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Existential-Humanistic psychology, and what can now be termed “Existential-Integrative psychology,” as will be discussed later, originated in the United States blending ideas from European existential philosophy and psychology with an American perspective, particularly humanistic psychology. The founding of this school of thought can be traced to the publication of the book *Existence* by Rollo May, Ernest Angel, and Henri F. Ellenberger in 1958. The bulk of *Existence* was a translation of three papers by Ludwig Binswanger along with two important chapters by Rollo May, who quickly became the leading figure in existential psychology in the United States. May was also very influential with the development of the humanistic movement in the United States; however, he used the label “existential” for his approach to psychology. The label “existential-humanistic” can be attributed to James F.T. Bugental, who was strongly influenced by May and the humanistic movement. Despite many still using just the label of “existential psychology,” the term “existential-humanistic” gradually became more commonly used to refer to this unique American existential psychology.

Given this early history, it is difficult to differentiate existential-humanistic psychology from the development of humanistic psychology in the United States. This is particularly true in the early history of existential-humanistic psychology. Yet, still today, it is common for the labels “humanistic” or “existential” to be used when referencing what is referred to here as existential-humanistic psychology. This ambiguity in language reflects, in part, the resistance of many in existential-humanistic psychology to be pinned down by a label. This also provides a challenge in writing a history of existential-humanistic psychology.
Humanistic psychology, including existential-humanistic psychology, is sometimes
known as the Third Force in contrast to two prior major orientations in US psy-
ochology, behaviorism and psychoanalysis, which, along with the biomedical model, are
generally considered by humanistic psychologists to be reductionistic, mechanistic, and
dehumanizing in regard to human beings as whole persons. Since the early development
of the Third Force, and partially due to the influence of the Third Force, there have
been a number of trends in the first two forces that reflect a move inclusive and holistic
understanding (see Grogan 2013). Many psychologists played a vital role preparing the
ground for what emerged as the Third Force; however, three stand out: Abraham
Maslow, Carl Rogers, and Rollo May. Maslow founded the psychology department at
Brandeis University in 1951 with a strong humanistic orientation even before the
movement was thus named. Originally working within experimental psychology,
Maslow (1954) developed a research program and subsequent humanistic theory of
motivation. He argued that people are motivated not only reactively by the "deficiency
needs" with which psychology had hitherto been concerned, but also proactively by
"being needs," ultimately including such motives as self-actualization.
Rogers (1951) sought ways to facilitate clients' yearning for self-actualization and
fully functioning living, especially via person-centered therapy and group work. He was
one of the first researchers to study psychotherapy process using tape-recordings and
transcripts, and he and his students also made extensive use of Q-sorts to study self
concept and change. He explored the necessary conditions for therapeutic progres
and emphasized congruence, presence, and acceptance on the part of the therapist.

May, Angel, and Ellenberger (1958) built a bridge from transpersonal psychanalysis
to European existentialism and phenomenology, having been influenced by Harry
Stack Sullivan, Ludwig Binswanger, and Medard Boss. May's books integrated crea-
tivity, the arts, mythology, and the humanities with psychology, and encompassed the
tragic view of life and the diarnonic forces. According to May (1969), the diarnonic
"any natural function which has the power to take over the whole person.... The diarnonic
function can he either creative or destructive and is normally both" (p. 123, italics in original).
Therefore, while existential-humanistic psychology shared with humanistic psychology
a valuing of human potential, it balanced the understanding of human potential with
human limitation and innate forces that had the potential to be destructive. Charlotte
Buhle, Erich Fromm, and Viktor Frankl also contributed European perspectives to this
stream, including a concern for values in psychotherapy, human development over the
whole course of human life, humanistic psychoanalysis, social issues, love, tran-
cendence of evil, and the search for meaning.

Although less publically prominent than Maslow, Rogers, and May, we would be
remiss to overlook the notable contributions of Clark Moustakas to the founding
of existential-humanistic psychology. Moustakas's early literary contribution to the
field was his edited volume entitled Tw Sef (1956), which led directly to his early collab-
oration with Maslow. This collaboration was followed up when Moustakas hosted the
first meeting of humanistic psychologists at the Merrill Palmer Institute in Detroit
where Moustakas, Maslow, May, Rogers and others first worked jointly to bring
a genuinely humanistic psychology into existence. In addition, Moustakas edited

Existential Child Therapy: The Child's Discovery of Himself (1966), which included
contributions by other existential and humanistic scholars such as Charlotte Buhle,
Eugene Gendlin, and Hanna Cohn. Finally, Moustakas's classic work, Loneliness
(1961), was the first to make a distinction between loneliness anxiety and existential
loneliness which was very much in keeping with Rollo May's existential interpretation
of anxiety and Medard Boss's existential interpretation of guilt.

In the 1960s, many isolated voices began to gather momentum and form a critique
of US culture and consciousness. Massive cultural changes were sweeping through the
United States. That larger movement was an expression of a society eager to move
beyond the alienating, bland conformity, embedded presuppositions, and prejudices
that had characterized the 1950s return to "normalcy" after the Second World War.
In psychology, adjustment models were challenged by visions of growth, and the
human potential movement emerged. T-groups, sensitivity training, human relations
training, and encounter groups became popular. The goal was greater awareness of
one's own actual experience in the moment and authentic engagement with others,
goals not well served by academic psychology, clinical psychology, or the culture in
general. Growth centers sprang up across the country, offering a profusion of work-
shops and techniques, such as transpersonal analysis, sensory awareness, Gestalt
encounter, body work, meditation, yoga, massage therapy, and psychosynthesis. These
developments in the culture and in "pop psychology" paralleled changes in clinical
and academic domains. Existential and phenomenological trends in continental
psychiatry affected the Anglo-American sphere through the work of R.D. Laing and
his British colleagues. His trenchant critique of the prevailing medical model's reduc-
tionistic and pathological view of schizophrenic patients began a revisioning of even
psychotic processes as potentially meaningful and growth seeking. Various American
psychiatrists also contributed to the elaboration of this alternative, most notably John
Ferry, Leson Havens, and Thomas Szasz. At the same time, Gestalt therapy was
developed and popularized especially by Fritz and Laura Perls.

Meanwhile, from the academic side a rising tide of theory and research focused
attention on this nonreductive, holistic view of the person. As the 1960s unfolded,
were enormously influential in this more receptive era. May pointed out that to study
and understand human beings, a human model was needed. He advocated a science
of persons, by which he meant a theory which would enable psychology to under-
stand and clarify the specific, distinguishing characteristics of human beings. Many
new voices also now began to be raised. Amedeo Giorgi (1965, 1966, 1970) criti-
cized experimental psychology's reductionism, and argued for a phenomenologically
based methodology that could support a more authentic human science of psychology.
Giorgi argued that psychology has the responsibility to investigate the full range of
behaviors and experience of people in such a way that the aims of rigorous science
are fulfilled, but that these aims should not be implemented primarily in terms of the
criteria of the natural sciences.

This passage on Clark Moustakas has been adapted from a personal communication from Erik Craig
(October 6, 2018). The authors wish to thank Professor Craig for the elaboration on Moustakas's important
influence on E-H psychology history.
As previously indicated, humanistic psychology as an organized movement grew out of a series of meetings in the late-1950s initiated by Abraham Maslow and Clark James Moustakas and included Carl Rogers and Rollo May, all members of the American Psychological Association. They explored themes such as the nature of the self, self-actualization, health, creativity, being, becoming, individuation, and meaning. In 1961 an organizing committee including Anthony Beale and others launched the *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, which included May and other existential scholars.

The new journal’s success in coalescing a responsive subscriber base quickly convinced its founders that a professional association could also meet a need. With the assistance of James Bugental, who served as its first president, and a grant arranged by Gordon Allport, the AHP was held in Philadelphia in 1965. Among the 75 attendees were many who would later play prominent leadership roles in this movement. In 1965 Bugental published a foundational article, ‘Humanistic Psychology: A New Breakthrough,’ in the American Journal of Psychology. In 1967 the AHP published a foundational conference proceedings, ‘The Third Force in Psychology’ in the JHP and appears, in the following slightly amended version, in each issue.

1. Human beings, as humans, are more than merely the sum of their parts. They cannot be reduced to component parts or functions.
2. Human beings exist in a uniquely human context, as well as in a cosmic ecology.
3. Human beings are aware and aware of being aware—i.e., they are conscious.
4. Human consciousness potentially includes an awareness of oneself in the context of other people and the cosmos.
5. Human beings have some choice, and with that, responsibility.

Although these five statements were intended primarily for humanistic psychology, Bugental's existential sensitivities can be seen in these statements as well.

The second AHP meeting took place in Los Angeles in 1966, with about 200 attendees. At the 1967 conference we attended, Bugental observed, this group already included the four major subfields: existential humanistic psychology, sociology, political sociology, political activism, academic activism, and research activism. The first conference included the following topics: the initial gathering of the AHP, and the educational psychology of the 20th century in general. The conference was of interest in its own right and also because of the questions it raised about the role of the AHP in the future of humanistic psychology.

In subsequent years, a number of graduate programs in humanistic psychology were founded, including Masters' programs in humanistic psychology at Southern State University (then Southern State College) in 1966, and the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1967. A Master's program in existential/phenomenological psychology was created at Duquesne University in 1967, and a PhD program was added in 1962. Several free-standing institutes also emerged to serve the needs of the AHP.

In 1971 the Association for Humanistic Psychology created the Humanistic Psychology Institute (now known as Saybrook University, named after the famous conference), which has since served as the cornerstone university of the existential-humanistic movement. Despite the close connections of humanistic and existential-humanistic psychology, some distinguishing factors began to emerge in this early period. For example, beginning with an open letter from Carl Rogers, May and Rogers engaged in a debate on the psychology of evil. For Rogers, evil was something external to the individual located in culture. May disagreed, emphasizing the importance of each person recognizing his or her own potential for evil, which was closely connected to May’s concept of the daimonic.

Similarly, Bugental, May, and others spoke of various givers of existence. While these are often attributed to Yalom (1980), whose categorization of the givers are the most known today, it’s conception of the givers was not the first. The existential givers are not ultimate truths, but rather aspects of human existence that everyone must face. Existential-humanistic psychology does not offer any answers to these givers, and even acknowledges that the answers are dependent upon the individual and his or her culture. Yet, the givers are difficult realities that reflect the fact that human nature is paradoxical and limited. While humanistic psychology focused strongly on human potential, existential-humanistic psychology balanced the emphasis on human potential with attention to human limitation. Although the distinction between humanistic and existential-humanistic psychology is often subtle, and a matter of emphasis rather than disagreement, the two modes began to characterize Third Force psychologies.

The Middle Years (1980–1999)

Although 1980–1999 represented a period of declining influence, many notable developments emerged in these years. Central to any discussion of existential-humanistic psychology during this period is the enduring vision and contributions of Rollo May, who continued to publish many important books and articles. It was May’s commitment to write, for not a “limited number” of psychologists and colleagues, which he considered a poor use of time, but rather he wanted to reach many open-minded and intelligent people in the general public as well. This is reflected in his important contributions of this period, including *Freedom and Destiny* (1981), *The Discovery of Being* (1984), and *The Cry for Myth* (1988), which all had appeal beyond the psychological audience. In the middle years, May’s protégés, including Ed Mendelovitz, Stephen A. Diamond, Ilene A. Serlin, and Kirk J. Schneider, broadened and extended May’s work and existential-humanistic psychology in enduring ways. Mendelovitz, in particular, carried forward the literary tradition of May’s work. Diamond further developed May’s conception of the daimonic. Serlin made important contributions to trauma applications, dance and the creative arts therapies, and whole person healthcare. Schneider, who stepped into the role of the leading figure in existential-humanistic psychology after May’s death, further developed the clinical applications of existential-humanistic psychology, as well as contributing to many different areas of theoretical development. *The Psychology of Existence* (1995), which Schneider wrote and edited with Rollo May,
was the beginning of existential-integrative psychology (a way of understanding and coordinating a range of bona fide modalities within an overarching existential or experiential context).

Bugental, who emerged as a central voice in the early years, continued to broaden his influence as well. In addition to contributing important new scholarly works, Bugental made a number of videos with demonstrations of existential therapy. These videos, along with his training programs, were highly influential in the development of the clinical applications of existential-humanistic psychology. The 1980s also witnessed the emergence of Irvin Yalom as a central figure. Yalom quickly became a highly recognized figure in the field because of his contributions to group psychotherapy as well as existential psychotherapy. Along with teaching, training, and scholarly contributions, Yalom became a popular writer with appeal to many in the field of psychology who did not identify as existential as well as to a growing lay audience. Although Yalom is arguably the best known therapist identifying as existential across the different schools of existential therapy, there are challenges in placing Yalom within a school. His approach most closely aligns with existential-humanistic psychology, and he was heavily influenced by May; however, in some ways Yalom’s existential therapy represents an approach of its own. Furthermore, Yalom (1980) did not conceptualize existential therapy as a stand-alone approach, which differs from most others in the existential-humanistic movement, and has not himself drawn much upon other important writers within the existential-humanistic field.

The middle years also witnessed other important voices that had an indirect influence upon the movement, such as Allen Whelton, Ernest Becker, Ernest Kreit, Maurice Friedman, and Paul Stern. While these figures are not always recognized as existential-humanistic therapists, their work has strongly influenced many leaders within the existential-humanistic movement. Similarly, Erik Craig, who studied with Clark Moulus and Paul Stern, and Madard Boss emerged as an important voice. While Craig’s work represents other schools of thought covered in this volume, he was an influential bridge builder between the traditions and his contributions influenced existential-humanistic psychology.

**Contemporary Developments (2000–current)**

Following a period of decreased influence and declining interest, the foundations for a renewed interest in existential-humanistic psychology began in the early 2000s. The early development of existential-humanistic psychology was dominated by charismatic figures, such as Rollo May and Jim Bugental (Schneider, personal communication, 2016). However, Schneider notes that there was an awareness that for the movement to sustain itself, there was a need for formalized structures and training. In the early 2000s, several key developments began to emerge that would help to sustain the existential-humanistic movement. Some of these were closely connected with the development of structures in humanistic psychology in the United States, in which existential-humanistic perspectives were popular. These developments fall into three primary categories: scholarship, institutes and training, and conferences.
institute was to provide training in existential-humanistic therapy internationally, particularly in Southeast Asia. Mark Yang, who has lived in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and China, has been the primary driving force of the institute, providing regular training workshops. Once a year, Louis Hoffman has brought students from the United States to assist in providing training. In 2014, the Zhi Man International Institute began offering certificates in humanistic and existential psychology in conjunction with the China Institute for Psychotherapy in Beijing. It is difficult for any movement in psychology to sustain itself without training institutes to support them. Psychodynamic, Jungian, and Gestalt institutes have helped for these movements to sustain and flourish over the years; however, the existential-humanistic movement has struggled to develop similar institutes to sustain and advance the movement. The founding of EHI and IIEHS, following a period where existential-humanistic psychology was beginning to struggle, served a pivotal role in revitalizing the movement.

Conferences

Conferences play a pivotal role in sustaining and advancing psychology movements as well. Along with promoting scholarship and offering training opportunities, conferences facilitate the development of a broader community and energize movements. For many years, there had been a dearth of conferences that reflected the existential-humanistic perspective. The primary conference was Division 32’s programming at the American Psychological Association Convention. The few hours granted were hardly sufficient to sustain the community and energy needed for the movement to grow and thrive. In 2007, under the leadership of David Cain, the Society for Humanistic Psychology began holding an annual conference. Each year, many of the program offerings represented existential-humanistic psychology. The conference played a primary role in developing a stronger existential-humanistic community, fostered collaborative scholarship, and advanced existential-humanistic theory. Additionally, the conferences drew many graduate students and early-career psychologists. For many years prior to the conference, one of the greatest threats to the future of existential-humanistic psychology was the small number of graduate students and early-career professionals identifying with the movement. In large part due to the Annual Society for Humanistic Psychology Conference, this has begun to change.

A few years later, in 2006, EHI began hosting an annual conference as well. Although smaller than the Society for Humanistic Conference, the programming was exclusively focused on existential-humanistic psychology. Similarly, IIEHS has offered a couple of conferences, largely composed of graduates from the Unearthing the Moment Training. These conferences as well have helped to build community.

In 2010, Louis Hoffman, Mark Yang, and Xuefu Wang began the Annual International Conference on Existential Psychology (ICEP). This conference, offered every other year in China, has helped expand an existential-humanistic presence in China. The first conference, held in Nanjing, had several hundred very enthusiastic attendees and was covered in the local media. Many leading scholars from the United States, including Kirk J. Schneider, Ilene Serlin, Ed Meichenbaum, and Erik Craig, attended the first conference. Although Hoffman, Yang, and Wang had already been providing numerous trainings on existential-humanistic psychology in China, Malaysia, and Singapore, the conference added more of a foundation in theory, research, and scholarship to the applied trainings that had been offered.

Emergent Trends

But a people unable to reform will not be able to preserve [their] old culture either (Lu Xun 1921/1961, p. 138).

Any movement in psychology that is not able to evolve and speak to the times will inevitably fade from influence, and rightly it should. In the 1980s and 1990s, there was some reason to fear that this could be the fate of existential-humanistic psychology. While there were some important innovative voices, the movement was fading and at times co-opted and adapted into the mainstream (Grogan 2013). The scholarship, institutes, and conferences would not have been successful without being combined with new directions in scholarship. In existential-humanistic therapy, several new directions played a vital role in its revitalization: existential-integrative psychology, multicultural and international influences, and spirituality.

Existential-Integrative Psychology

Although the initial formulations of existential-integrative psychology began to emerge in The Psychology of Existence (1995) by Kirk J. Schneider and Reillo May, it was Schneider’s book, Existential-Integrative Psychotherapy: Guidelines to the Core of Practice (2008) that formalized it. Existential-Integrative Psychotherapy accomplished a number of important achievements that helped solidify existential-humanistic psychology’s revitalization. First, it provided a framework for understanding existential-humanistic practice. Schneider, in his overview of existential-integrative therapy, identified core aspects of his therapy approach. Second, Schneider showed how existential-humanistic therapy can be integrated with various other approaches to therapy. The essence of an integrative approach is that there is a foundation from which therapists practice. From this foundation, other approaches can be integrated. This “assimilative approach” is different than an eclectic approach that does not have a foundation and seeks integration haphazardly. With the foundation in existential-humanistic psychology, the other approaches are integrated in a way that is internally coherent and consistent with the foundation (see Wolfe 2016). To this extent, it is now possible to speak of a transition taking place in existential-humanistic psychology to the title of this section which is called “Existential-Humanistic and Existential-Integrative Psychotherapy.”

Third, in moving toward the direction of integration, Schneider showed that existential-humanistic therapy can take a collaborative approach with other therapy modalities. This allows existential-humanistic practitioners to remain rooted in their preferred therapy modality while integrating other approaches that are often encouraged, if not required, by managed care. Connected to this, Bruce Wampold (2008), a leading researcher of therapy outcomes, noted, “I have no doubt that [E-I Existential-Integrative] approaches would satisfy any criteria used to label other psychological treatments as scientific” (para. 13, see also Shahr and Schiller 2016 for an elaboration on this point).
International and Multicultural Psychology

Psychological dialogues across cultures drive practitioners and scholars to deeper awareness of their own assumptions and biases, which can help advance psychological theories while supporting them to become more culturally sensitive. Additionally, international dialogues often can energize movements in psychology. Nader Shabanih’s work in Russia in the 1990s along with the visit from many Russian scholars in 1996 was one of the impetuses for the development of the EHI. Additionally, they helped to develop existential-humanistic psychology in Russia. More recently, existential-humanistic psychology has grown rapidly in Southeast Asia leading to important exchanges that have helped energize and advance the movement. This has been due to many exchanges and training across China by Mark Yang, Louis Hoffman, and Xueqi Wang. Additionally, the Zhi-Mian approach to psychotherapy, which was developed by Wang based upon the writings of Chinese literary figure Luo Xun, became recognized as an indigenous Chinese approach to existential therapy (Wang 2011). Since 2008, the international dialogues have helped existential-humanistic therapy grow in popularity in China with the trainings and conferences in China drawing significantly larger crowds than similar events in the United States. The influence of Chinese perspectives, such as Zhi-Mian therapy, Buddhist approaches to therapy (Schneider and Tong 2009), and Taoism (Craig 2009; Yang 2016), have grown in their influence on existential-humanistic psychology in the United States. More recently, the systematic training programs have further solidified the existential-humanistic approach in China. In addition to the existential and humanistic certificates previously discussed, Ilene Serlin offers a certificate training in movement therapy rooted partially in the existential-humanistic tradition through the China Institute for Psychotherapy.

Multicultural psychology, though related, is different to international psychology. In particular, it considers cultural differences within countries as well as between. As Hoffman (2016) has stated, existential-humanistic psychology was one of the first approaches to voice appreciation for cultural differences; however, it has struggled in actualizing this value. This has begun to change. Schneider played an important role in creating space for multicultural perspectives. In Existential-Integrative Psychotherapy (2008), Schneider invited many chapters focusing on multicultural perspectives. Similarly, during his time as editor of the Journal of Humanistic Psychology, he worked to diversify the editorial board and include more multicultural perspectives. Through the Society for Humanistic Psychology Conference and various recent publications, existential-humanistic psychology has evolved to address multicultural issues with much greater depth and substance.

Spirituality

Existential-humanistic psychology’s relationship with spirituality and religion has been controversial and frequently misunderstood (Helmhink, Hoffman, and Dodson 2012). Commonly, it has been misperceived as being rooted in atheism and agnosticism to spirituality and religion. This, however, is not accurate. While some, such as Yalom, have taken a more antagonistic stance to spirituality and religion, most existential-humanistic practitioners are more open.

Existential-humanistic therapy’s religious and spiritual influence has deep roots. Paul Tillich, a theologian, was Rollo May’s mentor and dissertation chair. The influence of Tillich, as well as Jewish theologian Martin Buber, on the development of existential-humanistic psychology is quite evident. More recently, Schneider’s (2004) development of the concept of awe has brought renewed interest in examining spirituality from an existential-humanistic perspective. Awe is rooted in mystery, wonderment, and appreciation, concurrently embracing our human limitation and potential. It is evident in various religious traditions, but not bound to any. Schneider’s conception of awe is relevant to therapy, but also for broader applications of existential humanistic psychology to education (Schneider 2009) and politics (Schneider 2013, 2019). In many ways, the re-emergence of a spiritual perspective reflects a return to important roots of existential-humanistic psychology.

Conclusion

After a long history of growth and decline, existential-humanistic psychotherapy is again in a period of growth, renewal, and advancement. As this trend continues, it is critical to heed the lessons of history and appreciate the importance of the values, ideas, and, most centrally, people who have helped build the existential-humanistic movement into what it is today.
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