

The diagram illustrates the 'Field Concept' in psychology, showing the relationship between various components within a psychological field. At the top, the word 'FIELD' is written in large, bold, capital letters. Below it, a large rectangle represents the 'Field'. Inside this field, there are several nested rectangles and boxes. On the left side of the field, there is a box labeled 'Investigator'. To its right, a dashed line with arrows at both ends is labeled 'Media'. In the center of the field, there is a box labeled 'Organism' containing a box labeled 'Response Function'. Below the 'Organism' box is a box labeled 'Stimulus Object' containing a box labeled 'Stimulus Function'. A double-headed vertical arrow connects the 'Response Function' box and the 'Stimulus Function' box. To the left of the 'Organism' and 'Stimulus Object' boxes, the word 'Setting' is written vertically. To the right of these boxes, the word 'Factors' is written vertically. Above the 'Organism' box, the word 'Preceding Segment' is written. Below the 'Stimulus Object' box, the word 'Succeeding Segment' is written. On the far left, outside the main field, is a box labeled 'Preceding Event'. On the far right, outside the main field, is a box labeled 'Succeeding Event'. The entire diagram is enclosed in a large rectangle with a dashed border.

PUBLISHED AT HARTWICK COLLEGE  
ONEONTA, NEW YORK

Winter 1981

Kurt Goldstein, 1939. The organism.  
New York: American Book Company, p. 121.

# THE INTERBEHAVIORIST

## Editor:

Ronald G. Heyduk, Hartwick College

## Associate Editors:

Donna M. Cone, Department of Mental Health, Retardation,  
and Hospitals, State of Rhode Island  
Dennis J. Delprato, Eastern Michigan University  
Edward K. Morris, University of Kansas  
Paul T. Mountjoy, Western Michigan University  
Noel W. Smith, State University of New York, Plattsburgh

## The Agora

For the second consecutive year, the meeting of the Association for Behavior Analysis has provided a forum for interbehavioral psychology. Following is the program for an invited symposium at this year's meeting:

### The Relevance of Interbehavioral Psychology

#### for Behavioral Research

Edward K. Morris, Chair

- Paper 1. Edward K. Morris, Stephen T. Higgins, and Warren K. Bickel (Department of Human Development, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045; 913-864-4840), "The Influence of Kantor's Interbehavioral Psychology on Behavior Analysis."
- Paper 2. James W. McKearney (The Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Shrewsbury, Mass. 01545; 617-842-8921, Ext. 322), "Organism-Environment Relations in the Analysis of Behavior."
- Paper 3. Sidney W. Bijou (Department of Special Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721; 602-626-3214), "Child Development and Interbehavioral Psychology."
- Paper 4. Donna M. Cone (Department of Mental Health, Retardation, and Hospitals, 600 New London Ave., Cranston, R.I. 02920; 401-464-1000), "Behavioral Applications: Complexity of the True State of Affairs."

Discussant: Paul T. Mountjoy (Department of Psychology, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008; 616-383-6246).

Edward Morris provided some comments on the paper that he co-authored:

My paper with Higgins and Bickel is based, in part, on a

giant questionnaire survey (shades of G.S. Hall) to all present and past editors of JEAB, JABA, and Behaviorism. It asks about their acquaintance with interbehavioral psychology and their estimates of it on several dimensions...The return rate has been good, and some of the answers interesting, ranging from the laudatory to the very critical.

A copy of the questionnaire that Morris et al used may be obtained from the editor.

\* \* \*

In the last issue of The Interbehaviorist the editor made some predictions and recommendations about the future of interbehavioral psychology. One response that was received was especially thoughtful, eloquent, and challenging. It appears below.

### A Challenge to the Interbehaviorists

Michael H. MacRoberts  
740 Columbia  
Shreveport, LA 71104

Dr. Heyduk has asked for comments on his editorial in The Interbehaviorist (Vol. 10, No. 2). Here are mine.

Since I began studying Kantor's writings some five years ago, I have been struck by the fact that interbehaviorism is almost unknown within psychology and completely unknown outside it. N. Smith's annotated list of citations to Kantor's work is enough to convince anyone of this. The question I have asked myself is: why is interbehaviorism unknown? I suspect that the answer is that most psychologists have never come into contact with it and that most of those who have, have rejected it because it seemingly "empties" the organism, and as Kantor has shown, an "empty" organism is of no interest to most psychologists.

There now exists a second generation of interbehaviorists. This handful of scholars obviously considers Kantor's work revolutionary and important, but they seem to be neither prolific nor especially concerned with spearheading a revolution. Let me underline this point by referring to the closing paragraph of Dr. Heyduk's editorial, the message of which seems clear. Instead of proselytizing, interbehaviorists appear to be willing to let psychology slowly and falteringly evolve toward their own position. It is the passivity of this editorial that caught my attention. It is as if interbehaviorism had its Darwin but lacked its Huxley.

But let me expand my comment. The motive power behind scientific evolution is the constant pressure put on current theory by individuals who have discovered new facts or who have reevaluated the status of current theory. Without this pressure, science would not evolve; it would drift-or worse, stagnate and degenerate. Passivity is ab-

normal or contrary to normal science where, in all ages, men with novel ideas have fought to get these ideas before their colleagues. If interbehaviorists feel that they have a contribution to make then they have the obligation as scientists to challenge psychology and to change it either by deflecting its course or by speeding it up.

My suggestion therefore is that an active, not a passive, program be initiated. I suggest that what the second generation leaders of interbehaviorism ought to do is essentially what the American Realists did in 1910. Finding themselves in philosophical disagreement with the reigning paradigm, Holt, Marvin, Montagu, Perry, Pitkin, and Spaulding co-authored "A Program and First Platform of Six Realists" and a year later The New Realists. No one could miss the challenge of these two polemics.

I would propose that five or more interbehaviorists begin by co-authoring a paper entitled something like "The Interbehaviorist Manifesto" and publish it in a major psychology journal. The reason for co-authoring is tactical. By doing so, it should be clear that interbehaviorism is a movement with a well-defined and agreed-upon platform, not the aberration of an eccentric singleton. While the content of the article would have to be negotiated among the authors, I would suggest that it focus on three main things: the conceptual nervous system (mentalism), physiological reductionism, and self-action. The remainder of the interbehavioral system follows once the traditional CNS is discarded. The interactional, adjustmental, and developmental aspects of interbehaviorism should be emphasized as should the advantages of interbehaviorism over other systems. I would suggest a polemical style and I would include a selected bibliography.

I would further suggest that the principal author be an interbehaviorist who is in the main stream of things and that he produce the first draft, which he would then send to those colleagues who have agreed to be co-authors. These individuals would then carefully comment on the paper and return it to the principal author. He would then rewrite and send his co-authors this revised draft for further comment. The senior author would then be responsible for the final draft and submitting it. Individual differences of opinion should not be allowed to overshadow the group effort.

Once this is accomplished (or while it is being done) I would suggest that the same group begin writing a book entitled something provocative like Interbehaviorism: The New Psychology. The purpose of the book would be to follow up in greater detail the points made in the article. Each contributor would write a chapter or two, again in polemical style, with the intention of putting the current state of psychology into historical perspective. Each chapter would explain the interbehavioral system and its advantages over rival systems. This book would contain chapters on history of psychology, the CNS, perception,

language, drive, self-action, and so on. Some of the chapters that were intended for the N. Smith edited Paths in Psychology are of the type I have in mind.

The aim of these exercises of course is to bring interbehaviorism to the attention of other psychologists. Any negative reaction would be followed by counterattack. But, and here is where the interbehaviorist has the advantage: any attackers will be obliged by the rules of thorough scholarship to familiarize themselves with the interbehavioral literature. This is the real aim, for I believe that no one can become familiar with interbehaviorism without some benefit to his own thinking, and no one who is already on the path to rejecting self-action, reductionism, and mentalism can fail to see the import of Kantor's work.

Consequently, while psychology may be evolving toward an interbehaviorist position, I see no reason why interbehaviorists should take only a supporting role in this evolution when they are already intellectual principals. I see no reason not to "convert" those with similar ideas nor why a revolution can not and should not come about under the banner of "interbehaviorism".

\* \* \*

MacRoberts made a few additional comments in a letter enclosed with his reaction that I believe are worth sharing:

Of course, being an outsider to psychology, I can't really tell what its status actually is, but from my peripheral position, I can see nothing approximating Kantor's position (taken as a whole). I can see bits and pieces of it or something resembling it in psychology, ethology, anthropology, and philosophy, e.g., here we have a philosopher making "interbehaviorist" noises about perception, and there an anthropologist who has discovered that "culture" is related to the environment, but what I don't find is a complete program: just bits and pieces. (I can even find bits and pieces in Abelard, St. Thomas, Ockham and others as well). My sidelines view of psychology and the place of interbehaviorism in it may have led me to a distorted view but then again, maybe it has not. This is for you as insider to decide.

\* \* \*

A Reply to MacRoberts' Challenge to  
the Interbehaviorists

Ronald G. Heyduk  
Hartwick College

In MacRoberts' response to my editorial, he suggests that we disagree about the proper role for interbehaviorists in the promotion of interbehavioral assumptions in psychology. I believe that while there are points of disagreement between us, they are somewhat different (and less

severe) than he suggests. MacRoberts characterizes my position as "passive", whereas he suggests that interbehaviorists must take a more active part in encouraging an interbehavioral psychology. I have no quarrel with his suggestion: in fact, I intended my editorial to be a call for activity, not passivity. It is with regard to the kind of actions that interbehaviorists should be engaging in that there is a disagreement - but even then our disagreement is only partial.

MacRoberts argues compellingly that scientists whose views clash with the dominant paradigm in their field have a duty to challenge that paradigm, and that an aggressive, polemical posture is needed to mount a serious challenge. His position is sound. Like any scientists who disagree with the mainstream of their discipline, interbehaviorists must be willing to argue fervently with those psychologists who give aid and comfort to our intellectual arch-enemies mentalism, reductionism, and self-actionalism. Certainly this newsletter has been a forum for such polemics, and it will continue to be (e.g., see N. Smith's response to Florence Denmark's A.P.A. Presidential Address in the next issue). MacRoberts' proposals for a polemical "Interbehaviorist Manifesto" in a major journal and a follow-up book are also attractive, and I did not intend by my editorial to discourage such activity. In summary, I agree with MacRoberts that it is desirable (and our duty as scientists) to engage in confrontation politics with those whose views are in conflict with our own.

It is in regard to how to relate to our intellectual kin--psychologists like Atkinson, Cassell, Schafer (see paper by Delprato in the next issue), and others who may not know of interbehaviorism but whose work reflects some of its premises--that MacRoberts and I may disagree. MacRoberts takes issue with my statement that our goal ought not to be to "convert" those with similar ideas to interbehaviorism. If in suggesting that conversion ought to be our goal he is recommending that we deal with our potential allies in the same fashion as our enemies, then I respectfully disagree. An aggressive, polemical style is not, I believe, the most productive mode of interaction with those who share at least some common assumptions with us. In my view, interbehaviorists have been too inclined to build barriers and too little inclined to build bridges between themselves and their intellectual neighbors, and an intellectual isolationism has resulted. By promoting mutual understanding through emphasizing points of agreement with those who, in MacRoberts' words, are "already on the path to rejecting self-action, reductionism, and mentalism", we may in fact "convert" them to Kantorian interbehaviorism, for the virtues of Kantor's systematic approach should be evident. But we must be prepared to learn as well as teach and that means we must be receptive to intellectual alliances involving some modifications of our own positions.

So, then, let us continue and even escalate our attacks against mainstream psychology, let us write our "interbehaviorist Manifesto"--and if an interbehavioral revolution takes

place, so much the better for psychology. But if, as seems likely, an evolution and not a revolution is the means whereby psychology sheds its mentalism, reductionism and self-actionalism, let us be a part of that evolution, even if we must lose our identity as interbehaviorists in the process.

\* \* \*

Noel Smith has provided a copy of the bibliography originally intended for the volume of original interbehavioral papers that did not find a publisher. It will appear in The Interbehaviorist in segments in this and forthcoming issues:

#### A Selected and Classified Bibliography of Interbehavioral Works

##### 1. POSTULATES OF THE SYSTEM AND POSTULATION

- 1.1 Kantor, J.R. Interbehavioral psychology: A sample of scientific system construction. Bloomington, Ind.: Principia Press, 1959.
- 1.2 Kantor, J.R. & Smith, N.W. Chp. 25: Psychology as systematic science. The science of psychology: An Interbehavioral Survey. Chicago: Principia Press, 1975.
- 1.3 Lichtenstein, P.E. Psychological systems: Their nature and function. Psychological Record, 1967, 17, 321-340.
- 1.4 Stephenson, W. Postulates of behaviorism. Philosophy of Science, 1953, 20, 110-120.

##### 2. THE SYSTEM AND ITS UTILIZATION

- 2.1 Bijou, S.W. Development in the preschool years: A functional analysis. American Psychologist, 1975, 30, 829-837.
- 2.2 Bucklew, J. Complex behavioral units of the reactional biography. Psychological Record, 1956, 6, 44-47.
- 2.3 Carter, J.W. A case of reactional dissociation. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1937, 7, 219-224.
- 2.4 Delprato, D.J. The reactional biography concept: Early contributions to a perspective for the psychology of aging. Human Development, 1980, 23, 314-322.
- 2.5 Herman, D.T. What is the stimulus? Psychological Record, 1957, 7, 70-72.

- 2.6 Herman, D.T. & Kenyon, G.T. A contribution toward interbehavioral analysis: I. Some general concepts. Psychological Record, 1956, 6, 33-36.
- 2.7 Kantor, J.R. Chp. 1: The domain, method, and development of psychology; Chp. 2: The primary data of psychology; Chp. 14: The nature of volitional conduct. Principles of Psychology, Vol. 1. New York: Knopf, 1924.
- 2.8 Lichtenstein, P.E. Psychology as a genetic science. Journal of General Psychology, 1950, 42, 313-332.
- 2.9 Lichtenstein, P.E. The significance of the stimulus function. Interbehavioral Psychology Newsletter, 1970, 1 (1).
- 2.10 Lundin, R.W. An objective psychology of music, rev. ed. Ronald, 1967.
- 2.11 MacRoberts, M.H. & MacRoberts, B.R. Interbehaviorism and animal communication theory. The Interbehaviorist, 1979-80, 9, 4-11.
- 2.12 Mountjoy, P.T. Science in psychology: J.R. Kantor's field theory. Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis, 1976, 2, 3-21.
- 2.13 Observer. Psychology in the service of mankind. Psychological Record, 1979, 29, 419-422.
- 2.14 Pronko, N.H. Textbook of abnormal psychology. Williams & Wilkins, 1963.
- 2.15 Ratner, S.C. Three questions about experimental extinction. Psychological Record, 1956, 6, 9-10.
- 2.16 Ratner, S.C. The search for learning and memory mechanisms. In W.C. Corning & S.C. Ratner (Eds.), Chemistry of learning: Invertebrate research. Plenum Press, 1967.
- 2.17 Ray, R.D. Physiological experiments as interbehavioral systems: A case study from the Soviet Union. Psychological Record, 1977, 2, 279-306.
- 2.18 Ray, R.D. & Brown, D.A. A systems approach to behavior. Psychological Record, 1975, 25, 459-478.
- 2.19 Sanders, S.L. & Cone, D.M. A critique of Kohlberg's theory of moral development from the viewpoint of interbehavioral psychology. Interbehavioral Quarterly, 1975, 6(2), 8-23.
- 2.20 Smith, N.W. Interbehavioral psychology: Roots and Branches. Psychological Record, 1973, 23, 153-167.

- 2.21 Smith, N.W. Interbehavioral Psychology. International Encyclopedia of Psychiatry, Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and Neurology, Vol. 6, 125-126. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1977.
  - 2.22 Smith, N.W. & Shaw, N.E. An analysis of commonplace behaviors: Volitional acts. Psychological Record, 1979, 29, 179-186.
  - 2.23 Stephenson, W.S. The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. University of Chicago, 1953.
  - 2.24 Zimmerman, D.W. Quantum theory and interbehavioral psychology. Psychological Record, 1979, 29, 473-485.
3. EVALUATION OF THE SYSTEM
- 3.1 Bentley, A.F. Chp. 12: The apprehensional space-segment: Kantor; Behavior, Knowledge, Fact. Bloomington, Ind.: Principia Press, 1935.
  - 3.2 Blumenthal, A.L. Language and psychology: Historical aspects of psycholinguistics. New York: Wiley, 1970.
  - 3.3 Carter, J.W. An experimental study of the stimulus-function. Psychological Record, 1937, 1, 35-48.
  - 3.4 Carter, J.W. An experimental study of psychological stimulus-response. Psychological Record, 1938, 2, 35-91.
  - 3.5 Dewey, J. & A.F. Bentley, Chp. 8: Logic in an age of science; Knowing and the known. Boston: Beacon Press, 1949.
  - 3.6 Farrington, J. Utilization of psychological constructs by group therapy participants. Psychological Record, 1972, 22, 387-394.
  - 3.7 Farrington, J. Some advantages of interbehaviorism. Interbehavioral Quarterly, 1975, 6(3), 9-10.
  - 3.8 Gewirtz, J.L. Deprivation and satiation of social stimuli as determinants of their reinforcing efficacy. In J.P. Hill (Ed.), Minnesota symposium on child psychology, Vol. 1. University of Minnesota Press, 1967.
  - 3.9 Herman, D.T. & Engstrand, R. Order effect in problem solving. Psychological Reports, 1957, 3, 623-626.
  - 3.10 Herrick, J.W. Kantor's anticipation of current approaches in anthropology. Psychological Record, 1974, 24, 253-257.

- 3.11 Heyduk, R.G. Cracks in the "billiard ball" organism. Interbehavioral Newsletter, 1970, 1(3).
- 3.12 Lazar, J.W. A comparison of some theoretical proposals of J.R. Kantor and T.C. Schneirla. Psychological Record, 1974, 24, 177-190.
- 3.13 Lazzeroni, V. Il Compartimento Organismico di E. (sic) Kantor; Le origine della Psicologia Contemporanea. Florence, Italy: Editrice Universitaria, 1956.
- 3.14 Lundin, R.W. Chp. 13: Later behaviorism; Theories and systems of psychology. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1972.
- 3.15 Marx, M. & Hillix, W.A. Chp. 11: Varieties of field theory. Systems and theories in psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- 3.16 Mountjoy, P.T. Science in psychology: J.R. Kantor's Field Theory. Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis, 1976, 2, 3-21.
- 3.17 Mountjoy, P.T. & Smith, N.W. A reply to Thornton's "Socrates and the history of psychology." Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 1971, 7, 183-186.
- 3.18 Neu, D.M. A critical review of the literature on "absolute pitch". Psychological Bulletin, 1942, 44, 249-266.
- 3.19 Poyer, G. Review of "Association as a fundamental process of objective psychology," Psychological Review, 1921, 28, 482-483. In L'Annee Psychologie, 1922, 23, 482-483.
- 3.20 Pronko, N.H. Language and psychological linguistics: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 1946, 43, 189-239.
- 3.21 Pronko, N.H.; Ebert, R.; & Greenberg, G. A critical review of theories perception. In A.L. Kidd & J.L. Rivoire (Eds.), Perceptual development in children. New York: International Universities, 1966.
- 3.22 Robinson, E.S. Review of Principles of Psychology, Vol. 1, International Journal of Ethics, 1924-25, 35, 429-432.
- 3.23 Ruch, G.M. Review of Principles of Psychology, Vol. 1. Journal of Philosophy, 1926, 23, 248-249.
- 3.24 Smith, N.W. (Chm. & Orgz.). Contextual interactionists: A symposium. Psychological Record, 1973, 23, 281-334.

- 3.25 Smith, N.W. The works of J.R. Kantor: Pioneer in scientific psychology. Mexican Journal of Behavior Analysis, 1976, 2, 137-148.
  - 3.26 Tilquin, B.A. Book 2, Pt. 2, Chp. 1: Behaviorisme et biology: La psychologie organique de Kantor; Le behaviorisms origine et developpement de la psychologie de reaction en Amerique. Paris: Librairie Philosophique, 1950. Trans. by N. Weissinger & L. Leduc, Interbehavioral Quarterly, 1976-77, 7(1,2), 4-11, 3-12.
  - 3.27 Wolf, I.S. Stimulus variables in aphasia: I. Setting conditions. Journal of the Scientific Laboratories Denison University, 1958, 44, 203-218.
  - 3.28 Wolf, I.S. Stimulus variables in aphasia: II. Stimulus objects. Denison University, 1958, 44, 218-228.
  - 3.29 Woodworth, R.S. Chp. 7: Hormic and holistic psychologies; Contemporary schools of psychology, rev. ed. New York: Ronald Press, 1948.
4. THE ROLE OF THE NERVOUS SYSTEM
- 4.1 Delprato, D.J. The interbehavioral alternative to brain-dogma. Psychological Record, 1979, 29, 409-418.
  - 4.2 Kantor, J.R. The nervous system: Psychological fact or fiction? Journal of Philosophy, 1922, 19, 38-49.
  - 4.3 Kantor, J.R. The organismic versus the mentalistic attitude toward the nervous system. Psychological Bulletin, 1923, 20, 684-692.
  - 4.4 Kantor, J.R. Problems of physiological psychology. Bloomington, Ind.: Principia Press, 1947.
  - 4.5 Observer. On the reduction of psychology to physics. Psychological Record, 1969, 19, 515-518.
  - 4.6 Observer. The basis fallacy in psychology. Psychological Record, 1969, 19, 645-648.
  - 4.7 Observer. Disunity in science: Inconcinnity in psychology. Psychological Record, 1971, 21, 565-569.
  - 4.8 H.C. Warren. Psychology and the central nervous system. Psychological Review, 1921, 28, 249-269.
  - 4.9 H.C. Warren. Neurology: Mystical and magical. Psychological Bulletin, 1923, 20, 438-44.
  - 4.10 Warren, H.C. Reply to Dr. Kantor. Psychological Bulletin, 1923, 20, 633-694.