he wrote. Compare such a commitment script with that of a lumberjack who also insists on working close to nature, but in the company of others, and in exercising the large muscles. Contrast both with an archaeologist who is enchanted with the rediscovery of the past, with others, in very special and remote nature sites, so that both time and space are remote.

Since commitments are heavily biased toward positive affects, and since individuals vary radically in their preferred locus of positive affect, commitments will reflect a wide spectrum of differential preferences for types and density of people (or solitude), for types of function drives (cognitive, affective, perceptual, verbal, memory, or motoric), for time past, present, or future, for types of place (calm, wild, remote, claustral, open, sea, mountain, urban, suburban, or village), for types of values (economic, political, religious, theoretic, scientific, aesthetic, or military).

Although every individual experiences a broad spectrum of scenes that either excite or provide enjoyment or that distress, anger, shame, disgust, or frighten, very few can result in commitment scripts, since these bind the

person to substantial investments of affect, energy, and activity over long periods of time. The individual is thereby much more constrained in the number of her possible commitments than in the number of her interests and other types of scripts. Such demandingness of commitment scripts generates interscript scripts designed to deal with competing commitments (e.g., between work and family) as well as possible conflicts between commitments and other types of scripts (e.g., noncommitted hobbies as in some aesthetic scripts or noncommitted instrumental scripts, as in the necessary but nonetheless routine earning of money).

Although commitment scripts are exceptionally robust, they are nonetheless vulnerable to a variety of transformations. They may be eroded by successful completion of their aim or by excessive failure to make progress toward that aim, by the overload of neglected demands competitive with the major commitment, or by the conjunction of the routinization of that commitment exposing the individual to seduction by underdeveloped potentialities of her personality, as in the case of the middle-age neurosis described by Jung. Competing commitments may require changes in priority under radical changes of circumstance. Thus, a woman whose child required long-term hospitalization elected to subordinate her career to the nurturance of her child at considerable cost to that career, but with a compensatory deepening of her commitment to her child.

In a study of a representative sample of the population of the United States (Tomkins, 1962), I found that there was an inverse relationship between the interest in work and the interest in interpersonal interaction, such that the interest in work peaked between the ages of eighteen to thirty and diminished steadily thereafter as the sociophilia increased to the age of seventy-five.

Transformation of priorities among commitments are not necessarily unplanned reactions. Thus, commitment to family and to work may be partitioned by the individual to be dominant at different phases of the lifecycle. Such partitioning may be socioculturally specified, as in the Indian assignment of the first half of life to attending to the mundane, so that the second half of life may be committed to the cultivation of the spiritual.

SOME ORIGINS OF COMMITMENT SCRIPTS

Let us now examine more closely some of the varied sources of commitment scripts. Commitment may arise from violations of ideology, as in the case of those abolitionists of the United States who felt that both Christianity and democracy were intolerably violated by the institution of slavery. It may arise conjointly from ideology and a nuclear script, as in the case of Marx, who as a late adolescent was repelled by the "bourgeois" demand of his beloved

liberal father that he give up his humanistic studies, settle down, and support his wife to be. Thenceforth, Marx committed himself to the liberation of all the exploited wage slaves, himself included, finding in Engels a surrogate father who not only worshipped him, but would also continue to support him.

It may arise out of the exercise of any talent whose reward is much greater than the costs of developing it. It may arise out of the fascination of a youngster at the deep commitment of a revered model to a particular kind of activity. Thus, Alfred Gwynne Vanderbilt became committed to the breeding and racing of horses when he was seduced by seeing the great excitement and enjoyment on the face of his father on the occasion of a horse he had bred winning the Belmont stake race.

It may arise out of respect and affection for a model who emits dense positive affect for the behavior of his or her child, as in the case of Hubert Humphrey who overheard his father boasting to his friends how pleased he was that his son was doing such a good job as his assistant in the store.

It may arise out of deep mutuality in excitement and enjoyment of game playing or any activity in which the child pleases the parents, e.g., by imitation. I have found this critical in the development of some entertainers and some writers (notably Chekhov).

It may arise from critically punishing scenes at the hands of otherwise loving parents, as in the case of Steichen, whose commitment to photographing "the family of man" appears to have originated when he had expressed an ethnic slur in the presence of his mother. She then closed her store, took him upstairs, and lectured him sternly that never again did she want to hear him express any kind of prejudice against any member of the human race.

It may arise out of deference to a parent who aspires to a status, vicariously, through a child and who is able to evoke in that child the commitment to satisfy those aspirations.

It may arise out of the loving overprotection of a child by a parent who displays intense concern for the child on the occasion of illness or distress, engendering a commitment to reciprocate and to recapture intimacy via helping others.

It may arise out of identification with a parent who is deeply committed to a helping or service profession, who does *not* either help or become intimate with members of his own family. I found such a constellation among some abolitionists in the United States whose parents were either nurses, priests, or politicians.

It may arise out of a wish to undo the humiliation of a beloved parent, as in the case of a Black politician who vowed he would devote his life to opening the barriers to full social and political participation against Blacks after witnessing the humiliation enforced on his father by exclusion from membership in a racist club.

It may arise out of the conjoint wish to undo and prevent and punish those responsible for the loss of life of a child, as in the case of the leader of an antigun lobby whose son was shot and killed and the case of the leader of a movement against drunken drivers after her daughter had been killed by a drunken driver. Such individuals commit themselves not only to revenge and prevention but, as they formulate it, to give "meaning" to the otherwise unassimilable random violence that robbed them.

Each specific type of commitment script has both idiosyncratic and general determinants, courses and consequences. We will now present some of these more general features.

First, there is required a massive density of experienced positive affect somewhere in the history of the individual if he is to be both excited into resonance by a positive vision of the possible and able and willing to endure the negative affect costs that will inevitably be encountered in the pursuit of any serious time-extended commitment. It may also (but need not) require a capacity for either outrage and/or for empathic suffering for those to whom one commits oneself.

The beginning of any commitment script requires that some *actual* scene be magnified by the construction of further possible scenes. This scene is but a beginning of a much extended family of possibilities.

Second, possibilities must be explored in a variety of alternative scenes *like* the beginning scene and these support magnification of the initial scenes. Thus, the abolitionist Phillips was sent by his Boston Brahmin parents on a trip to Europe in the hope of distracting their son from his interest in Black slaves. What he "discovered" was that there were all kinds of exploited oppressed people all over the world, increasing his resonance to the general idea of the salvation of others.

Third, there is required a *decision* to take risk on behalf of the commitment. This may involve a radical renunciation of the past way of life. In the case of Phillips, he had to renounce the conventional practice of law in Boston *and* most of his Boston Brahmin friends in favor of the men who were Black.

Fourth, as a consequence of the risk that has been taken, there is usually some punishment and suffering. In Phillips' case, it was alienation from white upperclass Boston society.

Fifth, as a consequence of absorption of such negative affect, resonance to the initial commitment is deepened. In the case of Phillips, this took the form of increased identification with the oppressed and increased hostility toward the oppressor.

Sixth, as a consequence of increasing magnification of commitment, there is an increased willingness and ability to venture more risk and absorb more punishment.

Seventh, there is a shift from strategy to tactics whenever the venturing of

effort and risk and the absorption of negative affect reaches a stage of perceived no-return in commitment. This ordinarily occurs *after* a series of second thoughts and flirtations with the possibility of giving up the commitment as either unwise or too costly.

Even so, any commitment remains vulnerable to erosion at any stage. For one abolitionist, the conjunction of poor health and defeat as a political candidate for the presidency of the United States burned him out. After the Emancipation Proclamation, many abolitionists regarded their mission as completed and spent their later years in public appearances, enjoying being lionized in contrast to their former vilification. Others, such as Phillips, continued, arguing that the battle was just beginning.

What were some of the determinants of such commitment scripts? In the case of the abolitionists in the United States, I found (Tomkins, 1965), first, that all were deeply Christian. Three of four had had conversion experiences. For them, Christianity required that they save others if they would save themselves. In all four families, moral and Christian zeal for the salvation of their children was combined with great affection for their children.

Second, these parents had also shown a pervasive concern with public service as minister, nurse, mayor, and political activity.

Third, all appeared to have been physically active and extroverted as children. They had abundant energy, which they translated into vigorous play and into fighting with their peers, which was to be important later in their dangerous face-to-face confrontations before large groups, not infrequently intent on killing them.

Fourth, all were exposed to, influenced by, and modeled themselves after the great orators of their day. So, as Perry Miller (1961) noted, one of the salient features of the Puritans' reformation was the substitution of the sermon for the mass. All four men were early exposed to the magic of the great orators of the day, both Christian and political.

Fifth, all of them were physically courageous. They had all experienced and mastered the art of fighting with their peers, so that they had a zest for combat rather than a dread of it. Different types of commitment, however, call for different types of courage. For some it is shame courage, the capacity to be mocked, excluded, and isolated. For others it is distress courage, to endure endless suffering in the face of great labor and exertion. For others, it is guilt courage, to endure the guilt at the violence that one must inflict on others. For others, it is disgust courage, to endure the endless confrontation with the imperfect, the degrading, and the ugly. For others, it is that amalgam of courage required to support a strong and confident self against the multiple sources of doubt from within and from without. This occurred in the case of Freud when he envisioned himself an intellectual Robinson Crusoe, whose innovative ideas would one day be rediscovered by another adventurer.

AFFECT MANAGEMENT SCRIPTS: SEDATIVE, PREADDICTIVE, AND ADDICTIVE

The following typology of affect management scripts was generated to deal with the problems of substance dependency, particularly the dependency on cigarettes. My interest in these phenomena grew out of my conviction that dependency on cigarettes mimicked addictive dependency in the absence of a biochemical base. This suggested the possibility that psychological addiction was masked in drug addiction by the presence of biochemical addictive tolerance. If this were so, it would illuminate the puzzling phenomenon of ready resumption of addictive dependency after years of abstinence. It would also illuminate addictive phenomena that were clearly psychological in nature, such as in compulsive gambling, eating, and risk-taking.

An empirical program of research was undertaken in cooperation with the Clearinghouse for Smoking Information of the United States Public Health Service, then under the direction of Horn (Horn & Waingrow, 1966). A stratified sample of the United States of 15,000 was tested to determine the fit between my models of affect dependency and the factor structure of that sample. The factor structure obtained was a very close fit between these models and the test responses of that large stratified sample.

With the aid of Ikard (Ikard & Tomkins, 1973), I pursued a series of experimental studies on these models in which predictions concerning the differential responsiveness of sedative, preaddictive, and addictive smokers (using scales designed to distinguish these types) were in no case disconfirmed. These models were further tested in large-scale therapeutic programs in cooperation with the Public Health department of the City of New York, with the cooperation of Donald Frederickson.

Although these models were developed to understand substance dependency, I have since applied them to related types of management of negative affect.

Affect management scripts aim not at affect control, nor at the salience of affect as target, but at the reduction of negative affect.

A sedative script is one that addresses any problematic scene primarily as though the first order of business was to attenuate or to reduce entirely the negative affect which that scene has evoked. It is an escape script rather than an avoidance script, and what it aims to escape is not the problematic source of negative affect in the scene, nor does it seek the instrumental solution to the problematic source. Sedative scripts differentiate negative affects from their source and from remedial instrumental action. Such partitioning of scene, affect, and action is then followed by an increased salience of affect to which the rest of the scene becomes ground, to affect as figure. It is the reduction of this affect that is then scripted as the primary target.

By virtue of the general feature of modularity, an *instrumental sedative* script may combine both types of scripts, using a sedative to help the self deal more effectively with a problematic scene. The sedative script may in fact enable the individual once sedated to resume dealing with the source of the negative affect and to enable more effective remediation without such instrumental intentions in the sedative script itself. Further, the attempted sedation may or may not be successful. The cigarette may enable an individual made fearful to be less fearful, or entirely calm. Quite independent of its effectiveness as a sedative of the negative affect, the cigarette may enable the individual to be more effective in dealing with the problematic scene or not. Thus, she may be helped just a little to be less fearful, but this small affect difference may make all the difference in dealing with the scene. Or, she might become entirely free of fear via the cigarette and yet give up on solving the problem of the scene itself or try and fail, despite having become much less fearful because of the cigarette.

A cigarette is but one of many types of sedative act. One may attempt self-sedation via alcohol, drugs, eating, aggression, sex, travel, driving, walking, running, watching TV, conversation, reading, introversion, music, or a favored place.

There are a number of conditions necessary for the formation of a sedative script. Sedative scripts can occur only under a limited range of the ratio of density of positive to negative affect. One will have no need to generate sedative scripts if that ratio is greatly biased toward positive affect, because then the individual suffers too little negative affect to become salient enough to prompt strategies for negative affect remediation. Further, the basic optimism derivative of such positive affect bias usually makes attempted coping with problematic scenes both salient and effective. Nor do sedative scripts ordinarily occur when the ratio of positive to negative affect is extremely biased toward negative affect. Under these conditions sedative scripts are characteristically transformed into addictive scripts.

Further, in addition to a specific range of positive to negative affect density, negative affect must be differentiated from its source and become salient as problematic. Then, some act must have effectively reduced negative affect, independent of changing the perceived source of that affect. Next, the sedative act must be given priority over instrumental acts designed to deal with the source of the negative affect, moving from last, to middle, to first resort in any problematic scene. Next, the sedative act must be resorted to over an increasing variety of different negative affect scenes, with some degree of perceived effectiveness, whatever the type, intensity, or duration of the negative affect. Then, the relationship between the sedative act and the negative affect must become that of a unique one-many type, in which one and only one act will sedate any of an indefinite number of negative affects, rather than

a many-relationship, in which there would be alternative ways of sedating any negative affect.

When these conditions have been met, the individual comes to believe in the *possibility* of reducing negative affect, rather than experiencing herself as a totally helpless victim, or as one who can do no more than celebrate her own misery. Further, she now believes in the *desirability* of reducing her own negative affect rather than be constrained by ideological norms against comforting herself. Further, she now favors the *self* as agent of sedation, rather than passively hoping for help from others to reduce her suffering. Finally, sedative scripts must then compete with a variety of other scripts that are in varying degrees incompatible with sedation.

Thus, an approaching automobile, apparently out of control, rarely prompts attempted sedation. The individual rather devotes full attention to driving her own automobile to avoid the threatened danger rather than to attempt to sedate her fear. There are also many scenes in which affect is so tightly bound to its source (as a species of affect worthy, affect salience scripts) that the individual cannot imagine sedating herself, e.g., upon first hearing of the death of a loved one. In such a case, one might seek to comfort oneself by seeking the company of someone else who also mourns. The total scene is too preemptive to be dealt with by affect sedation alone.

There are many types of scripts that attempt to deal with negative affect as one aim among many but which exclude sedation as such. Thus, a *commitment* script would absorb negative affect as a necessary price. A *doable* script would prompt the individual to turn to something easy enough to accomplish. A *celebratory* script would magnify and communicate the negative affect and the scenes connected with it. An *opportunistic* script would back off the problematic scene for another day that might be more opportune. A *resignation* script would prompt submission to overwhelming pressure. A *systematic* script would prompt transformation of the script in terms of reintegration of a complex matrix of scene consequences. An *affect control* script would address negative affect as a problem for suppression, hiding its expression, preventing its communication, inhibiting action, or suppressing awareness of negative affect. A *review* script would address negative affect as a sign of a radical change of status in the self and in other. A *toxicity* script would view the scene as intolerably threatening and prompt a mobilization of all resources in a war against threat. A *power* script would prompt an increase in skill to cope with this and any other problematic scene. An *insurance* script would prompt the insurance of a small amount of effort to limit very large possible negative affect losses (e.g., be courteous to all people). A *gambling* script would prompt the investment of a small amount of effort to win psychic affluence that would attenuate all negative affect (e.g., a lottery ticket or a courting of the rich and powerful). A *prudential* script would prompt the

moderation of risk to avoid future negative affect. A *boldness* script would prompt risking a great deal for the benefits that would minimize negative affect (in contrast to gambling, in which little is risked, for the same aim). A *nuclear* script would prompt defense, counteraction, and reparation as strategies for dealing with troubling negative affect.

Sedative scripts are conditional scripts. They are quite different in this respect from addictive scripts. They are used *only* to sedate experienced negative affect, and therefore vary in frequency and duration of activation, dependent on the experienced frequency and duration of negative affect. As a consequence, the frequency of sedative acts is dependent not only on source affect, but also on the relative effectiveness of the scripted sedative, be it smoking a cigarette, a claustrophobic introversive response, or a claustrophobic extroversive response as in a flight to being with others. If such attempted sedation is effective, the sedative response is terminated and its general frequency reduced. If, however, the sedative act is relatively ineffective, it will be repeated and the general frequency of sedative responses will increase. Paradoxically, sedative acts increase as a conjoint function of the density of source affect and of the *ineffectiveness* of the sedative affect. Sedative smokers who smoke as frequently as addictive smokers (but who are nonetheless *not* addicted) are individuals whose overall density of negative affect is high and for whom the attempted sedation is relatively ineffective. To some extent such an individual suffers a phenomenon similar to biochemically based drug habituation. He needs more and more cigarettes as they become less effective as sedatives. Indeed, most sedative scripts suffer the difficulty that their capacity for reducing and attenuating negative affect is limited and diminishes as the density of negative affect increases.

Despite the fact that the sedative act is a response to negative affect and not to the problematic nature of the scene, it is nonetheless true that individuals are troubled by a set of scenes that are idiosyncratic for each individual.

We can, therefore, determine the characteristic loci of negative affect by noting the types of scenes in which the individual resorts to sedation. Thus, some smokers are surprised to learn that although they smoke only when they are alone, that some smoke only when they are surrounded by others, that some smoke only in the bosom of their family, whereas others smoke only when working at their business, whereas many smoke under all circumstances. Because of the specific conditionality of the sedative script and the unconditionality of the addictive script, one can reliably differentially diagnose these scripts by asking whether the individual smokes (or invokes other sedative acts) when she is on vacation. The addictive smoker is surprised by the question, responding immediately that she does. The sedative smoker may also be surprised by the question, but also by the answer which is evoked. She often discovers, for the first time, that she does *not* smoke at all at such times. This illustrates an important feature of

many scripts, that the "rules" may be so overlearned and skilled, via compression, that their presence becomes visible even to the individual herself only by their effects.

PREADDICTIVE SCRIPTS

We turn now to another type of negative affect management. This is the preaddictive script, so labeled because it represents a critical step in the transformation of sedative to addictive dependency. In this case, sedation has been magnified by a substantial increment of urgency and required as a *necessary* condition to remain in the scene, and/or to *act* in it. Thus, there are preaddictive smoking scripts such that an individual believes he *cannot* answer the phone or he cannot meet others, or be alone, without the comforting cigarette *before* he enters the more threatening scene. At the sound of the telephone, therefore, he *must* find a cigarette. This increased urgency, and its moving forward in time, is the hallmark of part of the difference between sedation and what will later be transformed into the *unconditional urgency* of the addictive script.

But there is much more than an increase in urgency. In sedation, there is an activation rule for whenever any negative affect is experienced. The enactment rule is that a cigarette is a unique and necessary method of escape. The closure rule is that smoking terminates when negative affect terminates. In preaddiction, negative affect is now tightly linked with a specific scene that is anticipated will evoke more negative affect that will be tolerable unless *avoided* by a sedative. Its activation rule is to escape from present trouble when the anticipated increase of that affect can be avoided by sedation. At the beginning then it has been transformed from sedation into an *instrumental escape and avoidance sedation* script. It is no longer simply a response to any negative affect but to a specific problematic scene that promises unique punishment unless uniquely sedated in advance. It is a doable escape avoidance script, because it attempts to escape present negative affect and avoid more. It is instrumental because sedation is no longer its exclusive aim. Its major aim is to make it possible to tolerate a specific scene that is tightly linked with punishing affect. Its closure rule is the termination of that scene, not simply the termination of negative affect.

In the mother-child relationship, sedative scripts may require the presence of the mother or a knowledge that she is near or readily available whenever the child feels distressed, afraid, angry, or tired, but *not* otherwise. Such a child may be able to play endlessly without access to or wish for maternal comforting so long as all goes well.

In the parent-child relationship pre-addictive scripts, there is an increment of urgency about the *necessity* of the mother's presence, but it is now

required *before* he can begin to do anything that is in any way problematic, such as meeting a stranger. Preaddictive scripts do not arise without a prior sedative script.

While a child might run in panic to his mother for comfort in the absence of prior sedative dependence, it is unlikely it will be thenceforth scripted as preaddictive on the basis of one single scene. For this to occur there must have been frequent prior experiences of sedation, effective or partly effective. Then, what is *added* is an increment of urgency about a restricted set of scenes within the larger family of less urgent dependency scenes. This proved to be clearly the case in the histories of smokers, since preaddictive scripts were never found without sedative scripts, though there were many cases of sedative without preaddictive scripts.

If the preaddictive script generalizes to more than one type of scene, it will characteristically be transformed into an *habitual skilled as-if* script in which the combined compression of the rules and avoidant action at a distance enables the individual to act as if there were danger, but without fear, and with skilled but minimal awareness of what must be done to deal with that scene. An everyday example is the pedestrian crossing a busy intersection with skilled action as if afraid of the potential danger, but without fear.

There *is* a restricted set of preaddictive smoking scripts in the absence of sedative scripts, which I discovered accidentally. In some of our attempts to help smokers give up their dependence, we encountered a very surprising and *new* disability among positive affect smokers. These are smokers who use the cigarette to *enhance* otherwise already rewarding scenes. They do not smoke to *become* happy or happier, but to *retain* or *enhance* their positive affect. Such smokers characteristically have a low frequency of smoking, e.g., with morning or evening coffee. Ordinarily it is just such dependency that is most readily renounced if the individual is convinced it is in his/her best interests to do so. To our surprise we found some positive affect smokers became preaddictive smokers when we requested them to give up smoking. Now they suddenly found a deep reluctance to give up just those one or two cigarettes that they had most enjoyed. These they *now* felt they *must* have. This proved to be a transient phenomenon, as well as a relatively rare occurrence among all positive affect smokers, but it did teach us that the *intention to renounce* has the consequence of increasing negative affect in a very specific way. It was upon this basis I counseled the American Cancer Society (as a member of their tobacco committee) against too vigorous a media campaign in favor of renunciation lest they convert the majority of smokers (who were sedative smokers) into preaddictive or addictive smokers. As we will presently see it is the *ineffective* attempt to renounce that is one of the ways in which sedative scripts are transformed to addictive scripts.

ADDICTIVE SCRIPTS

An addictive script is one in which a sedative has been transformed into an end in itself such that the individual is perpetually vigilant toward the absence or presence of the distinctive feature whose absence is punishing and whose presence briefly provides relief, but whose continuing presence becomes sufficiently skilled that it provides minimal awareness and affect (as in the case of preaddictive habitual skilled as-if scripts).

Let us illustrate this by cigarette addiction. First, there is a highly developed monitoring skill that informs the individual *that* she has a cigarette in her mouth. This is based on a phantom cigarette, a special case of the phantom limb and phantom body. Phantom limbs becomes conscious only after massive *discontinuous* change in the contours of the body (e.g., after amputation of a limb). They do not occur if such change has been gradual and continuous (as in the absorption of the limb in leprosy). Further, they do not appear before the age of five. It appears to require substantial perceptual learning, which can be unlearned if the changes are slow and gradual but not in the event of such rapid changes as occur through surgery. What appears as a "phantom" after surgery exposes what I believe is the normal general case, that we learn to construct images that require minimal information to trigger their continuing internal construction and neural transmission. *Any* massive change in new information, however, changes the skilled monitoring into a difference detection mode. Examples are the compulsive exploration of the "hole" in the mouth by the tongue after the extraction of a tooth, or the equally compelled awareness of the difference in interface between the body as a whole and the mattress of a new bed the first night one spends in an unfamiliar bed. This new information is quickly added to the family of body phantoms, so that the second night is monitored with increased skill and minimal awareness and affect.

The cigarette addict has learned the skill of knowing with minimal awareness when there is a cigarette in her mouth. The moment it is "missing," he has the skill to detect that absence and to concentrate consciousness and affect on the "difference."

It sometimes happens to addicts that they will light up a cigarette when they have just momentarily put a still lit cigarette on a nearby ashtray. Acts may also be done with minimal affect and awareness, so that she does not know either that she has put one cigarette down or that she has immediately lit another.

To the extent that another cigarette is readily available, the addictive script continues in the skilled monitoring and skilled action mode. However, should a cigarette be unavailable, an immediate alert is sounded in what now becomes both *preemptive* and *urgent*. All else is, for the time of the alert, put

on hold, and all resources are mobilized to find a cigarette. If, at this stage, one were to suggest to the addict that she "forget" about it or she were to suggest this to herself, she would discover that awareness and deprivation affect remain preemptive. She can "think" of nothing else. There are no viable alternatives. There is very limited capacity for delay.

Should her quest for the cigarette fail, deprivation affect grows in intensity, acceleration, and density, experienced as a deepening of a crisis growing more and more intolerable.

Next, there is a projection of expected further intensity, acceleration, and deprivation affect density, which itself generates panic at the future prospect, a self-validating scene. The addictive script is insistent on the intolerability of such scenes and the necessity for a *unique* act or distinctive scene feature that *alone* will reduce such massive deprivation affect.

Further, such projections are *in fact* universally confirmed. The cigarette finally found and put into the mouth *does* evoke intense enjoyment, relaxation, and relief. The addictive script is both self-validating and self-fulfilling. It demonstrates again and again the necessity to be ever alert to the possibility of being without some X, the punishment that is inevitable should that X not be recoverable, the increased rate of punishment the longer one is without that X, its irreplaceability, nondistractability, or nonsubstitutability, and finally how wonderful it is to have it again no matter how brief such enjoyment continues to be.

There are many cigarette addicts who will on just the occasion of recovery of the missing cigarette express extreme disgust at their dependence and vow to renounce their addiction. More often than not this proves to be a momentary revulsion.

There is an additional set of auxiliary scripts that may or may not be developed to fortify the addictive script. These are characteristically *not* themselves addictive scripts. One of them is an auxiliary hoarding script. After a particularly prolonged and harrowing crisis, say at 4 am on awakening in the middle of the night to discover one has smoked one's last cigarette in the house, an addict may resolve "never again." She thenceforth buys several cartons at a time to defend against the possibility of running out. But *this* act need not itself become addictive, though she may become preaddictive in checking the size of her hoard whenever she becomes particularly disturbed about something else.

There are two additional types of auxiliary scripts which do not occur with cigarette addiction but may with drug addictions. One is an external "hoard" script in which one develops multiple "connections" with dope pushers, lest one run out of fixes. This does not occur in cigarette hoarding because of the relative ease and reliability of the source. There is an additional auxiliary script that develops when the individual cannot afford her habit and then must do whatever she thinks necessary to either earn or steal the money to

support her habit. This too is no part of the addictive script and is unnecessary to the extent either that the addict has the necessary money or the addictive substance is cheap or free.

Yet another auxiliary script that may be prompted by an addictive script is that of quality maintenance. To what extent is the addictive substance authentic, unadulterated, safe? Again, such concern may be massive but not necessarily addictive.

Let us consider the conditions necessary for the formation of such a script.

First, in contrast to a sedative script the ratio of the overall density of positive to negative affect must be heavily biased toward negative affect. Addicts are not happy people.

Next, addictive scripts require, as a precondition, a sedative script that has validated an act as a reliable means of attenuating or reducing negative affect. Further, however, it also requires an increase in the magnification of the need for and, in the demonstration, efficacy of the power of the sedative. The sedative act must become a one-many relationship, such that the *same* means is a means to an increasing *variety* of sedations as ends. The cigarette must make one feel better in many different types of scenes. Whether these scenes make one afraid, angry, distressed, ashamed, or disgusted, the cigarette must have prove to be equally capable of neutralizing such differently troubling scenes. To become addicted to seeking the mother's presence, she must have been comforting in many different bad scenes. Not only is a one-many magnification of sedation required, but the one sedation must *also* thereby have been magnified as the *unique* means to those many ends. When the chips were down and the individual most desperate she must have turned to her cigarette or to her mother as the only salvation, and that must have worked. This is a special case of the more general dynamic of the power script in which any means (whether for positive or negative affect) is transformed into an end in itself by being structured as both vital *and* scarce, as is the case with money and employment in an economic depression.

The next condition necessary for the formation of an addictive script is a transformation of the sedative script into an added preaddictive script so that the sedative act becomes under some conditions also *instrumental* for dealing with a variety of problematic scenes, over and above their negative affect. The experience of heightened urgency for the sedative in specific scenes provides a critical bridge to the more general addictive urgency. As more and more instrumental preaddictive scenes are added to more and more sedative scenes, the stage is set for the most radical and critical transformation. This is the shift from original negative affect as source to *sedative deprivation affect* as *new source affect*. One cannot become addicted until one has learned that to be without the sedative is much worse than any other negative affect that the sedative might reduce. It is similar in this respect to the power script of a

miser who dreads the loss of money much more than he dreads the loss of what that money might buy.

It is a remarkably effective script paradoxically because it has *created* conjointly both a unique problem and a unique solution to that problem. But that problem arises from the conversion of a rational sedative script into a costly, illusory extrapolation of idealized bad *possibilities* that become both self-validating as well as self-fulfilling.

In the case of the child who develops an addictive dependency on the mother, it would be required that she had encountered a very disturbing scene that became much *more* disturbing by the dramatic unavailability of her comforting mother when it was most needed and, thenceforth, began to live with the disturbing knowledge of the *possible* repetition of unreducible, growing *deprivation* affect that became self-validating and self-fulfilling independent of any specific *source* affect. She has then taught herself that there is something much worse than being hurt, distressed, afraid, angry, or ashamed about anything, and that is to be unable to count on someone who would comfort her *whenever* she becomes acutely aware that the comforter is unavailable. She does *not* need her to comfort her about fear of school or whatever, but rather against fear of her not being available. With addiction there are few if any sources of misery that can compete with the panic of having run out of cigarettes. Such a script requires critical scenes of acute deprivation of the sedative otherwise intolerable until the sedative is found. Only then can the sedative be experienced as a sedative for its own absence rather than as simply instrumental to reducing other sources of affect.

It is a script whose activation rules are always in operation. Its enactment rules are engaged whenever the addictive act is interrupted. There are no closure rules, since whenever enactment ceases, activation rules begin again.

I have witnessed the beginning of addictive script formation that was possible to abort and to prevent its further magnification. This occurred with a child who had developed a strong sedative dependence on a pacifier that became stronger as a result of severe continuing pain from an infected ear. One day I saw her reach for this pacifier as her pain returned. It had somehow dropped out of sight. I witnessed a sudden new panic. "Where's my boppy?" (her word for her pacifier). After a few minutes we found it, but the child had been severely shaken and the pacifier had been radically magnified in its importance as an end in itself that *might* not be there. I therefore supplied her with a large number of pacifiers placed throughout the house to prevent the further magnification of the dread of running out. This proved effective, and, within a year, the sedative dependence itself disappeared when this child resumed her former predominantly positive affect orientation.

One may understand such a shift more readily in the case of pain sedatives. If one suffers severe pain that it is felt urgent to reduce whenever it becomes preemptive, one would, to become *psychologically* addicted (to an otherwise

nonaddictive drug), have to have had a vivid demonstration of pain *without* the drug increasing radically the felt desirability of that drug and the felt panic or distress at its absence. One has then begun the critical transformation of dreading the absence of the sedative more than the original pain and negative affect source. It is as though aspirin, which was previously viewed as a means to reduce headaches, *now* became the *source* of the most severe headaches itself. This could not in fact happen, but something worse could. One could come to be vigilant and monitor for the presence of aspirin whether or not one had pain.

The addictive transformation must not only occur, but it must be further magnified by acting on it again and again, validating it by repeated cycles of deprivation and relief independent of its many original sources until there is a point of no-return to the sedative as simply instrumental so that one *must have* a cigarette no matter what else.

Such learning must also include an increasing *skill* in vigilant *monitoring* so that one knows at all times whether all is well *and* knows immediately whenever it is not, followed by radical increases in consciousness, affect, and action until all is well again.

Clearly the more alternative means one possesses to deal with negative affect scenes the less the probability of addictive script formation. The smaller the density of negative affect and the larger the density of positive affect, the less the probability of addictive script formation. Sedative scripts remain sedative for the majority of smokers and probably for the majority of human beings in general, because they are neither so disturbed nor so uniquely dependent on *one* sedative to become addictive. It must however not be forgotten that there are millions of Americans who are not only addicted but are addicted not only to cigarettes but also to drugs as well as to a variety of nuclear and nonnuclear scripts.

As an epilogue to these varieties of dependency scripts let us consider now their potential for change. By way of contrast we will include another type of script exhibited by a much smaller number of individuals who smoke cigarettes. These have a *positive affect savoring* script. They smoke not for sedative relief from negative affect, nor from addictive dependency, but to either enhance or maintain positive affect already experienced. Thus, they smoke at the end of a meal they have enjoyed, with a cup of coffee which they also enjoy, or to celebrate a special occasion. Characteristically, positive affect smokers smoke very few cigarettes daily. Some may smoke no more than a few per week. They are individuals with a very high ratio of density of positive affect over negative affect. They are at the other end of the scale compared with addicts. Paradoxically, the frequency of smoking appears to be inverse to the enjoyment experienced in smoking. Those who enjoy smoking least smoke all day long. Those who enjoy smoking most may smoke no more than a few cigarettes a day or week. Further, this paradox is paralleled by the ease

with which smoking can be renounced and cessation maintained. Positive affect smokers are able to give up smoking most readily and to maintain this cessation in the face of medical evidence of its toxicity. The probable reasons for this are not obscure. These are individuals blessed with many sources of positive affect, and renunciation of smoking, though regretted, is not experienced as a severe loss, compared to the diminished health risks they weigh against the loss. They are readily persuaded by evidence, primarily, I would suggest, because rationality is fragile in the face of massive negative affect and flourishes most under positive affect.

The sedative smoker (and preaddictive smoker somewhat less so) is less able and willing to stop smoking, compared with the positive affect smoker, but more capable than the addict. Her ability to stop depends in large part on the variability of her experienced affect. When she is feeling very positive she is quite capable of renunciation, since she would not under these circumstances have smoked anyway. However, of all smokers, she is the most vulnerable to backsliding as soon as she again experiences the pressure of negative affect. She may have decided on her vacation to quit and maintained her resolve for a couple weeks. On return to a more stressful work environment, such resolve readily dissolves for the sedative smoker, the more so for the combined sedative and preaddictive. The sedative smoker will tell you she has quit smoking many times and that she will probably do so many times in the future.

In marked contrast, renunciation is most difficult for the addict, but *if* she is successful in quitting she is much more likely to maintain this resolve than the sedative smoker who has quit. The reasons most often given by addicts are, first, that they now have an investment in self-control in which they take pride. Second, they do not wish to reexperience the suffering of the cold turkey withdrawal again. In contrast, the sedative is likely to deceive herself into thinking she is capable of more self-control than she possesses, claiming that if she wished to she could give up smoking any time she wished. She tends to forget that quitting is but half the battle and that she has a history of inability to maintain her cessation. The addict who cannot muster the resolve to quit is much more likely to be ashamed of her failure of will, though she also has a tendency to deny the validity of the evidence of the toxicity of her smoking.

NUCLEAR SCRIPTS

If ideology is a faith in a systematic order in the world, and commitment is the courage and endurance to bind the self to an enhancement of a segment of that order, nuclear scripts speak to the conjunction of greed and cowardice in

response to seduction, contamination, confusion, and intimidation. Nuclear scripts represent the tragic rather than the classic vision.

A nuclear scene is one or several scenes in which a very good scene turns very bad. A nuclear script is one which attempts to reverse the nuclear scene, to turn the very bad scene into the very good scene again. It succeeds only partially and temporarily, followed invariably by an apparent replay of the nuclear scene in which the good scene again turns bad.

Nuclear scripts arise from the unwillingness to renounce or mourn what has become irresistably seductive and the inability to recover what has been lost, to purify or integrate what has become intolerably contaminated or conflicted, and to simplify or to unify what has become hopelessly turbulent in complexity, ambiguity, and rate of change.

It is the seductiveness of the good scene that magnifies the intolerability of its loss and the intransigence of the relentless attempt at reversal of the bad to the good scene. It is the intimidation, contamination, or confusion of the bad scene that magnifies the hopelessness and ineffectiveness of that reversal. Thus, there is produced a conjunction of greed and cowardice. By greed I mean the inflation of positive affect seductiveness. By cowardice I mean the inflation of negative affect intimidation, contamination, or confusion.

The self victimizes itself into a tragic scene in which it longs most desperately for what it is too intimidated to pursue effectively. That part of the personality that has been captured by a nuclear script constitutes a seduction into a lifelong war that need never have been waged, against enemies (including the bad self) who were not as dangerous or villainous as they have become, for heavens that never were as good as imagined, nor would if attained be as good as they are assumed. Nuclear scripts are inherently involved in idealized *defenses* against idealized *threats* to idealized *paradises*.

They represent an entropic cancer in which negative affect increasingly neutralizes positive affect and does so by the varieties of mechanisms of magnification and growth, which are coopted by the nuclear script, which invades the lifespan of the more positive affect possibilities governed by other types of scripts. Growth and magnification are thereby excessively pressed into the service of psychological warfare on behalf of a beleaguered personality.

CONSTRUCTION OF NUCLEAR SCRIPTS

How could such improbable scripts have been constructed and, having been constructed, never relinquished? Briefly, several conjoint conditions both simultaneous and sequential had to have occurred. First, both good scenes and bad scenes had to be magnified through *repetition* and *aggregation*

rather than repetition and attenuation. Second, such magnification must have become *reciprocally defined* rather than orthogonal. The good scene must have become more seductive by vidious contrast to the bad scene, made worse by its invidious contrast to the good scene. Reciprocal simultaneous contrast magnified both the good and bad scenes. Third, such reciprocal definition and magnification must have been *multidimensional*, thus further enhancing the magnification of both. Fourth, the *directionality* of *sequence* must have been *biased* from positive to negative, rather than in the opposite direction and rather than random. Fifth, such biased directionality must have magnified an intention to *reverse* that bias rather than modulate, accept it, or habituate to it. The nuclear script formation begins with this intention to reverse the magnified nuclear scene. Sixth, nuclear script magnification begins with the *reciprocal* definition of nuclear scene and script, since that script is defined as the rules by which the nuclear scene can be reversed. Seventh, the nuclear script is *multidimensional*, both in the varieties of dimensions of the nuclear scene to be remedied and in the varieties of strategies to be employed in reversing each dimension. Eighth, the nuclear script is *biased* in the *directionality* of its *sequences*, beginning with analogs of the bad scene that are reversed into *better* scenes as antianalogs, which invariably turn into replays and analogs of the bad nuclear scenes. Thus, a nuclear scene positive, negative sequence is transformed into a nuclear script negative, positive, negative sequence. Ninth, good and bad scenes are *bifurcated and intense* rather than continuous with gradations of degree. One is safe or in danger, victorious or defeated, loved or rejected. Strategies of the nuclear script are therefore judged entirely effective and ineffective. Tenth, nuclear scripts employ a *minimize* negative affect, *maximize* positive affect strategy rather than optimizing or satisficing strategies. Eleventh, nuclear scripts are further magnified by *biased uncontrolled lability* in which rapid uncontrolled shifts from positive to negative scenes, from antianalogs to analogs, occur more frequently than shifts in the negative positive direction. These latter are more controlled but slower and more arduous. Such lability is in contrast to scenes that are *stable*, and *polarized* or *segregated*, or *orthogonal*, or scenes that *change* but do so *slowly* with effort, or at a *controlled rate* as in any skilled performance. Twelfth, there is increasing *magnification advantage* over information advantage. In both cases, increasing quantities of information are controlled by compressed, smaller amounts of information, but in information advantage this is a relatively silent, skilled performance. In magnification advantage, the controlled information is affect magnified and conscious as figural rather than as ground. It is the difference between casual but skilled recognition of someone's presence as contrasted with the same recognition as intensely exciting or distressing.

Thirteenth, magnification is increased by *mutual support networks* in which succeeding scenes provide an increasingly interconnected network for

each other as part of one system. These include increasing skill in analog and antianalog formation, increasing refinement of auxiliary "theories" that are nuclear script relevant, and increasingly refined "maps" for orientation in nuclear script space. Fourteenth, there is increasing stability of *nuclear script equilibrium* in contrast to erosion, attenuation, transformation by review, or modulation. Changes are assimilated and absorbed rather than transforming the script via accommodation.

NUCLEAR SCRIPT FORMATION

Let us now examine nuclear script formation in greater detail. What are the kinds of scenes that are likely to become nuclear and then generate nuclear scripts?

The origin of a nuclear scene and nuclear script is in a very good scene that turned into a very bad scene. The good scene is a *seduction* via excitement or enjoyment at others who provided either models, mirrors, stimulation, guidance, mutuality, support, comfort, and/or reassurance.

The bad scene is either an intimidation, a contamination, a confusion, or any combination of these that jeopardize the good scene. The bad scene is an intimidation whenever excessive violence or threat via anger, disgust, or dissmell evokes excessive terror, shame, or distress. The bad scene is a contamination whenever excessive distress, anger, shame, disgust, or dissmell is evoked by excessive overcontrol; or by indifference, distancing, or threat of withdrawal of love; or by character flaws of the other that contaminate the idealized image of the other as model, mirror, guide, provider of mutuality, support, or comfort; or by humiliation by the good other; or by excessive piety by that good other that evokes guilt, distress, or conflict; or via the death of the good other; or via any triangular rivalry. The bad scene is a confusion whenever there are both multiple affects from the good other and by the self in response, to create excessively turbulent scenes. Turbulence occurs above and beyond ambivalence and conflict, via negative plurivalence to and from the self and other. This may occur via any extreme lability of affect and action by the good other that evokes extreme lability of affect and action by the self; or via any inconsistencies (whether labile or not) of affect or action by the good other that evoke extreme inconsistencies of affect or action by the self; or via any combination of seduction and intimidation or contamination or confusion, since to be threatened or to be humiliated by the good other may be as confusing as it is intimidating or contaminating. No less confusing are serious character flaws perceived in the idealized good other. Turbulence and confusion are compounded whenever there are too many possible sources of blame for good scenes turned bad, and whenever one does not know whether it is the self or the other or some complex combination of

both that is responsible for catastrophic problematic multiple good scenes turned bad in different ways. Thus, a young child suffering the divorce of a parent cannot be certain whether the good family has turned bad because of something or many things done or felt by the self, by a sibling, one or the other parent, or by every member of the family now suddenly in jeopardy. Similarly, the death of the good other may be as confusing as it is intimidating or contaminating. Any bad scene may be either intimidating and/or confusing and/or contaminating when it is sharply contrasted with the seductiveness of a good scene that precedes it.

There can be no greed without a seductive other. There can be no cowardice without an intimidating, contaminating, or confusing other. But neither can a seductive intimidating nuclear *scene* be converted into a nuclear *script* without massive, collusive reciprocal magnification.

If a nuclear scene occurs whenever there is a descent from heaven to hell, from magnified, dense positive affect to equally magnified, dense negative affect, it cannot occur in the absence of a nuclear script that represents a sustained magnified struggle to reverse the negative affect to positive affect and to ascend from hell to heaven. Heaven and hell are thereby locked in unholy wedlock until death do them part. What one elects to "do" about any scene is more than a response to a scene whose features are otherwise independent of those elected responses. The responses that follow any scene, whether they be immediate or delayed, constitute and *define*, as well as mirror the nature of a scene. Thus, a contemptuous remark is in part defined by whether the insulted one elects to begin a vendetta or to shrug it off as a momentary lapse of sensitivity.

A threat of violence is in part defined by whether one elects to hire a bodyguard or to assume it was a transient irritability unlikely to be repeated. The Watergate attempted burglary remained an inconsequential event so long as the nation preferred to "let sleeping dogs lie" given the alternative of the possibility of impeachment of a president. What one elects to do or not to do about any scene that is intense in affect in the scene itself, and in the projected consequences of how one further responds to that scene, is a complex function of the scene, the past, and the anticipated future scenes, and of their relative weighting with respect to costs and benefits. The "origin" of a nuclear script therefore is ambiguous. The nuclear script is a set of rules that define the "response" to the nuclear scene, but, in fact, those scripted responses define the scene as much as the scene "evokes" the responses. As the nuclear script encounters increasingly remote derivative scenes, over many years, and is progressively modified, the relationships between the ongoing nuclear script and its *multiple origins* become increasingly complex. A personality not only writes its own history in a nuclear script, but also constantly rewrites its history as well as its present and future. A nuclear script therefore is more properly regarded as a *connected set* or family of histories.

Some of these complexities are illustrated in Carlson's (1981) case study of the development of a nuclear script.

Nuclear scene and script are interdependent not only in their reciprocal *definition* of heaven and hell, but more importantly they are locked into *reciprocal magnification*. Many scripts become autonomous of their origins, but a nuclear scene as origin in heaven turned hell and a nuclear script as hell with terminal in heaven collude in not only keeping each other alive, but in providing the luxuriant soil for their reciprocal growth and magnification. Each *requires* the other to thrive. It is only the *repeated* intensely rewarding vision of heaven and the equally punishing replay of that heaven turned hell in unending, varied, but nonetheless inevitably recurrent sequences of scenes of delight and anguish that validates the nuclear script and prompts the lifelong pursuit of certain defeat amidst uncertain, partial, and temporary victories.

How such collusive reciprocal definition and magnification of nuclear scene by nuclear script may occur, we will now examine in the case of a creative sculptor. This was an individual whose life was at some risk in his first year. He suffered protracted hunger because of an inability to digest milk, to which he responded with violent projectile vomiting. His mother gave him to a wet nurse, for breast feeding, who described the infant's oral greed as "killing" her. This provided the earliest repeated model of a good scene, the pleasure of feeding, turned suddenly and unaccountably bad, shaking the whole body in frightening painful projectile vomiting. Because he was troubled with intestinal problems, he was given, on the advice of his mother's brother (an experimentally minded physician), high colonic enemas of argyrol. These were no less painful, nor less terrifying than the vomiting. Together they evoked a vivid sense of himself as a battlefield with concurrent explosions at both body orifices. Further, food and feces were fatally connected by his mother's insistence on giving him an enema to "clean" his body whenever he ate food that she feared might be bad for him. In this way, the good scene of oral pleasure was turned bad not only by vomiting but by intentional maternal invasion of his body by high colonic enemas. To this day he remembers the terror of the threat of the enema. But he was bound to his oppressor by the intense love she displayed, by her constant reassuring hovering attention, by her soothing bathing of him, by her constant reassuring feeding of him (after his first year's projectile vomiting had stopped), and, not least, by her remaining by his side when he went to bed, permitting him to hold her hand so that he fell asleep in her arms. If it was hell to be ripped apart at the mouth and anus, it was heaven to look at her, to be looked at, to be fed, to be bathed, and to be held in her arms.

If, too often, she appeared to wish to torture him, that only heightened those moments when she became his savior, and those moments became more continuous and sustained after his digestive problems diminished. The

distinction between good food and good mother, and bad food and bad mother, bad vomiting and bad enema, was to become a permanent script in which he was to be forever vulnerable to the good turning bad as a nuclear scene. Even at this early date the sequences were at least two-dimensional. He was not simply the passive victim of his savior. He also knew that to be ravenously hungry and taking into his body meant that he would have to give up and give back what *he* had greedily sought and taken in, and that if he did not, it would be taken from him by force. Distress, pain, pleasure, and terror were tightly fused.

Taking in was then further contaminated by a severe whooping cough that left a residue of inhibited, shallow breathing discovered and disinhibited 30 years later in the course of psychotherapy.

When he was three years old, his precarious hold on life via his mother's eyes and hands was suddenly and violently shaken by the arrival of a baby girl. His mother's eyes and hands and whole being were now rivetted on that intruder and away from him. His own account of that scene is consistent with the account his mother gives.

For six months, he retreated to his own room and he spoke to no one. His mother reported he appeared angry. This primary initial response of defense by retreat is one of the universal first nuclear subscripts to the shock of the good nuclear scene turned bad. However, it must be insisted that this is nuclearity by reciprocal definition and magnification. Had Sculptor not been so sensitized by the prior reciprocal magnification of the good and bad mother, he might well have weathered the reduced attention from his mother.

If he could have modulated his anger and distress and shame, the scene would have not been nuclear and the script would not have become nuclear. It is the reciprocal density of positive and negative affect that is critical in the reciprocal magnification of paradise lost that must be escaped, fought, and recovered.

If his scripted *response* to this scene had not been to run away and hide and be mute, then that bad *scene* would not have been so intolerable. It was in *part* made more intolerable by his attempt to make it *less* so. In that very attempt he has characterized it as a scene that *must* be escaped. Second, the conversion of a scene to a nuclear scene via a nuclear scripted response is never totally or permanently successful, and so becomes a replay, an analog of the very scene the individual is trying to master. To run away and become mute is *not* to radically diminish his aloneness, but to exemplify it, no matter how much better it seems than continuing to passively suffer the scene of betrayal. A scene is made nuclear, and the scripted response to it nuclear when the response *must* be made *and* does not *effectively* deal with it. Nuclear scripts conjoin ineffectiveness with compulsion in contrast to the addictive script which is equally compelled but effective. The nuclear script

response ultimately results in an analog for the intolerable nuclear scene, even when it is temporarily or partially effective. We will defer a discussion of Sculptor's other nuclear subscripts.

The nuclear script not only magnifies the nuclear scene by reciprocal definition but also by bifurcating the good and bad nuclear scenes into the starkest idealization and invidious contrast between the good scene and the good scene turned bad. Such a polarization excludes many degrees of freedom as possible alternative. Strategies for remediation are therefore similarly bifurcated and perceived to provide safety or danger, victory or defeat, reunion or exile. The self or the other is regarded as clean or dirty, conflicted or decisive, affluent or poor, confused or single minded. In the case of Sculptor, he is either hungry and greedy in eating, or vomiting or being robbed and invaded by enema. He is either in total possession of his mother or he has entirely lost her. He must therefore hold her hand tightly or withdraw, mute and hide in his room. There are no gradations in nuclear script space and this radically diminishes the possibilities of graded responses which might deal more effectively with the good scene turned bad.

Such bifurcation leads directly to action strategies that are equally radical.

With respect to their general strategies, nuclear scripts are typically two valued, requiring to minimize negative affect, and to maximize positive affect rather than optimizing or satisficing strategies. Greed requires a maximum of reward. Cowardice requires a minimum of punishment. Clearly a double maximum cannot be achieved, and the nuclear script consequently fails in *both* respects. It neither attains the prize nor escapes defeat. It is a game that must be played even though the player knows the dice are loaded against him.

There is a reciprocal relationship between the bifurcation of nuclear scenes and the minimizing negative and maximizing positive affect strategy. To the extent that Sculptor is confronted with either totally losing or keeping his beloved mother he is caught between greed and cowardice. He must have everything. He must lose nothing. He is necessarily forever suspended between heaven, which he can never reach, and hell, which he can never escape by pursuing a double minimizing-maximizing strategy.

Next, nuclear script formation is magnified by the *multidimensionality* and by *multiple ordering* the family of nuclear scenes and nuclear scripted responses to them. Because the change from a very good to a very bad scene is so momentous all the cognitive powers of the individual are inevitably brought to bear on it. The individual is totally engaged in trying to understand what has happened, why it has happened, what might have prevented it, how it might be prevented from happening again, how serious the consequences might be, how long such consequences might last, what he might do to mitigate these consequences, how much this is possible, whether this change means he will have to change his understanding of the other, or of himself, or

of their relationship, how responsible he was for what happened, how responsible the other was, or both were, what he should do about it, and what are the consequences of every response, how can he discover what would be the optimal response, should he try to defend himself, to avenge himself, or to recover the good scene. These are but a sample of the multidimensional *possibilities* he now generates and with which he must come to terms by way of response. For every possible interpretation of what happened and what might further happen there are *many* possible remedies he is forced to entertain and to act on. The more biased and ineffective, or partially or temporarily effective these prove to be, the more other possibilities he is forced to try. Nor will such experimentation ever come to a complete halt in his lifetime of seeking a final solution to these his most urgent and central problems. In contrast to the increasing discrimination and enrichment of nonnuclear scripts by *convergent differentiation*, here *generalization* increases complexity in ever divergent nonconverging possibilities. It is like a strategy in a game of 20 questions in which possibilities are continually increased rather than decreased through differentiation and convergence.

TYPES OF NUCLEAR SUBSCRIPTS

Because of the multiple ordering of interpretation and responses to interpretation, it is not possible to enumerate all the theoretical possibilities in all nuclear scripts. We can nonetheless enumerate four of the more general types of nuclear subscripts ordinarily generated in any family of nuclear scripts. First are a set of positive and negative *celebratory* scripts. These describe, explain, and celebrate the nuclear scene that was once so wonderful and then turned so bad *and* the continuing family of scenes which have been repeated again and again and which cast a long shadow over the future as ever present possibilities. These celebratory scripts power continual monitoring of ongoing experience for *either* signs of good scenes (anti-analogs) or of bad scenes (analogs) or of possible sequences of good scenes that will become bad scenes. These celebratory scripts also then guide responses and celebrate their successes and failures, separately, as well as sequentially. Thus, the individual who has just won an apparent nuclear victory, by defeating his enemy, will react as an omnipotent hero. The same script may dictate the surrender to total ignominious defeat moments later, to be followed by the negative celebration of the sequence of how the mighty have fallen.

The second general type of nuclear subscripts are scripts of *defense*. These may take one of several forms of avoidance or escape in which the individual attempts primarily to minimize the negative affect of the nuclear scene, by, for example, running away from home, by becoming introverted, by being alone,

by becoming mute. The negative affects usually involved in these scripts are terror, shame, or distress—the “feminine” affects.

The third general type of nuclear subscripts are *counteractive* scripts in which the individual attempts to reverse the sign of the affect in the scene by changing negative to positive affect, or by reversing the casting of the scene via recasting. In the latter case, the individual who had been terrorized would attempt to terrorize the other, or if humiliated would attempt to humiliate the other, or if distressed would attempt to distress the other, or if enraged would attempt to enrage the other, or if disoriented would attempt to disorient the other. The negative affects involved are usually the “masculine” affects of anger, disgust, and dismell. Recasting is however one type of counteraction. Thus, a loss may be counteracted by trying to understand how it happened or by action designed to give it “meaning” as in the case of the head of the gun lobby who elected to prevent the further use of guns after his son was killed. Counteraction may take the form of atonement for guilt, or increased skill to reduce shame, or toughening of the self better to endure distress. Counteraction may take the form of simplification of the lifestyle in the attempt to deal with the turbulence of the pluralistic nuclear script, to get away from the “rat race.” Counteraction may take the form of hostile identification in which one attempts to make the other envy the self by surpassing the other.

Finally there are *reparative* scripts in which the individual attempts to reach the good scene, rather than to hide or to avenge himself. It is an attempt to recover excitement and enjoyment, not via relief, not via revenge, but directly. This may take one of several forms, either an attempted recovery of the preproblematic good scene before all the trouble started or a new scene projected into the future as a utopian scene which will *undo* all the problems created in part by *both* the nuclear scene and by the nuclear script. In some versions, the sinners must pay an appropriate price to be reinstated, and that sinner may be the self, the other, or both. Reparative scripts may be restricted to the level of phantasy and yearning, or may be expressed in political manifestos and political activity in favor of a future utopia, or in helping behavior in which one enacts an idealized good scene, “saving” both the self and the other.

Because the individual is continually being reexposed via analog formation to the contaminated nuclear scene, it appears to *him* (and to observers) that he is really trying to *recover* the good scene and to *minimize and escape the bad scene*. We are saying however that the nuclear scripts do *not* aim at recovering the original good scene but rather aim at recovering or producing an idealized good scene which has been magnified by contrast with an idealized contamination of the good scene, by double simultaneous contrast.

Consider how Sculptor generated these types of nuclear subscripts. In his celebratory scripts, he continually detected analogs of scenes of betrayal and antianalogs of lovers who were pure of heart and faithful until death did

them part. He also found recurrent sequences of the apparently faithful turning treacherous. He was alternately attracted to the good beloved, repelled by the bad beloved, and crushed by the saint becoming a "whore."

He fled the betraying mother in a defensive set of nuclear subscripts which included mutism and hiding in his own room so that he would not have to look at his mothers' breast feeding his sibling rival. But he also attempted several counteractive strategies. He hit the sibling and made her cry. His counteractive attempts to assert his rights, to hurt his rival, to exhibit his own superior virtues failed to displace the other from center stage. Then he experimented with becoming his mother, walking around with an extended belly in simulation of his mother's pregnancy, evoking more laughter than joy. Then he attempted to become his own mother by feeding himself and overeating as he watched the mother lovingly feeding her new love.

Next he becomes increasingly curious about his extraordinary rival. What was it about such a toothless, hairless wonder that could turn that all wise, all loving mother's face away from his own, to that face? There is evidence of much more than curiosity and uncertainty. A year later he remembers an overwhelming excitement at the story of Genesis, of how God created the world out of "nothing" as he put it. Had his mother not earlier exhibited just such incredible creativity? Further, his mother often admiringly spoke of his sibling as perfectly "sculpted." Thus, I think were the foundations laid for a counteractive nuclear subscript of creativity as a sculptor, perfectly suited to emulate and compete with his mother as creator. His sculpture alas did not breathe life into his creation, but it was the best he could do.

Then, he attempted to be a better mother by feeding and caring for her child continuously, never once looking away and so never threatening her. At the same time he would hit his mother if she attempted to displace him in his counteractive script.

Finally, he would alternate between mutism, withdrawal and counteraction, and numerous direct and indirect *reparative* quests for resuming his interrupted communion with his mother. He would ask to be bathed because then he would be cared for. He would pretend to be sick because then he was immediately again his mother's beloved. He would ask to be fed by his mother. He would insist that his mother hold his hand as he went to sleep, guaranteeing at once her attention and the displacement of his rival. He attempted to do clever things to evoke her attention, and then repeated them endlessly to hold that attention, guaranteeing the ultimate loss of her attention.

None of these experiments was ever abandoned. I was able to trace their continuation and elaboration over many years. They constituted the basis for a lifelong family of partitioned nuclear subscripts.

It should be noted that the partitioning of the nuclear script into many varieties of celebratory, defensive, counteractive, and reparative subscripts

introduces genuine novelties into the original nuclear scene responses. The individual never stops inventing new ways of celebrating, defending, counteracting and repairing both the original nuclear scene and succeeding *derivatives* over a lifetime. Thus, when an individual tries to escape the original nuclear bad scene, he might or might not have attempted that in the original nuclear scene and if he does in the derivative nuclear subscript successfully escape an experienced threat of the nuclear bad scene, this constitutes a genuine antianalog *victory over that* defeat. When that victory is attenuated or habituated and he begins to feel lonely again, this is characteristically experienced as a *double* defeat. It is in one case a defeat of the nuclear subscript of escape inasmuch as he may no longer feel "safe." In the second case, it is *also* a replay of the original nuclear scene, in that he experiences the attenuation of victory as equivalent to being alone again as he was in the nuclear scene. Finally, the sequence, possible threat of the nuclear scene, successful escape, attenuated escape is also an analog replay of the entire original nuclear good scene turned bad. In this whole sequence, the positive-negative nuclear scene hovers over the nuclear subscript threat, defense, victory, failure, as a double repetition of, positive turned negative, and negative turned positive turned negative. A dual sequence has been overcome in a triple sequence, but this *also* repeats the dual sequence as a *part* of the triple sequence. Every nuclear subscript success is also a specific failure *and* a repetition of the original nuclear scene failure. In one case his victorious escape has turned "weak," into loneliness. It has also turned back into the original loneliness he intended to escape. The paradox of such magnification of the original nuclear scene is that it is produced by the partial success and subsequent failure of the responses intended to weaken that original defeat.

At the same time that possibilities are multiplied by the generation of these four types of nuclear subscripts, further magnification of the nuclear script requires the learning of many new skills of analog formation of auxiliary theories and of generalized nuclear script space-time maps.

WAYS OF THINKING

In order to understand the *growth* and continuing magnification of the nuclear scripts, we must distinguish two different ways in which we think. One is by the principle of variants; the other is by the principle of analogs. A variant is a way of detecting change in something which in its core remains the same. Thus, if one's wife is wearing a new dress, one does not say to her, "You look very similar to my wife" but rather, "I like the new dress you're wearing." Scenes which are predominantly positive in affect tone thus become connected and grow through the classic principle of unity in diversity.

So, a symphony is written and appreciated as a set of variations on a theme. The enjoyment and excitement of such experience depends upon the awareness of both the sameness and the difference. So, an interest in any skill or in any friend can grow endlessly by increasing variation on an underlying core which does not change. It is of the essence of friendship to enjoy the rehearsal from time to time of a long shared past history.

Contrast this mode of reasoning with the principle of analog formation which, though it is used in dealing with positive affects too, is much more frequently and powerfully used in dealing with negative affect scenes. Let us first illustrate the nature of this mechanism on a neutral task. The art historian Gombrich (1960) demonstrated that if one asks that a series of contrasting words (e.g., "mouse" vs. "elephant") be categorized as to which one would properly be called a ping and which one a pong, then it is remarkable that over 90% of all subjects agree that a mouse is a ping and an elephant is a pong. This is an extraordinary consensus on an absurd task—without any communication or collusion among subjects. I repeated the experiment and studied it further and discovered that although most subjects agree that a mouse is a ping and an elephant is a pong, they do not, in fact, all use the identical thought processes in arriving at their conclusion. Thus, some subjects thought that since a ping seemed small, and a pong seemed large, then a mouse would be a ping since it is smaller than an elephant, however, other subjects thought that a ping sounded like a higher frequency sound and a pong sounded like a lower frequency sound—therefore, since a mouse has a squeaky voice and an elephant a low roar, a ping is a mouse and a pong is an elephant. Whichever reasons were used, however, the basic mode of thought was analogic and as often as not, somewhat unconscious. Many subjects said, "I don't know why, but a mouse just seems more like a ping to me and an elephant seems more like a pong." In fact, the individual was responding to imagined relationships between shared dimensions.

Such analogic constructions become the major mechanism whereby a negative affect scene is endlessly encountered and endlessly defeats the individual when the ratio of positive to negative affect becomes predominantly negative. Consider the following example of Sculptor. He is driving his automobile on a lovely spring day on a brand new just-opened interstate highway. He looks at the lush greenery all about him and at the shiny, white new highway. An unaccustomed peace and deep enjoyment seizes him. He feels at one with beautiful nature. There is no one else. He is apparently the first to enjoy this verdant and virginal scene. Then, as from nowhere, he sees to his disgust a truck barreling down the road, coming at him and entirely destroying the beauty of the setting. "What is that truck doing here?" he asks himself. He becomes deeply depressed. He can identify no apparent reason, but he senses that there is more to it—that his response is disproportionate to the occasion, but the depression is deep and enduring.

This scene was one of hundreds of analogs which he constructed and imported into scenes which would have quite different significances for individuals with different nuclear scripts. It is because he can neither renounce, forgive, nor possess his mother that he is destined to be victimized by endless analogs which repeat the same unsolved scene—seducing him to continually try to finally settle accounts with his hated rival and his beloved but faithless mother, and to restore the Garden of Eden before the fall.

He characteristically does not know why he feels as he does (as many do not know why a mouse seems like a ping and an elephant like a pong). He is victimized by his own high-powered ability to synthesize ever-new repetitions of the same scene without knowing that or how he is doing so.

This represents a major mechanism whereby disproportionate ratio of negative to positive affect can become stabilized.

Contrast the luxuriant growth potential of analogs compared with variants that stress the continuing sameness of the core, despite some changes, and thus increase differentiation rather than generalization. Variants do not lend themselves to the same rate of growth as analogs because the latter lend themselves to an increasing skill in abstract similarity detection between *different* scenes, and so generalize.

Nuclear subscripts are also supported by generalized nuclear space—time “*maps*.” Just as one could not orient oneself in space without an abstract map of the location and distances in one’s space of movement, so too in each of nuclear subscripts one requires and develops general maps of how different kinds of scenes may play in interpersonal space and time. Thus, Sculptor is acutely aware of scenes that threaten possible betrayal which he must avoid. He is no less aware of contrary scenes that promise the possibility of counteractive turning of the scene, to his advantage over hated rivals. Finally, he is forever alert to scenes that promise the possibility of true love, whether for him or for others.

But the nuclear subscripts require not only the information necessary to detect analogs and antianalogs, and the more abstract nuclear space—time maps for orientation, but they also require *mini-theories* to deal with the deeper dynamics underlying the space—time surfaces of scenes. These are particularly required to deal with counterintuitive scenes that appear on the surface to contradict the nuclear script.

As with any general theory of personality, so may an auxiliary theory of a nuclear script possess the characteristics of a scientific paradigm which enables the individual to extrapolate explanations for apparently remote and contradictory phenomena consistent with the paradigm.

Consider again the case of the sculptor who has suffered excessive humiliation over a lifetime, when he is confronted by unexpected praise. How may his nuclear script absorb and neutralize such evidence? First, the sincerity of the judge may be questioned. Second, “He praised only this work of mine

because he knows that everything else I have done is trash." Third, "He may be sincere, but he is probably a fool." Fourth, "What I have done is a fluke, which I can never do again." Fifth, "He is trying to control me, holding out a carrot of praise. If I eat this, I am hooked and I will thenceforth have to work for his praise and to avoid his censure." Sixth, "He is exposing how hungry I am for praise and thus exposing my inferiority and my feelings of humiliation." Seventh, "He is seducing me into striving for something more, which I cannot possibly achieve." So may defeat be snatched from the jaws of victory by a nuclear script. Such a nuclear script can be produced only by a long history of failures to deal effectively with positive affect scenes turned negative.

Not only is there increasing generalization via analog formation and theory construction, but this is done more and more skillfully with increasing *magnification and informational advantage*, in the same fashion as a scientific theory decreases its assumptions as it increases its explanatory power.

The continuing proliferation of alternative nuclear subscripts not only occurs within and between such types of scripts as celebratory, defensive, counteractive and reparative, but also in generating *mixed* types of nuclear and nonnuclear scripts.

Nuclear scripts are capable of further magnification by invading and coopting other scripts and by being transformed into other types of scripts. Thus, in one case, a nuclear script may invade and coopt an addiction. In the other, a nuclear subscript may be transformed into an addictive nuclear subscript.

Consider the transformation of a nuclear subscript into an addictive form.

A script response which may not have been effective in dealing with a nuclear scene, but only partially so (e.g., introversive running away from nuclear scenes or analogs), may *become* addictive to the extent that not doing it becomes a new source affect to which the doing of it becomes a *new* sedative and the analogs of reexperience of (e.g., nonintroversion) are further magnified. In all other respects, the addictive nuclear response is similar to addictive responses. Absence makes it a source; effective sedation of deprivation requires continual response; there is magnification of absence (and absence potential) whenever one cannot respond by urgent restoration after monitoring and detecting "absence." Like money whose absence becomes (in addiction) worse than the absence of what it can buy, in addictive nuclearity the absence of introversion can become equal to and/or worse than the nuclear scene's humiliation. For the nuclear script to *become* addictive, it must have been effective for more than one nuclear scene analog, *and* have been critically blocked and its absence magnified, leading to magnified relief affect at running away to the (either) introversive (or extroversive) refuge. This is to be compared to a nonaddictive nuclear introversive script

which sometimes works, sometimes does not, prompting the continuing generation of other nuclear scripts to deal with the same nuclear scene. This is readily misunderstood because introversion was *originally* a partially successful *means* to escaping and avoiding such nuclear scenes which continues to be necessary in the nuclear script in general. Therefore, the addictive nuclear introvert will necessarily continue battling betrayal, the sibling, the intrusive parent via introversion, and via many other scripts (e.g., travel, creativity, salvation, reading, sex, eating, gambling, music, etc.) some of which are *not* introversive. What is different is the special status of the script as generating its own negative affect (independent of its instrumental value). In other words, he wishes to be alone rather than *not* being alone (no matter how free of nuclear threats that presence of others might be, just as an addict smokes when "happy," e.g., on vacation). He cannot be "reassured" because defensive introversion has received an increment of affect beyond its instrumental value. Since the burden of the *entire* family of nuclear scenes and scripts remain, the addictive nuclear scene cannot become the major value, but rather adds an additional burden to an already heavy one, which is only partially lightened by the attempted addictive script response. It is in part because of its relative ineffectiveness and the consequent *pluralism* of multiple nuclear scripts that the addictive nuclear script remains one among many scripts rather than completely dominating the nuclear scripts. The nuclear script never puts all its eggs in one basket as in pure addiction.

A nuclear script may be transformed not only by becoming addictive but rather by invading and coopting an already existing addiction.

In any nonnuclear addiction, the response "works" either via habitual skilled continuing responses or via relief of panic following a quest for the missing act. This is because of its simplified end of reducing the absence of the addictive object and act. If and when such an addiction is captured by a nuclear script so that the addictive act (of smoking, eating, or drinking) becomes *instrumental* to dealing with either the nuclear scene or nuclear scripts, it loses its efficacy as a habitual skill *or* as dealing simply with the absence of the missing object, and is *overloaded* with attempted sedation of what is both very magnified and perceived to be essentially insoluble. This results in increasing the frequency and intensity of the attempted solution such that there is an addition of nuclear affect to what would otherwise either have been a habitual skilled act or a temporary addictive panic effectively reduced by the addictive act. Therefore, such a captured addiction will result in orgies of compulsive bottoming out in the hopeless attempt to sedate what cannot be sedated (as in eating more than one wants, in fighting till one is beaten into unconsciousness, in drinking into stupor, or in endless masturbation).

A nuclear script is more unrelenting in its demandingness, and so when it captures an addicted drinker he is much more likely to drink to unconsciousness than in the case of a nonnuclear addicted drinker. The same act will be more *relentlessly repeated* because it is aiming at more than reduction of addictive affect.

Such capture of an addiction by a nuclear script may be continual or intermittent (depending on the waxing and waning of threatening analogs) or preaddictive conditional, which requires the addictive act under very specific, fixed scenes.

In the first case (*continual*), the individual *superimposes* the nuclear burden on all the addictive responses reducing radically the effectiveness of the habitual skilled addictive response. In the second case (*intermittent*), a *massing* of nuclear scene analogs may seize upon the addictive act as vehicle for sadomasochistic desperation and oblivion. In the third case (*conditional*), it may be only when, e.g., positive longing for the reparative nuclear scene is magnified that eating or drinking may be coopted for a symbolic attempt to recover the lost good scene, leading to excessive eating or drinking, not in a sadomasochistic manner but in a symbolic reparative quest for oceanic fusion. Such behavior may be indistinguishable from sadomasochistic overloading to oblivion, despite radical differences in aim. Further, one may lead into the other, changing a perceived hope of oceanic fusion into massive analogs of nuclear desperation, or changing sadomasochistic nuclear addictive compulsions into positive longing for the good nuclear scene. These are possible because of the inherent connectedness of nuclear scenes and scripts.

The ever-growing family of nuclear scripts and subscripts guarantees a growing variety of challenges, successes (partial and temporary) and failures, as replays of the nuclear scene as well as new types of failures. This occurs in part because the possible relationships between all of these scripts create new problems, new barriers, new conflicts, and new ambiguities.

There continue to be a sufficient number of positive antianalogs to maintain the family of nuclear scripts and to preserve the bifurcation of good and bad scenes, the possibility of partial and temporary reversal, and the impossibility of total and enduring reversal.

Thus, he learns the overall lesson that his defensive scripts permit him to run but that he cannot hide. His counteractive scripts permit him to win battles, but not the war. His reparative scripts permit him to see the promised land, but not to live in it.

Although he may achieve deep victories, privileged sanctuaries, and oceanic communions and reunions these antianalogs remain tragically fragile for a variety of reasons.

First is insatiable greed. The deeper the reward the more he craves, the longer he hugs it to his bosom. He tries in every way to hoard the transient

and secure its permanent possession. He envisions not only more, but better, and undermines his security, his victories, and his love by testing for possible flaws. He seeks continually to increase his power to repeat and to extend the good scenes attained. He is also acutely aware of the *incompleteness* of his good scenes just because they are partitioned. Thus, perfect security is *not* victory, nor reparation. Victory is not security, and it is not reparation. Reparation is his deepest wish, but it leaves unfulfilled his need for safety and his need to avenge his defeats.

Further, each general type of nuclear subscript is further partitioned, and so even reparation may leave unfulfilled another reparative script calling for the other to express regret and atonement for past sins, and for promises never again to sin.

The victory of revenge does not necessarily constitute a victory of demonstrated superiority over the other, and neither of these necessarily constitute a demonstration of identity with the other.

The victory of security against intrusion by introversive hiding is not necessarily a victory against imagined rejection or criticism by the other, nor necessarily a victory against overcontrol and engulfment by the other, nor necessarily a victory over the others' occasional indifference.

Finally, attained rewards are inevitably vulnerable to attenuation through habituation. The moment of perfect security, the moment of glory in victory, the moment of ecstatic rapture in communion will fade in intensity, and be transformed not to a regret, but to a major replay of the nuclear scene as analog invades antianalog. Thus, the departing guest characteristically plunges Sculptor into the deep depression of reexperienced abandonment, not simply as an analog of the good scene turned bad, but because the vivid sense of the other's rewarding presence ultimately becomes weaker and the absence of the image becomes a bad scene.

If Sculptor's rewards are fragile to analog formation, his several partitioned scripted attempts to reach such rewards are more fragile still. First, are serious conflicts inherent in his partitioned aims. He cannot at the same time woo the other, fight with the other, and hide from the other without defeating all of these aims, and plunging himself into new scenes as punishing as the nuclear scene these scenes attempted to reverse. He cannot exhibit his sculpture and hoard and hide it at the same time.

In the case of the nuclear script of Sculptor, production and hoarding of a beautiful artistic object is the major chosen and self-validating antidote to loss and emptiness. This individual not only becomes his own creative mother, creating both himself and a sibling who contaminated his exclusive possession of his mother, but also in recasting the scene, turns away from the mother, making *her* suffer loss as he had suffered loss at her hands. So long as he can create he does not need her. To the extent to which he seeks more

than revenge and safety, he is prompted to seek a more idealized version of his original relationship in which he is still the beloved child. He can do this by exhibiting himself through his created objects. In the evocation of love and appreciation from an audience which bestows upon him the sense that he is valued passionately and exclusively, he would succeed in his long-deferred quest. But that script first of all violates the introversive hoarding script by surrendering his exclusive possession of the substitute mother, as though he were to share a security blanket whose great charm had been his exclusive control over it. To exhibit his sculpture is also to give it away and thus lose it. So also, Picasso held on to many of his paintings—Hemingway held on to many of his stories. Freud cherished his Robinson Crusoe island isolation because, as he expressed it, he did not have to publish and worry about priority.

But going public with the created internal hoard threatens another kind of reexposure to the nuclear scene, in the possibility that the exhibited product will evoke contempt or even worse, indifference, or interest that is too moderate, or, if intense, too transient. Should this happen he is entirely lost, since he has squandered his hoard, and it has proven to be valueless, so that now the tragedy of the original nuclear loss is deepened because of the *proven* inauthenticity of his ineffective and illusory pretensions to coping with the nuclear scene, by being as creative as his mother.

Because of his dread intuition of these possibilities, the life of the nuclear creative artist or scientist, most notably in the case of Leonardo da Vinci, is tortured by ambivalence and indecision about completion and exhibition of his most cherished products. The classic consequence is that completion and exhibition are at best partial, withholding both effort and products so that there is always a fall-back position if there appears too much risk.

Sculptor is further troubled by conflict inherent in the differentiation within each partitioned script. If he hides, *and* continually monitors his security, *and* further tests the adequacy of his refuge, he will be unable to enjoy the security he actually possesses.

If he fights with the other, tries to be just like him and also to defeat him and to make him envious of the self, these several simultaneous attempts cannot but diminish their effectiveness, and his whole-hearted commitment to them.

If he attempts to woo the other, but also to extort a confession of regret and a promise never again to offend, these conflict and overload the reparative script.

Finally, his partitioned scripts are vulnerable to the frequent unwillingness of others to play their assigned roles.

His hiding may be frustrated by intrusive others, by demanding others, by hostile others.

His counteraction may be frustrated by his adversaries, by invidious comparisons, by rejection, by indifference, by obsolescence of his products.

His reparation may be frustrated by rejection, by indifference, by lability of affect, by hostility, by criticisms and by rivalries.

All of these may in varying degrees be real or imagined as analogs.

REFERENCES

- Bruner, J. (1968). *Processes of cognitive growth: Infancy*. Worcester: Clark University Press.
- Carlson, R. (1981). Studies in script theory: I. Adult analogs of a childhood nuclear scene. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 501-510.
- Darwin, C. (1965). *The expression of the emotions in man and animals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ekman, P., Friesen, W. V., & Ellsworth, P. (1972). *Emotion in the human face: Guidelines for research and an integration of findings*. New York: Pergamon.
- Gombrich, E. H. J. (1960). *Art and illusion*. New York: Pantheon Press.
- Hertz, R. (1973). The pre-eminence of the right hand: A study in religious polarity. In R. Needham (Ed.), *Right and left*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Horn, D., & Waingrow, S. (1966, April). *Behavior and attitudes questionnaire*. Bethesda, MD: National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health.
- Ikard, F., & Tomkins, S. (1973). The experience of affect as a determinant of smoking behavior: A series of validity studies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 81, 172-181.
- Lewis, O. (1961). *The children of Sanchez*. New York: Random House.
- Miller, P. (1961). *The New England mind: The seventeenth century*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Needham, R. (1973). Right and left in Nyono Symbolic Classification. In R. Needham (Ed.), *Right and left*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rustow, A. (1980). *Freedom and domination*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sanday, P. R. (1981). *Female power and male dominance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tacitus (1901). *Germania 14.4* (revised translation). London: Oxford.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1962). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. I. The positive affects*. New York: Springer.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1963a). *Affect, imagery, consciousness: Vol. II. The negative affects*. New York: Springer.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1963b). The right and the left: A basic dimension of ideology and personality. In R. W. White (Ed.), *The study of lives*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1965). The psychology of commitment. Part I. The constructive role of violence and suffering for the individual and for his society. In S. S. Tomkins & C. Izard (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and personality*. New York: Springer.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1975). The phantasy behind the face. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39, 550-562.

- Tomkins, S. S. (1979). Script theory: Differential magnification of affects. In H. E. Howe, Jr. & R. A. Dienstbier (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Vol. 26)*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1981a). The quest for primary motives: Biography and autobiography of an idea. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *41*, 306-329.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1981b). The rise, fall and resurrection of the study of personality. *Journal of Mind and Behavior*, *2*, 443-452.
- Tomkins, S. S. (1982). Affect theory. In P. Ekman, W. V. Friesen, & P. Ellsworth (Eds.), *Emotion in the human face* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomkins, S. S., & McCarter (1964). What and where are the primary affects? Some evidence for a theory. *Perceptual and motor skills*, *18*, 119-158.
- Tomkins, S. S., & Miner, J. B. (1956). *The Tomkins-Horn Picture Arrangement Test*. New York: Springer.
- Vasquez, J. (1975). *The face and ideology*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.