

Shrink Rap Radio #140, February 29, 2008. Adventures in Jungian Typology

Dr. David Van Nuys, aka “Dr. Dave” interviews Dr. John Beebe
(transcribed from www.ShrinkRapRadio.com by Jo Kelly)

Excerpt: *“Jung simply felt that the attempt to try to impose a model of the mind on the psyche was exactly what it didn’t need. What it needed was this kind of empathic understanding which would start with the premise that not everyone uses the mind in the same way. So it seems to me that that was the true origin of psychological types and then explaining the differences between himself and Freud and Adler was almost secondary to this being a true assertion of what he felt psychology itself should be.”*

Introduction: John Beebe, M.D., is a Jungian analyst in practice in San Francisco. He received degrees from Harvard College and the University of Chicago medical school. He is a past President of the C.G. Jung Institute of San Francisco, where he is currently on the teaching faculty, as well as Assistant Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the University of California Medical School, San Francisco. He is a Distinguished Fellow of the American Psychiatric Association.

A popular lecturer in the Jungian world, Dr. Beebe has spoken on topics related to the theory and practical applications of analytical psychology to professional and lay audiences throughout the United States as well as in Canada, China, Denmark, England, France, Italy, Germany, Israel, Mexico, and Switzerland. Dr. Beebe is the Founding Editor of The San Francisco Jung Institute Library Journal.

Dr. Dave: Dr. John Beebe, welcome to Shrink Rap Radio.

Beebe: Hello

Dr. Dave: I’m really pleased to have you here today. Actually I got the idea for doing this interview because I heard from a listener that they would like to hear something about Jung’s typology and I know that one of your specialties is Jung’s theory of types.

Beebe: That’s right.

Dr. Dave: But before we get into that, I’d like to start out with a little on your background as a Jungian analyst. How did you first discover Jung?

Beebe: It happened really quite early.

Dr. Dave: When you say quite early, how old would you have been at that time?

Beebe: I was 18 years old.

Dr. Dave: Oh that is early.

Beebe: Yes. I was an undergraduate at Harvard, and actually my first exposure to Jung was between age 17 and 18 during my freshman year. I took a course - in those days Harvard was very much pushing what was then called “general education” - so one had as a freshman to take courses in natural sciences, in the humanities and in social sciences. And the course in social sciences was taught by Clyde Kluckhohn and Henry Murray, and Henry Murray is the man who created a very famous test called the Thematic Apperception Test where people show various pictures ...

Dr. Dave: Sure, the TAT as it’s known.

Beebe: Yes the TAT; and then people read the implied story. And it’s actually in many ways quite a Jungian test. It was developed by Henry Murray and Christiana Morgan who were both patients of Jung. Now he didn’t talk about that in his course, but he was extremely unusual for the Academy in that period in talking about Jung.

Now I was a freshman at Harvard between the years of 1956 and 1957 and those were years when psychoanalysis and ego psychology were very much strongly dominant. Erik Erikson had written his great book on Childhood and Society in 1950 and that too had a Jungian bent, but no-one knew it. They thought of it as a psychoanalytic book. One English critic said it was “somewhat Jungian”. But Jung as a name was not in good odour.

We were only eleven years after World War II and there was a lot of perception that Jung was anti-Semitic and had somehow, at least rhetorically, supported some aspects of Naziism. So he was – we didn’t have that word then, but he was certainly politically - we wouldn’t have said incorrect, but in those days we had U and non-U. It was even before in and out. We had U and non-U in those years, and he was definitely non-U. In other words you could say not upper class, or in the intellectual world, or maybe even better: non-university. The universities didn’t like Jung.

So there was Henry Murray rather openly talking about Jung and actually assigning us *Modern Man in Search of his Soul*; so that was quite an eye opener. The other teacher Clyde Kluckhohn was a very famous anthropologist and he had us reading *Childhood Society*. So from a very early time I had a kind of sense of a development that lasts a whole life long. I had a sense that dreams were important and I had a sense that maybe Jung was OK. Maybe there was something good there, which was not the way everybody else was talking about him at the beginning.

Dr. Dave: Do you remember what it was that grabbed you as you read that first work by Jung? Was it that longitudinal view of life? Do you recall what it was that kind of really connected for you?

Beebe: I think in those days I was very much what Erikson was talking about: a young man preoccupied with finding himself. I think I kind of loved the idea that there was a true self somewhere. I think that was the idea that was really exciting me; the idea that there was a way to be precisely yourself. That somehow probably caught me. None of this however happened in any kind of conscious way in which I suddenly claimed myself as a Jungian, that's not the way my nature goes. It's just that my ears were perked up and my interest was aroused.

That very first summer after my freshman year, I'd made a friend in my natural science class whose mother was a writer. That interested me a great deal because I was in those days majoring in English and thinking that I was going to be a novelist. So here was a friend at Harvard - and so many of the undergraduates have parents who are rather famous and I used to tick off the numbers of people that I was in classes with whose parents were well known; like Lena Horn's daughter and Elia Kazan's son and that kind of thing. And so this woman, Nancy Hale, was not a celebrity at quite that level, but she did hold the record for publishing the most stories in *The New Yorker* in one year. She published 17 stories in one year in the mid 50's.

Dr. Dave: Wow. That is impressive.

Beebe: She was pretty well known, named Nancy Hale, so I was so eager to meet her. So I spent a summer in Cape Anne, Massachusetts which is where Nancy Hale and her mother, who was a painter, kept a house. And this friend of mine and I went to stay for a while and then I got a place of my own to live and got a job working in a restaurant and stayed that summer. My real interest was in talking to her about what it was like to be a writer. She was 50 then and I was 18. But what she couldn't stop talking

about was her Jungian analysis with Beatrice Hinkle, who was the first Jungian analyst in America and who translated Jung's book *The Psychology of the Unconscious*. And so she just filled me with all kinds of things about writing her dreams down every day; what has it meant to her to try to live for other people; and then breaking down in that process and having to really listen to who she was. And so I got a very practical sense very early of what it was to be in Jungian analysis.

Next thing I knew I went back to Harvard and in the next year I saw signs saying "Help a Child who is Mentally Ill", and I started working as a volunteer at the Children's Unit at the Metropolitan State Hospital in Waltham Massachusetts not very far from the Waltham Pond. Volunteers got a certain amount of in service training. One person who talked to us every week was also volunteering, working with a retarded child, and that was Robert Coles who later became rather famous, as you know, writing about children and their vicissitudes in various social situations; and he was at that time a psychiatric resident. So that turned me on so much that by the end of the year I suddenly realised that I wanted to be a psychiatrist.

So I was sorely troubled and I went and talked to my friend Nancy Hale. It was on my 19th birthday and I went and I took a train ride from Boston to Rockport Massachusetts, and went to see her at that beautiful house overlooking the rocks leading into Cape Anne. And I told her that I thought I wanted to be a doctor, and she said "well, you know if you are going to be a doctor you can't be a writer – it's one or the other in terms of what your primary thing is" and I said well I hope that I can write something, and she said "well, yes psychiatrists write wonderful books but it's not the same as being a full time writer. You'll be a full time doctor and it's a very self sacrificing life." She said "you know my old beau, in my teens, I had a beau who later became a psychiatrist and he worked so hard that he got tuberculosis, and he's out in San Francisco now and I don't know what he's doing." And that turned out to be Joe Wheelwright who founded the Jung Institute of San Francisco.

We're sitting in Massachusetts and I've just discovered I want to be a psychiatrist, and she is talking about the man who founded the C.G. Jung Institute of San Francisco where I was later to train as a Jungian analyst.

Dr. Dave: Yes, and that you're still associated with.

Beebe: So it was all laid out for me by my 19th birthday. It was sort of intuitive; you see I just sort of found my way.

Dr. Dave: Yes that's wonderful. Now are you of that generation that was analysed by someone who was analysed by Jung himself? Or are you too young for that.

Beebe: Yes, I was. I had three analysts, and all of them had had contact with Jung, one of them had a full analysis with Jung. The one who had the full analysis with Jung was Joseph Henderson, and I was with him for over 20 years.

Dr. Dave: Oh my goodness.

Beebe: And so the Freudians have something to say about this, they call it "the family romance". (laughter) It's sort of the psychoanalytic version of the apostolic succession. You have the fantasy that you belong to some sort of royal family because your analyst was analysed. It's your psychological family's romance; that your analyst was analysed by ... Never the less I found it very helpful in my case because Joe Henderson had really resolved his transference to Jung. And although he became a Jungian he became his own person and developed his own theory of how the unconscious received the archetype, which he called "the cultural unconscious", which was very influenced by some of the ideas of Clyde Kluckhohn.

Dr. Dave: I like that term, "cultural unconscious". I hadn't heard that before but in a way, a newcomer could much more readily accept that concept than the concept of the archetype.

Beebe: Well it makes very good sense that there are archetypes. As someone put it: is there any evidence of the collective unconscious? I have a colleague in France, a great professor of religion named Antoine Faivre. When I brought up the idea that some people still say there's no evidence for the collective unconscious he said "well, the world behaves as if there was a collective unconscious" and I think that's just the kind of wonderful French intellectual, practical way of saying it.

In a sense once you have said there is a cultural unconscious you almost haven't said anything. Of course there are elements to human experience that are common throughout the world. It's not too surprising that people would form somewhat similar images of them but, in a sense, so what? How does it really grab us and get into us? And the answer is almost certainly through culture.

In other words there must be some built in affectional system, as Harry Harlow was later to speak of it, that enables heterosexual love and homosexual love and all the variants. But there may be several affectional systems; Harlow used to say we have more. But what's really interesting is how we think about love on a daily basis, and that is very much shaped by our cultural expectations. In our particular culture we get it from movies and rock records; and by the age of 18 anybody who has had any exposure to media at all in this country has a very good idea of what love is supposed to be like. So whatever archetypes may be embedded in all that, it's the cultural role model that we get and when our feelings are channelled along certain lines by the culture, that really allows us to get into the archetypes, so to speak.

Dr. Dave: OK. There are so many paths that we could follow here, that I would love to follow but I'm aware that your time will be limited, so let's begin to talk about Jung's theory of types. I'm under the impression that he developed that theory, at least in part to try to make sense of his break with Freud.

Beebe: One never knows why a psychologist develops a theory. In a way if you are psychologically creative you will be the last to know. So what we do know is, he came up with this great theory and he had to tell other people why his mind had turned itself in this direction. And he says in some places that he developed the theory to explain the enormous differences between himself, Freud and Adler, since he was part of the triumvirate that people constantly said in those days. There is a story of him going to the British Museum Library in 1920 and he asks if he can use the stacks, and they ask for his identification, his name. And he says "I'm Professor Jung", and immediately the person said "Oh, Freud, Jung and Adler?" And he said, "No, just Jung."

Dr. Dave: (laughs)

Beebe: So you can see that he was that famous, and that triumvirate was that famous so it was almost like being part of almost a scandal, because here you have these three people who have theories of the unconscious and they couldn't really agree with each other, or get along with each other. So he says that he developed the series of psychological types for that.

I think behind it are also many other people that are speaking to him in the question of "What is a psychology anyway?" And that two of those people, just to name two, are Friedrich Nietzsche who had really pioneered the idea of perspectives. His ideas were sometimes called perspectivism: that every

single mindset is a perspective. As Jung would say, it's a different consciousness. And then there was William James, who had already started to divide people into the tough minded and the tender minded. By about 1900 he had two different kinds of people.

Dr. Dave: I didn't know that went back to William James; interesting.

Beebe: Yes, he was the origin of that. And then even beyond that, and this is the person Jung never names, but he was in Paris and he was reading his work in around 1902: Alfred Binet – we know the name from the Stanford Binet Test of Intelligence. Binet was studying human intelligence and so he used as his prime example his two daughters. And one of them really oriented entirely in an extroverted way, and other in an introverted way. And he came up with terms that were French near equivalents to extraversion and introversion. He had “externospection” was one of them, the other had something with “intro” in it. So the type idea was in the air, the idea that not everyone thinks the same. I think that's the beginning of psychology. I think psychology in the modern sense really begins when you recognise that not everyone thinks the same.

What Jung was really saying when he broke with Freud, was that this attempt to create a universal theory based on one complex, and at that time only one drive, sexuality: Oedipus complex and one drive, the sexual drive - that would be absolutely universal, and thus create the basis for a science of the mind, which was Freud's dream, was profoundly unpsychological; because the basis of psychology is that we are not all the same. We all think differently. One has to be a kind of anthropologist going into each psyche issue and going into so many different cultures and without any presupposition about what that culture's rules and norms are going to be. You have to find them out for yourself. And Jung simply felt that the attempt to try to impose a model of the mind on the psyche was exactly what it didn't need. What it needed was this kind of empathic understanding, which would start with the premise that not everyone uses the mind in the same way.

So it seems to me that was the true origin of psychological types; and then explaining the differences between himself and Freud and Adler was almost secondary to his seeing a true assertion of what he felt psychology itself should be. So when he says psychological types, that word “psychological” is critically important. And his basic criticism of Freud is that Freud was trying to be some kind of scientist; and that that itself was not really psychological. Something different needed to come into being and it wasn't just going to be another science like anatomy, it was going to

be different. And it was going to be grounded in a sense of the individuality of psyche. So he was really writing this book to explain why he had such a violent resistance to Freud.

Not so much that his type was different from Freud, but that his whole approach to psychology was different and he couldn't finally accept Freud, and be loyal to Freud as Freud wanted, because he had a different view of what psyche itself was. And that was the book he put it together in.

Dr. Dave: Thank you for giving us that very rich sense of context. Let me have you now take us through the types, and tell us about their significance and dynamics.

Beebe: Well the remarkable thing is that Jung up until that point was many different things but he never was more specific than in his type theory. The starting point for him was that William James idea that there were more or less two types of people. And he also noticed that the kinds of patients Freud was treating as a neurologist working in an outpatient practice specialising in hysterical neuroses and then eventually obsessive compulsive neurosis was a very different group of people than he, Jung, as a psychiatrist in the main psychiatric hospital in Central Europe, which was at that time headed in Zurich by Bleuler who came up with the term schizophrenia while Jung was working as his first assistant. And I've often thought that Jung may have had a role in coming up with that name along with Bleuler.

So he was seeing nearly the kind of people I saw when I worked in a state mental hospital; seriously mentally ill people. Today we would see the people with schizophrenias particularly, but also manic depressive psychoses, and he was working with a much different population. And particularly the schizophrenic population is not like the so called hysteric population of Freud. Naturally the schizophrenic people were far more withdrawn and preoccupied with images that Jung soon enough recognised had parallels in mythology, and eventually what he was to call archetypes. So he was dealing with people who were very withdrawn and caught up in private mental processes, as opposed to the hysterics who were extremely reactive to other people and to the emotional feel between other people.

Early on he thought maybe there are two types of patient and two types of psychology; one is sort of the introverted type, one is the extroverted type. In those days he thought the extroverted type had some kind of overdevelopment of feeling, and the introverted type had some kind of obsessive relation to thinking. He had sort of an early model that there

were two types: the introverted thinking type and the extroverted feeling type and Freud's psychology might be adequate for the extroverted feeling type but something else was needed for the introverted thinking type. And that was what Jung was trying to develop in his work.

Now Freud couldn't stand that, because it struck right at the heart of the idea that there is a universal science of mind based on a commonality of experience between all of us. And Freud also didn't really like and see the advantages of descriptive psychiatry, and thought that was different from dynamic psychiatry; whereas, with Jung the description always implied dynamic underneath.

So when Jung presented this idea for the first time in 1913 it was seen as a very bad thing by Freud and the psychoanalysts. When he published the book *Psychological Type* eight years later, now no longer a Freudian psychoanalyst, Freud essentially dismissed the book. Because he said, well, this is no longer depth psychology at all, it's just ... Because by then Jung had elaborated the description to not just two types, but he now had extraversion and introversion as a pair of attitudes that were expressed through different (what he called) functions of consciousness; and he named them thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition. And for the longest time nobody seemed to know what this meant, and this was only something you learned if you got into Jungian circles.

Nowadays it's so well known through the Myers Briggs Type Indicator that I dare say that there are likely to be more people in this country who at this moment know what extraversion, introversion, thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition is, than who really know what id, ego and super-ego is. It's the strangest thing, but the type theory has really caught on. Even movie makers in screenplay classes are taught the type theory, so they can make characters that will work on the screen; it's that kind of thing.

Dr. Dave: Yes I've been shocked to see just how widespread the Myers Briggs is used in the business world.

Beebe: People make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year sometimes, in consulting practices teaching how type theory can be used in personality management; and their books about vocational placement with titles like: *Be What You Are*.

Dr. Dave: Yes.

Beebe: We find we get the best work out of people if we communicate with them and allow them to work with their strengths and not to try to conform them to one model, which is the way we do things here.

That's sort of where American personnel management has been going, and these courses are extremely popular and I think very helpful to team building and other things. The money is well spent because people spend most of their working lives, more and more, in these jobs; and it's sort of wonderful to think that people in those places are actually trying to tap the different kinds of intelligence people have, which is how I see types. I see types as a range of intelligences that we all have.

Very much like Howard Gardner's cognitive psychology in a very famous book, *Frames of Mind*, where he names I think initially seven intelligences in the first version of the book. If you look closely, they correspond rather well to seven of Jung's psychological types. The only one he doesn't cover is the one Jung calls introverted intuition.

By the time Jung wrote *Psychological Types* in 1921 he had essentially turned introversion and extroversion into adjectives, so that they appeared in relation to functions of consciousness. So that probably better to say: introverted thinking and extroverted thinking, and introverted feeling and extroverted feeling, and introverted sensation and extroverted sensation, and introverted intuition and extroverted intuition. And then you get an eight function model or the technical word, eight function attitude model, which is the one that I have been pioneering.

But you see it right in Jung in the last chapter 10 of *Psychological Types* where he actually takes each of the functions and shows what it looks like in the introverted and the extroverted attitudes. So four functions: thinking, feeling, sensation and intuition; and two attitudes: introversion and extroversion – end up with these eight psychological types. Eight types of human intelligence; and that's cognitive psychology about 40 years before its time.

Dr. Dave: I was struck by your reference to your own pioneering work. So tell us how you have in your own work kind of taken it beyond.

Beebe: Well when you learn Jung, you learn all these different wonderful contributions he made. So some people have compared his work to a cathedral with different rooms or different turrets. So one of the turrets might be psychological types, and another might be archetypes, and yet another is the theory of complexes; because it was really Jung who

advanced that too. Freud would not have used the term Oedipus complex if he had not met Jung, because Jung was the one who was working on complexes before he met Freud.

And Jung was already a little more famous than Freud when they met because he had worked out a way of talking about the complexes of people with schizophrenia. So that famous book *The Psychology of Dementia Praecox* was read all over the psychiatric world shortly after its publication in 1907.

Freud felt that psychoanalysis could kind of enter psychiatry through the theory of the complex, and Jung was the general who would take it there. Then later Jung got the idea that every complex has at its heart an archetype and so he got really more interested in the theory of archetypes than the theory of complexes, though he never lost full interest in either.

Then came the theory of psychological types and nobody knew what to do with it. But what I've done in my work is to see that every single complex can be typed. Every single complex that we see in a dream or in our lives is associated with a psychological type. Moreover, every complex does have an archetypal core.

Turning it from the other angle, every psychological type is expressed through an archetype. So that in me for example, extroverted feeling which is in my list of functions - what we would call my third function. If we take where I discovered Jung by just following my nose, that is about as good an example of what extroverted intuition is like as I can give you. And the way I think is rather private: I never quite define anything the same way twice, and I am always going inside to say my ideas. So that one has the peculiar experience sometimes, perhaps you've had it already, of someone in a sense talking to himself. But what I'm really doing is going inside, making sure that what I am saying matches up to some sense within me that it's true. That's introverted thinking. So those are my extroverted intuition, introverted thinking; pretty much defines the strange rambling talk and private referencing that you would doubtless experience in me.

Dr. Dave: So those would be your two dominant modes.

Beebe: My two dominant functions. But my third function is extroverted feeling. And there people who know me and experience me, and often patients, pick up a definitely child-like quality to me. And that extroverted feeling is associated with the archetype of the Puer eternis. It has an eternal, boy like quality. When I'm in my extroverted feeling it's almost

like I am an 8 year old child sharing his discovery with another 8 year old child and having this kind of excited conversation about something they have just discovered together. It all but says “Gee!”, you know, it’s that kind of thing.

If you go back to my leading functions I think there was something courageous, ambitious, fearless, about finding my way to Jungian psychiatry and my mind so early; and daring to think about that when I was not just saying that, well I had plenty of time to decide but to actually ... almost like Babe Ruth pointing his bat at the place in the stands and then hitting a home run. I said I was going to be a psychiatrist at 19 and I am a psychiatrist. And I was hearing about the Jungian analyst who was living the self sacrificing life and I followed in his footsteps. And I did come to San Francisco and I did train, and I went all the way. So in a sense that would be the heroic function; you can feel the hero archetype there.

And when I teach and I try to explain things, that’s where my introverted thinking comes in. And I really do take an effort to try to be as clear as I can, and try to say it the way I think it ought to be said so that people will get it right, and not just get something out of a book that they read and try to apply and they can’t use. That’s my introverted thinking, and when I teach I try to use that in a fatherly way.

So if you look at my first three functions you’ve got a hero, and you’ve got a father, and you’ve got a Puer eternis. Now this isn’t very different from transactional analysis where they speak of a parent, an adult, and a child. That’s three different states. It’s just that I’m calling them psychological types carried by archetypes and I have something certainly that transactional analysis doesn’t have. Through the Jungian lens I can say that my hero has a certain type, or if you call it my adult - has a certain type, and my parent has a certain type, and my child has a certain type. Puer eternis means eternal boy, or Puella eterna: eternal girl. So it’s really the child, the eternal child in all of us, or as one of my patients called it “the endless boy”.

So those three states of mind have a lot to do with my everyday functioning and each one of them is a different type. In analysis I look at dreams to see how the different types of consciousness show up in dreams, and are they in good shape or are they in bad shape. Are they afflicted, or how are they doing and I try to help them operate as well as I can. That’s the differentiation of consciousness; as by having those three functions gives me a range of options that I wouldn’t have if I was stuck in one or the other.

Or even worse if one of them hadn't really been born yet and if it was still stuck in the birth canal, and so there are many people who have never found their hero. And that is why Joseph Campbell was so thrilling to so many when he told people to follow their bliss. He actually gave lots of people permission to come forward with their heroic function and do what they really wanted to do with their lives.

And that was the man who had written *The Hero With A Thousand Faces*; encouraging mass audience to develop their own individual heroism. That coincided with the rise of interest in psychological types with the MBTI, the Myers Briggs Type Indicator where people all over this country began to reflect on who they really were; and whether it was possible to live and work and actually earn money following one's bliss, so to speak, as Campbell was saying. So that whole self development, the burgeoning of self help books is all in a way hero psychology.

But now what's suffered was our ability to take care of each other, and so the father function, the mother function, really got very undeveloped. So that's the function you use when you take care of other people and show a sense of social responsibility, and are conscious how you take care of people. And that in our particular culture in America today is an area that is very problematic.

It shows up when we try to find a president: we keep trying to find a father or mother we can trust, and nobody feels we can. Right now we all have the idea of which one we can trust and which one is reliable; which one has the most experience; which one is most steady, which one is most inspiring. Arguments go back and forth – who really is going to be the good father. But all that shows how poignantly and how sadly we have failed to develop very much of that function in ourselves in recent years.

Dr. Dave: Fascinating.

Beebe: That's what my work really is. Freeing that up and finding the lines along which it will naturally develop in an individual.

Dr. Dave: Yes, now speaking of your work and your teaching, I wanted to share with you that my wife a few years back was listening to a series of tapes of lectures that you had given and she discovered her type with a real "ah ha!" as a result of listening to your tape. She realised that she was, I believe, an extroverted intuitive and that had a lot of meaning for her because suddenly she realised, OK, this explains what I am good at and

now I understand why I am so good at some things and so poor at some other things. And for her it was a big breakthrough and yet she had been trying to figure out her type for some time. She was actually seeing a Jungian analyst and she would say, OK I think I'm this type, and the analyst would say "no, you haven't got it quite yet".

So on the one hand we have the Myers Briggs which makes it sound like it's really easy to figure out your type, and on the other hand there are people who say it could take you years to figure out your type.

Beebe: Well, it's a terrible problem to figure out type, and I would say anyone who thinks you can get it from taking a paper and pen test is extremely naïve, because you don't know which part of you is taking the test.

I believe we all have all eight function attitudes within us somewhere, and under certain circumstances we use one, and under others another. I myself had a devil of a time figuring out whether I was an extrovert or an introvert, and that was something like seven years into my analysis, and two or so years into my training to be a Jungian analyst. And I wondered if they, as they often do in the educational system, if they had made a mistake accepting me into the program, because I couldn't tell even whether I was an extrovert or an introvert.

And it was then that I learnt this idea from the Myers Briggs creators. Isabel Briggs Myers and her mother Katherine Briggs had the idea that if the first function is extroverted, the second function is introverted. And when that was explained to me by an analyst named Wayne Detloff in 1972 it just amazed me. I thought, oh my goodness: in other words I am extroverted under certain circumstances, and introverted under others. So I use my extroversion in dealing with people, in certain categories of my life. But I use my introversion in others. And that explained why some of my friends were sure I was extroverted and others said I was the only introvert they knew.

Dr. Dave: Well that makes a lot of sense to me, that really is very helpful.

Beebe: That really was useful. And that must have happened to your wife, too. What she probably heard was the mirror because I talked about my own experiences in extroverted intuitive... and it began to add up to hers, what she was like.

Dr. Dave: Yes, in fact I think you told some stories about yourself and she realised that it was very similar to her own profile.

Beebe: And that's what I think we all should be doing, is tell our own story of how we experience these things in our own lives. And then just hearing that you can begin sort of like the This American Life of the psyche. If we can tell the stories it pretty much becomes clear after a while: "oh, I see if that's what introverted feeling is like, I've sure got it". You know, that kind of thing.

Dr. Dave: Well I hate to draw this to a close, but your thought there that we each need to tell our own story is a perfect close. So I'm going to say Dr. John Beebe thanks so much for being my guest today on Shrink Rap Radio.

Beebe: Well you have been a marvellously enabling interviewer and made all the space for an extroverted intuitive to go where he wants to go; which is never the same place in the same way. But if you got that I was being myself, you got a lot today (laughs). I enjoyed it, is what I mean.