

## PP Summit 1999 Martin Seligman Speech

---

September 28, 1999

We are here I guess for a good cause, but also because some people arranged it for us. Now, to demonstrate that I'm spontaneous, during the last days I spent in North Carolina on the beach, and I read a book by Stewart, a British scientist, who really wrote the book to make sure that biology, in its future role as the king of science, would not forget mathematics. So it was a book about mathematics and how the world is constructed according to the rules of mathematics, so I had to learn about Menderpold mathematics and nonlinear mathematics, and I decided, when asked to say a few words, that I would try out whether I had learned enough.

Now, since Mandy, your wife, Martin, isn't here, I can create a new marriage; the marriage is between Don Clifton and Martin Seligman. And the important part of nonlinear mathematics is that what we all have learned in school seems like one and one makes two. It really no longer is the most important insight into mathematics, and so I'm going to test your creativity. Your creativity is what does one and one make? And if you want to become creative, you also know that imagination is very important, so just picture one Don Clifton and one Martin Seligman next to each other. And if you're really creative, you know that one and one makes eleven. You've got to picture it, you've got to picture it. So you have this fantastic multiplication function that some of these new mathematics permit. If you now add to that the other organizers of this conference, Ed Diener, Corey Keyes and others probably, you have 111,111, and that amplification effect is what we owe to the two of you. And positive psychology is very important, but it is very important because of the special mathematics that link Don Clifton and Martin Seligman. I toast the two of you. Thank you for having us.

Some tables are finishing up, some tables are still working on their main course, so if you've finished up and would like to get dessert, they're over here in the corner. If you'd like to get another drink, this young lady will be happy to serve you. And after everybody gets dessert, we'll sort of keep an eye out, then we'll have some remarks from Marty.

I'm very proud to be a friend of his and to be a part of this movement. As you know, without Marty, this thing would not have gotten started. It's his energy, his vision, his intellect, all of these things, and his motivation, and I think we've had a wonderful conference. The whole movement was started by Marty, the idea for the conference was his and Don's, and I think we'll offer him a round of applause after his talk. So, Marty.

Well, there are a lot of people that we want to thank tonight. I think first we want to thank Gallup, we want to thank Don and Shirley Clifton, we want to thank Sharon Lutz and Karen Burns, and the tremendous staff that Gallup has produced for this. The speakers and the audience have been already thanked. And today, I have to tell you, was one of the most intellectually stimulating days I can remember of my life, and I'm just especially grateful to the speakers and the audience, the quality of questions. Now, it's

not an accident that we're here in Lincoln. I'm not a real believer in complete accidents. And I believe, as Jung did, in synchronicity in life.

The history of what I'm about to say is, in Grand Cayman a few months ago, Don gathered us together, and we articulated 15 characteristics that we thought were wellsprings of a good life, the positive life. And three of the most important characteristics were leadership, intimacy, and future-mindedness, and it just so happens that by synchronicity, if I were Bill Damon going around America asking for the paradigm people who embody these virtues, it turns out there are three such of the paradigms in Lincoln, and I'm going to say a few words about each one, and I'd ask each one to stand up and be acknowledged. For leadership, Lincoln has a person who embodies the characteristics of leadership. He does it every day, he's doing it right now, and I'd like Don Clifton to stand up as a paradigm instance of leadership. And I'm especially grateful to have the single psychologist who most embodies the best things we know about intimacy and relationships here. She hasn't spoken. She's a pillar of both knowledge and the family, and I'd like one of Lincoln's great people, Mary Pipher, to stand up. And it's not just Don and Mary that Lincoln has, but when I think about future-mindedness, the embodiment of future-mindedness I think is mentorship, the building for the future, and it so happens that Lincoln has the teacher, the high school teacher who won APA's award, the Crystal Apple, as the best high school teacher in America. I've known him for years, and, Randy, Ernst, I'd like you to stand up and be acknowledged.

Cliff Hardin asked me a pointed question in a break at the meeting. He asked, "Should we invest in this stuff? That is, should a business invest in the notion of positive psychology and the notion of positive social science?" And one way or another, that's the question that all of you are asking yourselves: Is this science, this movement, worth the investment of your time and energy and writing? Now, as I said to Cliff, I want to suggest to you that it is, and I'm going to say it for rather an odd reason. I believe that when nations are troubled, when they're at war, when they're in famine, when they're in social turmoil, when they're poor, it is perfectly natural that their concern should be defense and damage, that the science they underwrite, the art they appreciate, the novels they understand, should be about repairing dangerous things, should be about defense and damage. And most of the history of humankind has been lived in societies like that.

But something happens when societies are in surplus and not in social turmoil, not at war. Those societies have lifted their eyes up from defense and damage and asked questions of what makes life worth living. What are the best things in life? After all, if you have, as so many of you have said in the last couple of days, a science that is utopianly successful, that is focused only on repairing what's wrong, the best you can ever get to zero. Now, zero's a lot better than minus eight. But when societies are in the kind of world historical moment that I believe our society is, society collectively and individuals, all of you, the question you're interested in is what makes life worth living? How can I go from plus two to plus six? If you look at the history of those societies—there have been a few of them—Golden Age Greece was the cradle of democracy and philosophy, met those conditions—Victorian England enshrined honor, duty, valor—and the best example I think is Florence of the 15<sup>th</sup> Century. Florence in the 1450s became enormously wealthy

based on its world trade and its banking trade, and it had been considered the option of becoming the most important military power in Europe. And it decided not to do that; it decided to invest in beauty, to invest its surplus in beauty.

The suggestion that the first Positive Psychology Summit makes to the world is not that we build an aesthetic monument, but rather that we create a scientific monument, that we ask the question that would bring the light of science to bear on the question of what are the best things in life? How can we achieve those things? How can we help our fellow human beings to achieve them? And so I want to say to Cliff Hardin, this is the moment to invest in those things. The market is right, the society is right, this is a window that is a world historical moment, and it makes sense for all of us to invest in coming to understand what makes life worth living.

Corey was talking about languishing today. We think about languishing of individuals. And I was thinking that when we as individuals focus on curing negative things, on remediation, on making the things that are bad in our life better, we may languish because we don't have enough positive goals that we're pursuing even if we're successful at the negative ones. I also want to suggest to you that a field can languish, that discipline can languish in the same way. And psychology has, for 50 years, been almost entirely about remediation, almost entirely about what's repairing the worst in life; it has not pursued the goals of what makes life worth living. And when a field does that, I believe it can languish; so I think the social sciences, Corey, just like many of our citizens, are languishing for the personal reasons.

I want to say something about the structure of what I'm going to say in the next half hour or so. I'm going to tell you the intimate story—I had an epiphany a couple of years ago which started positive psychology for me, and some of you may have heard this story before—I'm going to tell you the story that actually happened at a moment. I'm going to talk then about the implications of that epiphany for me personally and for what I've thought about psychology. I'm going to talk about the modern history of psychology and how it became part of the medical model and what the costs and benefits of the healing profession are. I'm going to talk a bit about the notion of prevention and therapy and how they open up the area of positivity. I'm going to say something about what I think the structure of the science may well become. I'm going to talk about what the implicit goals of positive psychology are. And I'm going to say something about teaching positive psychology. I'm going to say a little bit about the practicalities and what seems to be on the table. And then I'm finally going to say my hopes and my visions for what our future will be. And then I'm going to tell you the actual story about why I ran and decided to become APA president. So that's what I'm going to do in a half hour.

The moment in time was about two years ago. I'd come back—I thought my theme as president was going to be prevention—and so I gathered together a dozen of the leading people in prevention, and one of them was Mike Csikszentmihalyi. And we held a meeting, which I found dull intellectually, and I found it dull because it was kind of a routine application of the medical model doing it earlier. And not only did I think that probably wouldn't work, but I also thought there was no way of capturing the imagination

of the best young scientists and the best clinicians into something as mechanical as that. And I said to Mike on the way up, "Mike, this has to have some intellectual backbone, this has to be a lot more interesting." And that was the background.

A few days later, I was weeding in the garden, I'm a rose gardener, and I was weeding with my daughter, Nikki, who had turned five a couple of weeks before that, and I have to tell you, Mary, that even though I write books about kids, I'm really not very good with kids. And, like most of you, I'm goal oriented and time urgent. And I was trying to get the weeds out, and Nikki was throwing weeds in the air and running around and dancing, and I yelled at her, and she sort of looked at me and she walked away, and she came back and said, "Daddy, I want to talk to you." I said, "Yeah, Nikki?" She said, "Yeah, Daddy, you may not have noticed, but do you remember that before I was five years old, before my fifth birthday, I was a whiner? I whined every day from the time I was three until the time I was five. And, you know, Daddy, on my fifth birthday, I decided I wasn't gonna whine anymore. And that was the hardest thing I've ever done, and I haven't whined since. And if I can stop whining, you can stop being so grumpy." This was actually an epiphany for me. First, personally, Nikki was exactly right, for fifty years of my life, I've walked around being grouchy and grumpy. And even though I'm surrounded in my life by my wife and children, who are just rays of sunshine, and there's no reason for my grumpiness. Anything I've done has probably been in spite of it, not because of it.

So personally I decided I was going to change just like Nikki, and that's the hardest thing I've ever done, by the way. I don't know if I've succeeded or not, but I've tried. It doesn't come naturally. And the second thing was about the notion of child rearing. I've been, like many of you, brought up in a school of psychology that says that education and child rearing is about repairing weaknesses, about finding what's wrong and correcting it. Now, that's ridiculous, given what Nikki had just done. Raising Nikki wasn't about stopping her whining, she decided to do that herself. Raising Nikki would be about taking the strength that she had just shown--I call it seeing into the soul--naming it, nurturing it, reinforcing it, helping her to lead her life around it and let it buffer against the weaknesses and the disissitudes. The most important thing, the most general thing I learned, was that psychology was half-baked, literally half-baked. We had baked the part about mental illness; we had baked the part about repair of damage. But as Corey was telling us today, that's only half of it. The other side's unbaked, the side of strength, the side of what we're good at.

And so at that moment, I decided that—I called Mike Csikszentmihalyi immediately after that, and said, "Mike, I don't know what your plans are for New Year's, but I'd like you and Isabella to cancel them, come to Mexico with Mandy and me, and let's talk about the notion of creating a field of positive psychology." And I called Ray Fowler and said the same thing. They all canceled what they were doing and we all showed up in Mexico for a week and walked and talked. And, Paul, we talked about you a lot because the one example we had, Paul, of a field that had been created successfully was ancient. So we asked, as a model, how did Matilda Riley and Bert Breman and Paul Baltes do this almost thirty years ago now? And we decided to take the lessons of that and try to do them here. And so that's how it began.

How did psychology get painted into the corner of being a healing profession, of being almost exclusively about identifying what was wrong with people and remediating it? It's got an interesting history, and it's a lesson for where we are now. Before World War II, psychologists who were interested in changing the world had three missions. One mission was curing mental illness. A second mission was making the lives of all people stronger, happier, more productive, more fulfilling. And a third mission was nurturing and identifying genius, nurturing and identifying high talent. Well, after World War II, psychology got derailed and deformed and two of those three missions were forgotten.

And there are two reasons, two causes, of that. The first was that in 1946, the Veterans Administration Act was passed, and psychologists found that they could make a living treating neurotics in Omaha. And thousands of us found we could make a living and flocked to that profession. And the second thing happened in 1947 to complement it; the National Institute of Mental Health was founded, and in spite of the charter that Corey read to you today, it's always been the National Institute of Mental Illness, it's not remotely about mental health. And academics like I found out you could get grants if you said you were doing something toward the cure of mental illness. And that's the way it happened, that's the way the practice and the academics got deformed.

Now, I don't want to say this in a negative way. I think there were two great victories of this economic change in what psychology did. One victory was that in 1947, none of what I would now call the major illnesses were treatable, it was all superstition and shadow, fog. And now, by my count, 14 of the major mental illnesses are treatable, two of them curable, in my opinion, by either psychotherapies or by pharmacological agents. So that was the first great victory. This is very important. And the second great victory was that a science, and this is the important lesson for us, the science of mental illness developed. That is, first we were able to take enormously difficult, fuzzy concepts, like depression, anger, alcoholism, schizophrenia, impotence, and define them, operationalize them and then assess them in reliable and valid ways. And then we were able to ask about the causal skein of them. We asked by experimental methods and by very sophisticated longitudinal methods, how do these things get caused? And, best of all, we developed interventions for these things, both biological and psychological, and were able to test, in rigorous ways, whether or not these interventions worked. So a science appeared built out of nowhere that actually works.

But the cost of this was that psychology forgot its other two missions. It forgot that it was also about making the lives of normal people better and more fulfilling and more productive and happier. And it forgot about genius, it forgot that one of our obligations is to identify the most talented, this precious resource we have in America, our most talented young people and find the conditions under which they flourished. That mission is virtually a dirty word now. Well, that was the cost.

Now, what heightens this issue and brings it home to us I think are one thing about therapy and one thing about prevention. I've worked in prevention for the last 15 years or so, and I thought when I started that what prevention would be about was what this group

of prevention experts told me it was about; it was about the medical model done early. And then as the prevention literature started to emerge on what worked and what didn't work, it turned out that virtually nothing that we had learned about the biology of mental illness or the psychotherapy for mental illness was applicable to prevention, that prevention wasn't about repairing damage. Rather, the things that worked, in my own life I work on learned optimism, and just to spend thirty seconds on that, we basically teach children and adults the skills of thinking about bad events as rather than being pervasive and permanent, we teach them the ways of thinking about them as local and specific and becoming accurate in their attributions for bad events, and we find that we cut the rate of depression by about fifty percent in both children and adults. I mention that for its generality, that is that like half a dozen other things I could tell you about in prevention, is not about repairing damage, that's about taking the human strength, hope, optimism, future-mindedness and building it and using that as a buffer against depression.

So I believe that if you're interested in preventing schizophrenia in kids that are genetically vulnerable to schizophrenia, if you're interested in preventing drug abuse in kids that are vulnerable to it because they live in the wrong neighborhood, if you're interested in preventing depression for people who are going to come across awful events, it's not the medical techniques, it's not the psychotherapy techniques that are useful, but rather there are a set of human virtues, human strengths, which are the great buffers against these conditions. Courage, hope, interpersonal skill, perseverance, honesty, work ethic, capacity for pleasure, future-mindedness, capacity for insight, just to name a few.

But the problem is that because we have been a profession and a science focused on what was wrong, and what was weak, we know almost nothing about the strengths, about those virtues. So if you want to do prevention, we need a science of what is strongest and best. Now, parallel considerations hold in therapy, and they hold about a set of findings which people have wanted to sweep under the rug for thirty years, which really cannot be swept under the rug. I've spent a good part of my life looking at therapy outcome and there are a set of findings in therapy outcome research that you should know about. They're a mystery, but there are huge effects, and they're not explained. There are three such findings. The first is that whenever you do a drug study, test out a new drug, or a psychotherapy study and you control for it well, you get an enormous placebo effect in the control group, and the better the control group, the bigger the placebo effect. And effectiveness, efficacy in this research, turns out to be the difference between 60% responding in the group that gets Prozac or cognitive therapy or whatever, and 45% responders in the group that gets placebos, and that's not an exaggeration. So signal to noise causes an enormous placebo effect.

And the second well-kept secret of outcome researches is that contrary to what you read about in textbooks, contrary to the efficacy literature in which you get clinic volunteers and do a laboratory version of the therapy on them and find specificity of that, that cognitive therapy works for depression or Masters and Johnson therapy works for female sexual dysfunction, in the effectiveness literature, that is when you take real people and you do it in the field, there is not an ounce of specificity for any drug or any

psychotherapy. That is, I was the consultant for the *Consumer Reports Therapy Study*, which is the largest therapy study ever done. And I came into that study in 1994. I should tell you, by the way, that *Consumer Reports* is a really serious outfit about analysis of data. I've collaborated with a lot of academic and business and military institutions in my time. There's only one other outfit that is as serious about data, this includes, Paul, the Max Planck Institute, as *Consumer Reports*, and that's the Central Intelligence Agency. These are the two groups that really know how to do data. And I know a little bit about data, and I was expecting specificity, so we basically created a matrix in which we took every disorder, and we took every drug and every psychotherapy, and I was expecting sort of things to happen on the diagonal, that specific drugs and specific psychotherapies would work for specific disorders.

There was none, and when I say none, I mean I spent two or three months massaging that data, looking for specificity, and I couldn't come up with an ounce of it. So that's the second thing to keep in mind, that there's a huge placebo effect, and when psychotherapy or drug therapy is done, it works on everything about equally well. And the third thing is it works very well indeed. That is, the *Consumer Reports'* figures are 90% benefit for drugs and psychotherapy, not the 55 to 60% benefit that comes out of laboratory studies. So what in the world is going on here? What accounts for those three facts? No one I know has accounted for them.

Well, let me suggest to you, when therapy is well done, people talk pejoratively about non-specifics in therapy. They talk about trivial non-specifics, like saying it's pause here instead of let's stop here, they talk about relationships with therapists, which is not trivial. Here's what they don't talk about, this is what I think the deepest non-specific is, is what Don Clifton has spent his life working on and it's what I believe every good psychotherapist, every good psychiatrist who gives drugs is very good at, they build the strengths; they identify the strengths of their patients and they build them. I want to suggest to you that that is the buffer, that that's why there's a big placebo effect, it's why there's non-specificity, and it's why 90% of people benefit from drugs and from psychotherapy because what we're really doing is identify—it's the Nikki effect—we're identify and amplifying strengths.

So that points to those two hypotheses that the future of prevention is the building of strengths and that the really active ingredient in psychotherapy and drug therapy is the building of strength. It points to the question, it points to the need for a science of strength, and that's pretty much what got me there. And let me tell you how I parse the science, this is just my own view of it, and we already have a hundred flowers, and here's my bias: I parse it as first being about positive, subjective experience. You heard about it from Ed Diener today, and I parse the positive, subjective experience differently from Ed, but I think Bob has convinced me I'm wrong about that. I'll tell you what I thought yesterday before Bob cornered me. I parsed it as past, present and future. So positive, subjective experience about the past is contentment, satisfaction, well-being, sort of how you view your history. Positive, subjective experience about the present is what archeologists work on, happiness, flow, ecstasy, the sensual pleasures, the like, and

positive, subjective experience about the future is optimism and hope. So that's the way I parsed it.

The second way I think about positive psychology is positive individual characteristics. This was the Cayman group getting together asking, how do you make an attempt? The question of the opposite of a DSM is a very serious question. I think if we want to get the public, the congress, the medical profession thinking about assessing lives, and we want to move it away from do I have a disorder, we need an alternative, we need the opposite of a DSM. That is, we need a sensible taxonomy of the strengths, and several people in this room have their own. The Cayman group got together with Don Clifton and developed one which had, as I mentioned before, intimacy, future-mindedness, leadership, altruism, integrity, creativity, wisdom, a few other of the strengths on it. I think the next time this group gets together, we'll probably want to look at different taxonomies against each other, and the future of that is operationalizing it, asking is it reliable and valid, and then asking what to do, do these things have causal effects. But at any rate, positive individual traits strike me as the second pillar of this science.

And the third pillar of the science is positive institutions, positive communities. Sociology has been in the same languishing state as, and of course Corey comes from sociology, so he testified to it, as psychology; it's been all about the "isms" and how the "isms" disable us and ruin life. It's been about racism and sexism and ageism. Well, you get rid of those things, which we all want, and you're at zero. What are the institutions that take human beings above zero? Not just Kathleen Jamieson works on incivility; I mean she's interested in Congress and presidential campaigns and people focus on the cost of incivility. Incivility makes you angry at the person who's uncivil to you, you want to get revenge on them, you want to pay them back, your blood pressure goes up. That's all true. But civility is not the opposite, it's not just the absence of incivility. Civility leads to the kind of thing that Barbara Frederickson was talking about today; it leads to building and broadening, and I'd add to what Barbara said as to what positive emotions do; civility moves you out of a zero sanguine way of thinking and arguing, putting out fires way, to a creative, to a non-zero sanguine, to everyone can benefit. So the question is, what are the positive institutions and what do they produce? We need a sociology of positive institutions.

So that is what I see as the science. And I think there are three applications that will grow the science. The first is one that Gallup does as well as anyone, and that's the question of assessment, testing. One way that I parsed the project that Don is leading with Ed Diener and Derek Isaacowitz you'll hear about tomorrow is they took the 15 or 17 characteristics from the Cayman Islands, they created Gallup-like questions for all of them, there's a 107 item questionnaire. It's about the psychological health of the nation. What they're doing holds the promise of combining with economic indices, indices of air pollution, to ask the question, how is the nation doing, how is the political system doing? How are things changing over time? So one of the applications is the ability to measure the psychological health of the nation, people.



Another application is intervention generally. That is, once you can name the characteristics, you can ask which of those can you intervene on, which of those can you build? And the final one is life span developmental psychology. How do these things change, interact over the course of one's life? So that's the way I see the shape of the science.

I'll talk for a couple of minutes about what the real goals are of this movement and what it might accomplish if you're successful in it. I told you the first, it will create a science of positive, subjective experience, which is there in many forms of positive individual traits in the positive community. And I don't think this science is going to be difficult to create. That is, the reason I mentioned the science of mental illness, it did the work for us. We can be completely parasitic on the kinds of operational definitions, the methods of assessment, the structural equations, the experimental methods, the intervention, the outcome testing, that the science of mental illness created. These are applicable methodologically, virtually in toto to the best things in life.

So the first underlying goal is the science. The second is prevention by buffering, and I talked about that. The third is to change the nature of therapy, or at least to get people to recognize what they're doing. That is, to train our young practitioners to build strength explicitly, what the moves are, what's the right way to add another arrow in the quiver of the practitioner. A fourth is to end victimology. That is, if you think about the disease model, and the underlying picture of the human being that the disease model embodies, it doesn't take very long to understand, and the word response contains it all, response I think is the most repulsive word in the psychological vocabulary, a response is the passive view of the human being. That the environment is acting on you and it's pushing some response out of you. These aren't responses; I'm not responding now, I'm initiating something, I'm acting. You're listening to me. What you're doing in your head now is not responding; you're playing with the ideas or having sexual fantasies or whatever, you're an active initiator. And so I think it's not just the view of the human being as the passive victim that we might end here, but it's the victimology with which the social sciences are pervaded, in which we view people as the victims of their environment. Well, once in a while that's true, and you want to be able to say that accurately, but the rest of the time it's not true, and it's time to distinguish those things.

Another goal has to do with moving psychology from the egocentric to the philanthropic. And I want to amplify on something that was said earlier today about that. We're under attack right now. This is our first attack, you may not know it, we're under attack from the people you would have thought were our brothers and sisters, and that is the humanistic psychologists. What they're saying, we are going daily on the net with them, is they're saying, hey, you guys are just reinventing the wheel and not giving us credit. Karl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, we invented this stuff, and, you know, you may be marketing it for us, but this is ours, it's our intellectual property. And let me say what I think the difference is between humanistic psychology and positive psychology. I think there are two essentially. The first may be intended, the second was unintended. The first is that the humanistic psychologists were not empirical scientists; in fact, some of them were downright anti-empirical scientists. But be that as it may, it did not attract the

science; it became a mode of treatment and intervention in the absence of a science, and it's got very little concern with empirical evidence in the sense that everyone in this room cares about. That's one difference. And the second difference is I think unintended, if you're a Maslow scholar, which I'm not, you can find it, but it's not what it led to. Humanistic psychologists is one of the movements that led to the sanctification of the individual, of Narcissism, of individual gratification, which I think our country is in epidemic of.

And you've noticed in the way we've structured positive psychology, it's not just about happiness and subjective experience; it's about positive character, and about half of those positive characteristics are about relationships to others and altruism, and it's about positive community and families. It's not about the glorified self. And I can best illustrate this by telling you about my teaching experience last semester. I taught positive psychology for the first time in the spring. I gathered 20 Penn undergraduates together and we read a few books, and there was a weekly essay that everyone wrote, but it also turns out that we started to do weekly assignments based on the stuff we talked about in class. I'll just tell you what happened one week to illustrate the egotism philanthropy question. We were talking about John Haight's work that Barbara mentioned. Basically what John does, John started off with Paul Rozen working on moral disgust, and Paul and John put Adolph Hitler's T-shirt on people and things like that and worked for emotional reaction. And then John began to wonder, was there an opposite emotion to moral disgust? And so he began to ask people, "Have you ever seen a human being do something wonderful? Have you ever seen the best side of human nature?" He gets stories, and what he's looking for in the telling of the story are the traditional indices of emotion. And so he gets stories like this. An 18 year old woman, the University of Virginia, a snowing night, they'd been working at the Salvation Army, they're driving home in a truck, and they go by an old lady shoveling her walk, and the guy says to the driver, "Would you let me out here?" And the girl thinks, well, he just wants to take a shortcut home. But when he picked up the shovel, my throat constricted, and I started to cry. And I wanted to tell everyone about it. And it turns out there's evidence these people go out and volunteered.

So we talked about John's work in class, and so I gave the following assignment, I do the assignments myself, and the assignment I gave for the next week was, one, do something enjoyable. And the other one was do something philanthropic, and write it up, tell us what happened. Well, we all came in with our assignment the next week, and there was a remarkable regularity to it. When you did something enjoyable, like hang out with your friends or go to the movie, there was a square wave offset. When it was over, it was over. But when you did something philanthropic which involved your own skill, just giving five dollars to a homeless person didn't work. One of the girls, her nephew called for help with his arithmetic, and she spent an hour on the phone helping him with arithmetic, and what she said was, gee, the whole day went better after that. People liked me more. I could listen better. I was mellower. People found in this assignment that they were a lot happier doing philanthropic things than going to the movies, watching television, hanging out with friends. There's a lesson there with the egocentric versus the philanthropic.

Let me tell you where things are practically at the moment. I see my role mostly as convener and cheerleader and fundraiser for all of you good people out there and your students and the possibility of the field, and this is an idea that has attracted donors, as well as scientists. The Templeton Foundation has set up the largest prize ever given for the best research in positive psychology for the next three years; the first prize is \$100,000 a year, for people under forty. You've seen what Don Clifton has done here, at Cayman, and you'll be hearing more from him in the future on other plans. We're holding meetings of young scholars in Mexico every January, of the talented young people that we're finding. And a research network will come to exist in the next year, and it will basically have a structure that you'll hear more about tomorrow, but have a structure that looks like positive, subjective experience, which Ed Diener will be heading, positive individual characteristics, which Mike Csikszentmihalyi will be heading, positive institutions which Kathleen Hall Jamieson will be heading, and the development of an opposite of DSM-4, which George Ryan will be heading, and Bob Nozick will be our gadfly and someone who will try to get us to think straight about these things, which we're not yet doing.

And this will not be a research network in the sense of exclusiveness or funding research; it'll be convening people together. Each of these eminent scientists thinks there are great questions to be answered here, so they will try to articulate what the great questions are and convene the right groups of two, three, six, ten people together to begin answers to them. So that's what's on the horizon. There are various foundations and others who are saying intervention, can we use positive psychology to intervene prevention of mental illness, to intervene in the inner city, and these things may develop. We'll be tracking these and trying to help with them.

So my prediction is, and my hope is that there will arise, in the next few years, a science of positive psychology, and in lockstep a profession of positive psychology will arise whose mission will be to assess and build human strength. And my vision of the transformation that this may reap in psychology is that psychology will become—Tom Sauce e-mailed me last year about the psychology—I'll have to tell you what he said, George. He said, "Marty, psychology is the racket that imitates the racket cult psychiatry." And what Tom, it's obvious what he meant by that, that we have become sort of little psychiatrists, and I think Tom's wrong about that. My vision, and I think he's wrong in many ways, is psychiatry means doctoring to the soul, and the kind of doctoring that we're talking about isn't doctoring, it's not medical, it has to do with the building of strength. And it's my vision that that's what psychologists are very good at, and it's my vision that as the future comes, psychologists will be called on not just to ask how do we heal damaged self-esteem, but how do you build a sense of worth or warrant a sense of esteem? That psychologists will be called on, as Harry was telling us, not just to ask how do you repair a broken marriage, but how do you find ecstasy and friendship in marriage again. Psychologists will be called on not just to ask when a Columbine occurs, how do you prevent violence in kids, but how do you build morally exemplary youth. That psychologists will be called on not just to explicate how and why we distrust our leaders, but to ask the question of what is trustworthiness in a leader, and how can we build it, and

how can our leaders warrant it. That psychologists will be called on not just to repair incivility in our national life, but how to build civility. That psychologists will be called on not just how do we make our work less boring, but how do we find flow and meaning in our work. That psychologists will be called on, in the end, not just to ask how do we relieve the pain and suffering of death, but how do we find meaning and dignity in dying.

I want to close by telling you actually I ran for president of APA, it's kind of bizarre. People often ask why a content academic would spend his life in his laboratory with his students to do something as difficult and, if you know APA politics, as aversive as trying to lead these 150,000 presidents, Bob. And here's the real reason: I always had this image. You know, in *2001*, the movie, at the end of the movie, I don't know how many of you remember this image, there's the little embryo sitting over the planet, and I just had that image about it. And what that image was, I now understand it, I believe that I had a mission but I didn't know what the mission was. And I believe that if I found myself in a position of leading American Psychology, that I would find out what that mission was, and I did. That mission was, and is, to build with you a science of positive psychology, and it's for that opportunity that I'm deeply grateful to all of you. Thank you.

END

Transcribed by Bette Curd on 10/3/99