

Existential Positive Psychology as “Height Psychology”: Toward a Multidimensional View¹

Dmitry Leontiev, Ph.D.¹

¹International Laboratory of Positive Psychology of Personality and Motivation,
HSE University (Higher School of Economics), Moscow, Russia.

Some personal contexts

I am happy to know Paul Wong since early 2000, when I read somewhere a call for papers for the international congress “Searching for meaning in the new millennium” to be held during the following July in Vancouver.

It was a positive shock for me for several reasons. Not just because the list of brilliant speakers exceeded the power of my imagination. The point was that the issue of meaning was the object of my deepest, however strongly frustrated professional and personal interest for two decades, since my student years. My professional socialization was associated with the Cultural-Historical Activity Theory approach (CHAT), developed by Lev Vygotsky and Alexey Leontiev, my grandfather; his theory of personal meaning is its important component. Aside from that, I was deeply attracted by humanistic, especially existential psychology. In the 1980s-1990s I had multiple opportunities to communicate with some prominent members of the humanistic psychology community, such as Stanley Krippner, Amedeo Giorgi, Jim Bugental, Tom Greening, Kirk Schneider and others, both in Moscow and in California. I was happy to meet in person Viktor Frankl in Moscow in 1986 and 1992 and in Vienna in 1991, and became involved in translating and publishing his works in Russia. One of the intersections of both approaches was the problem of personal meaning which attracted both academic scholars and existentially

¹The paper was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program

minded thinkers outside the academic tradition. The theory of personal meaning became the subject matter of my graduate work in 1982, my Ph.D. Thesis in 1988 and my next level dissertation in 1999.

Despite all this, I had no feeling that personal meaning was considered an important issue beyond some local professional communities. This construct did not belong to the commonly accepted psychological thesaurus, it was not relevant at most international conferences and in most journals, so that I had to put my main interest aside and switch to secondary ones. That is why the announcement of the Vancouver conference shocked me (positively) so much.

I immediately wrote to Dr. Wong and received a very encouraging answer revealing a true interest in what I could bring to the conference. There was, however, another embarrassing obstacle. During the very days of the planned conference I was to give an invited talk at a conference on cultural-historical psychology in Rio de Janeiro, with all the expenses covered by the organizers. Having failed to devise a travel plan which would allow me to attend both events, I found myself facing a hard choice: either enjoyment in Rio at the expense of organizers, or meaning in Vancouver at my own expense. I decided to make a gift to myself on the occasion of my approaching 40th birthday, counted my cash, headed to Vancouver and never regretted it. Take-home message: investing in your meaning pays for itself.

The 2000 conference was one of the best conferences I ever attended, if not the very best one. The same can be said about the subsequent biannual meaning conferences (I attended most of them). Paul Wong as the heart of this long-term project managed to unite, first, scholarly and practically oriented psychologists, and second, positive psychologists and existential psychologists, having overcome two major splits in the meaning-oriented community. How could he do it? I guess it was due to his character strengths which Chris Peterson labelled

“strengths of the heart”, listing among them zest, gratitude, hope, and love (Peterson, 2006, p. 154). These are the strongest.

It was a couple of years later that I got acquainted with positive psychology and experienced one more shock, both a positive and existential one, when Martin Seligman in his opening speech at the First Positive Psychology summit in Washington (DC) announced the meaningful life to be an inalienable and even the supreme aspect of the good life (see also Seligman, 2002), making the issue of meaning again a legitimate one in a broad academic context. Being basically culturally-historically and existentially minded, I liked the agenda proposed by positive psychology because it provided the space for focusing on meaning and other existential issues of our life, the most important ones in the present-day world. Paul Wong made a huge step toward this synthesis. This chapter is an attempt to combine several perspectives in psychology on the verge of the new world, departing from the agenda of positive psychology, in a dialogue with Paul.

An academic introduction: Whither Positive Psychology?

The stream of thought and research currently labeled positive psychology (PP) seems to become less and less uniform and more and more difficult to define. “PP is in flux. Given the dynamic changes in the field, PP today is already very different from what was originally proposed by Seligman” (Wong, 2011).

PP is a problem field covering a broad spectrum of diverse approaches; it is the subject matter rather than methodology that unites them. Its initial message was necessarily an antithesis to the previous psychology, namely, that the laws and regularities of the good life are very important but cannot be deduced from the laws and regularities that account for the ordinary life. Correspondingly, the subject matter of PP is “how to go from plus two to plus seven in your life,

not just how to go from minus five to minus three” (Seligman, 2002, p. xi). If we begin with problems and deficits, what we learn there cannot be transferred to the domain of strengths and positive affects. According to Seligman (2011), “Once in a while I would help a patient get rid of all his anger and anxiety and sadness. I thought I would then get a happy patient. But I never did. I got an empty patient” (p. 54). The psychological dynamics in the “plus” area are different from those in the “minus” area. Thus, PP created a new agenda for psychology at large.

Existential psychology (EP) is a school of thought which took shape after World War II. Like every scientific school, it has its specific philosophical foundations, theoretical bases and methodology, though it shares some of them not only with other branches of humanistic psychology, but also with the cultural-historical tradition and even cybernetic views of complicated self-regulating and self-organized systems (see Leontiev, 2020). Unlike EP, PP is an agenda rather than a school of thought; it defines itself through the previously largely neglected problem field of positive living rather than through philosophical foundations, theoretical bases and methodology which vary broadly across the field. PP provides a variety of possible approaches to the positive agenda. There may be and there indeed are different positive psychologies, ranging from rather straightforward procedure-based approaches to complicated comprehensive evolutionary theories (Csikszentmihalyi, 1993).

Like humanistic psychology that after a decade of triumph in the 1960s transformed its own environment so much that it had to revise much of its goals and tenets, positive psychology experienced a similar challenging success through 2000s and by the end of the decade arrived at a similar necessity for critical self-reflection. This self-reflection highlighted the direction of further development of positive psychology from emotional states and evaluations to the more in-depth structures predictive of maintaining a positive emotional background even under threats

and adversities (Sheldon, Kashdan, & Steger, 2010).

In the beginning of our century, the relationships between the reemerging existential psychology and the newly born positive psychology became an issue. In fact, there was no inherent contradiction between the two. Indeed, existential positive psychology as the existentially based approach to positive psychology's problem field or, to put it simply, as the existentialist answers to positive psychology's questions, is not only possible but long awaited. I have mentioned this state of affairs more than once, pointing at pending challenges for positive psychology which could be met through adding an existential dimension to it: the challenge of dialectically embracing both the positive and the negative sides of human nature; the challenge of moving from surface phenomena to essential explanations; the challenge of explaining both human self-determination and straightforward causality; and others (Leontiev, 2006; 2008; 2014). There have also been some attempts on the side of existential psychology to integrate some tenets of positive psychology into its scope (Deurzen, 2008).

The second decade of the history of PP started with a number of attempts to conceptualize it through the use of specifying labels like humanistic positive psychology (Schneider, 2011), existential positive psychology (Wong, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2019), second wave positive psychology (Ivtzan, Lomas, Hefferon, & Worth, 2015; Lomas & Ivtzan, 2016), third wave positive psychology (Lomas, Waters, Williams, Oades, & Hern, 2020), or meta-positive-psychology (Huta, 2017). All these labels which I use here indiscriminately reflect the striving to bring together the highlights of humanistic, existential, and positive psychology, considering positive psychology in its original form (PP 1.0) helpful but insufficient. It is supposed that positive psychology with its highlights of conditions of well-being and the life worth living is to be complemented by the highlights of humanistic psychology (HP) with the

emphasis on the inherently creative and developing human nature, and those of existential psychology (EP) stressing the role of human freedom, agency, and effort.

The most elaborated of these attempts seems to be Paul Wong's idea of positive psychology 2.0 (PP 2.0) as an integrative framework (Wong, 2009, 2011) articulated as a "part of the ongoing evolution of PP", "a mindset, a movement and a big tent for all positive-oriented psychologists, rather than a distinct subdiscipline". He called for a more balanced, dialectical view regarding the relationships between the positive and the negative (see also Leontiev, 2008). Among the four pillars of PP 2.0 Wong listed virtue, meaning, resilience, and well-being, giving a detailed justification of this statement. In a more recent version (Wong, 2021) it is faith (spirituality), meaning, and relationships that make the pillars of positive mental health.

This contribution as a development of the idea of PP 2.0 claims to add to the discussion the seemingly neglected dimension of agency (deliberateness), which occupies a very important place in the cultural-historical tradition in psychology that was launched by Lev Vygotsky in the 1930s. This adds one more pillar to the ones listed by Wong. The appropriate label for this synthetic view would seem to be "height psychology", a label coined in the 1930s by Lev Vygotsky and Viktor Frankl (see below).

We begin with the essence of positivity. What was wrong with PP 1.0 so that PP 2.0 was needed?

The Three Faces of the Positive

Positive psychology means the psychology of good things. The key issue is a philosophical one: What is good for us human beings? What are the criteria of the good? When we speak of positive psychology, in what sense is it positive? Besides, everyone engaged in empirical studies in the field knows that all good things covary, and the key problem of data interpretation is the one of discriminant validity. In other words, the same things are at the same time pleasant, meaningful, helpful, healthy, etc., and the problem is to differentiate what these labels denote, if they are not the same.

Socrates taught that what is called “good” depends on one’s purpose. A good sword, a good horse, and a good jar are different things and possess different attributes (Xenophon 3.8). Aristotle, subsequently, stressed individual differences: What is good depends on whom you ask: “With regard to what happiness is people differ and the majority do not give the same account as the wise” (Aristotle, 2006, 1095a).

Several different answers to this question are to be considered, some of them being more evident than others.

The first answer is apparently the most self-evident one: *The positive is what feels positive and brings positive emotions like happiness*. This answer was implied by PP 1.0 with its predominant emphasis on emotions. The positive is identified with the pleasant or the attractive. In this view, emotions are strictly ordered along the pleasant vs. unpleasant dimension, especially the basic, evolutionarily oldest ones; this dichotomy seems to become less strict along with evolutionary development. This definition is both fundamental and insufficient. All emotions refer to here-and-now, rough, subjective evaluation. “Subjective” suggests interindividual variability, despite many commonalities. “Rough” means that emotional evaluations make a not-

too differentiated scale, and the same emotional evaluation may be given to objects differing in subtler and more sophisticated ways. “Here-and-now” means that the evaluation refers to the present moment, even though more distant consequences may go contrary to the immediate feeling. John Locke (1690/1999) noted over three centuries ago that we often make bad choices which we regret later because we focus on the immediate, teasing benefits and are unable to anticipate distant consequences (often negative ones) of what is immediately attractive.

The second answer is this: *The positive is what makes sense in the lifespan, social, and transcendental contexts*. Essentially, it is some comprehensive context that defines the meaning of anything, including our life at large. Meaning is the bridge that connects our actions to broader contexts, “a divine knot holding things together” (de Saint-Exupery, 1979, p. 55). In this case, a meaningful life is connected to something greater and receives energy from this connection. It possesses awareness and perspective, is directed by goals and by the insight of possibilities (“Being-motivation”; see Maslow, 1968). It is distinctively human and authentic and follows an “individualistic” path of development (Maddi, 1971). A meaningless life, on the contrary, is fragmented and disconnected from something else. Awareness and perspective are lacking; it is pushed by external causes and driven by deficits. It is not fully human (i.e., not much of human potential is involved), alienated, and follows a “conformist path” (Maddi, 1971; see Leontiev, 2006a for more details).

The third answer puts forward still another criterion: *The positive is what provides improvement and progression toward a better state of affairs*. This idea follows from the existentialist view, but not only from it. According to an anonymous meme: The point is not whether the glass is half full or half empty, the point is that it is refillable! We do not merely evaluate the glass as it is; we treat it as a possibility of doing something in line with our wishes.

William James (1896), a forerunner of 20th century existentialism, introduced the melioristic understanding of positive functioning. Meliorism transcends the optimism vs. pessimism dichotomy; it treats the future as undetermined and containing various possibilities that are a challenge for our conscious action. It is through our action that the world can be saved. “This life is worth living, we can say, *since it is what we make it, from the moral point of view*” (James, 1896, p. 61).

This view has been developed in the middle of the 20th century not only in existentialism, but also in the cultural-historical activity theory paradigm in psychology (Lev Vygotsky, Alexey Leontiev; see Leontiev D., 2002; 2020) and in the systems-cybernetic models of self-regulation and self-organization (Nikolai Bernstein, Norbert Wiener, W. Ross Ashby, Gregory Bateson a.o.; see Leontiev D., 2012). This is the most dynamic view of what is good and what is bad: Good is what allows one to refill the glass, to move from a worse to a better state of affairs.

To sum up, we call positive things and events that correspond to one (or more) of the following three complementary criteria. Good is what (1) feels good and arouses positive emotions; (2) connects our actions to superordinate contexts (makes sense); and (3) predicts improvements in the future. All three criteria often converge but may sometimes diverge. For example, drug addiction provides positive emotion at the expense of the other two criteria. Positive emotion in general provides the oldest, simplest, and least specific criterion of what is good. The two other criteria relate to the highest human potentials and resources of self-reflexive consciousness.

Figure 1

Three dimensions of the positive.





Figure 2

Stereometric metaphors of the “dimensional ontology” (Frankl, 1979, p. 25).



The three criteria are connected with each other as three dimensions, such as in a cube (Figure 1). This figure shows how we can combine the three dimensions of pleasure, control, and meaning. The three faces are relatively independent of each other, though they covary, like all good things. If we reduce all criteria to just one face (i.e., subjective well-being), we lose the whole dimension. As the illustration from Frankl’s (1979) book highlights (Figure 2), in this case we confuse complicated 3D bodies with their 2D projections and cannot distinguish three different bodies by their projections only; their differences lie in a higher dimension.

The difference between PP 1.0 and PP 2.0, to simplify things a bit, seems to be in the

number of dimensions taken into consideration. We therefore must move from 2D to 3D space, from PP 1.0 to PP 2.0, which embraces PP as one of its aspects but considers more dimensions.

To Be or To Have?

The first attempt to make sense of positivity beyond pleasure and satisfaction was Aristotle's concept of happiness (eudaimonia) as "an activity (energeia) of the soul in accordance with perfect virtue" (Aristotle, 2006, 1102a). Eudaimonia refers to one's personal merits, and treating happiness as the outcome of personal merits became the dominant view in Ancient philosophy. Moreover, the disputes over eudaimonic vs. hedonic views on happiness have taken the central place in positive psychology since the 1980s; we cannot dwell on them here. Examples of personal merits approaches to the essence of the positive are the theory of psychological well-being (Ryff, 1989) and the directory of character strengths and virtues (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The pie model (Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005) states that stable personality traits (both merits and demerits) account for about 50% of variance in subjective well-being. Indeed, being happy or unhappy are feelings, but more than just feeling; they can also make an identity, or even a way of living (Lyubomirsky, 2001).

However, this view has its limitations. The emphasis on personal merits suggests that a person is viewed as a creature equal to oneself, defined by intelligible determinants and hence predictable and controllable, like all other creatures. Hence, a person can be labeled as happy or unhappy on the positive-negative continuum. For human beings, this explanation works but does not suffice. It considers the stable aspects of the person but fails to embrace the self-transcendent aspect—our optional capacity of not being equal to ourselves. This can also be phrased in terms of Fromm's (1976) dichotomy of "having vs. being": merits are something we have, and a good life can be an implication or implementation of these merits. While this works statistically, it is

not necessarily the case, and the good life can occur independent of these merits; either merits do not help one to be happy (like in the biblical Job's case) or the lack of merits does not impede being happy. Indeed, is our well-being something we have or something we are, being well-being human beings?

Human nature suggests that, unlike other creatures, we need not (though may optionally) be equal to ourselves, simply reproducing inborn or learned routines. Humans have no definite pre-established nature, but by their nature they are able to transcend any givens. The core of human nature is our transcendence capacity (Fromm, 1964; Giorgi, 1992). This capacity is based on our choice and intentional activity rather than on traits and states. Love is an emotional state, something that happens to us, but productive loving is an active capacity of relating to one's fellow, something we do rather than have (Fromm, 1956). Optimism is a trait (Carver, Sheier, & Segerstrom, 2010), but it can also be a self-regulated style of explaining events in our life (Seligman, 1990). Happiness is an emotional state, and satisfaction with life can be measured as a trait (Diener, 1984), but they may be also a way of acting we optionally choose (Lyubomirsky, 2001). If what we have accounts for about 50% of the variance in subjective well-being, what we intentionally choose, accounts for about 40% (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005).

Acknowledging both predetermined and transcendent aspects of human nature, we can see the difference between PP 1.0 and PP 2.0 in terms of their emphasis on the one or the other. PP 1.0 deals mostly with "psychological mechanisms," stable structures of personality that function on their own and predict sustainable happiness, optimism, and love, whereas PP 2.0 is probably best defined in terms of moving toward self-determined optimism, love, happiness, etc., in terms of the fulfillment of one's own existential project (Galati & Sotgiu, 2004).

Fromm's (1976) dichotomy—to have or to be—sets the relationship between these two

types of psychological bases of positivity in a most sharpened form: to be or not to be, to be or to have, that is an option. By *non-being* we mean non-aliveness, being totally driven by organismic and environmental forces (“tapes”; see Bugental, 1991), like any natural object. Many humans like being determined because this relieves them of responsibility (Fromm, 1941). In contrast, *being* suggests developing optional self-determined forms of relating to the world, transcending the object status and taking a detached attitude toward one’s states and traits (Frankl, 1969).

Involuntary vs. Self-Controlled Processes and Systems in Human Self-Regulation

The transition from a flat emotion-based positivity to a multicriterial positivity that considers not only actual experiences but also comprehensive life contexts (meaning) and controllable outcomes (control, or regulation) brings us to the domain that has been labeled “height psychology.”

The term “height psychology” was coined independently by two great thinkers: Viktor Frankl in his papers of the late 1930s (Frankl, 1938) and Lev Vygotsky in his manuscripts of the early 1930s, published only in the 1980s (see Vygotsky, 1931/1983, 1984). Both wrote that what was badly needed was height psychology, as opposed to both surface (i.e., behavioristic) psychology and depth psychology. Both moved from different starting points but arrived at essentially the same ideas.

Frankl (1987) identified height psychology with his existential analysis and focus on the spiritual dimension: “It is true, rather than being a substitute for depth psychology, height psychology is only a supplement (to be sure, a necessary one); but it does focus on specifically human phenomena” (p. 266). Frankl (1969) saw the roots of human freedom and self-mastery in two fundamental psychological capacities—self-transcendence and self-detachment—which

allow one to adopt an attitude to everything that might determine us, including heredity, environment, or our drives, thus acquiring a substantial degree of freedom from them.

Vygotsky (1984) viewed this problem through the prism of his cultural-historical psychology of higher mental functions and deliberate actions. Both he and Frankl viewed the human person in terms of multilevel organization, where lower levels are fully causally determined by uncontrollable physiological and psychological mechanisms, while by virtue of higher levels one may master one's own behavior. Vygotsky emphasized the emerging and developing capacities of communication and self-reflection: "If we look at the significance of self-reflection for mental life at large, we shall see a profound difference between a nonreflective, naïve personality structure, on the one side, and a reflective one, on the other" (p. 238).

The idea of a multilevel psychological structure of human self-regulation has been recently reincarnated in dual-system psychological models, which distinguish two types of regulatory systems controlling human conduct and cognitive processing, one of them being unconscious and automatic and the other deliberate and controlled (e.g., "hot" and "cool" systems in Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999; "reflexive" and "reflective" systems in Carver, Johnson, & Joormann, 2008; "fast" and "slow" systems in Kahneman, 2011). Essentially, all of them are versions of what Vygotsky offered in the early 1930s in terms of the distinction between higher and lower mental functions (Vygotsky, 1931/1983). Lower functions are common for all animals, which act due to inherent uncontrollable mechanisms. Higher functions develop over the course of our cultural development and are the capacity to relate to our capacities and take control over them. Probably the most radical phrasing of this distinction is James Bugental's (1991) distinction between acting "on tape" or "alive." On the one hand, acting "on tape" means

reproducing the response patterns elaborated in the course of one's past experience and recorded in mental structures; on the other hand, being "alive" means the capacity of changing one's action at any moment independent of the pre-existing patterns that shape much of our conduct, but which can be overcome and denied.

In his recently published notebooks of the early 1930s, Vygotsky offered further explanations of his approach rooted in the philosophical issue of self-liberation posed by Spinoza:

In essence, in his *Ethics*, Spinoza was all the time trying to solve one problem. This single problem was the following: How is the higher possible in man, when we assume that man does not disturb the laws of nature, thereby, as it were, creating a kingdom within a kingdom, but himself forms part of nature [and is] necessarily subordinated to its laws. How is the higher in man really possible? This was the central question of his whole theory. (Zavershneva & van der Veer, 2018, p. 222)

Vygotsky did not give an answer but, having planned the concluding chapter of a new book about Spinoza (only the first part of this book was written and published posthumously), entitled "Height psychology: *Ecce homo*," he commented:

NB! But this higher is not given from the very beginning. It must be achieved with difficulty. It is a path through steep summits. It is as difficult as it is rare. Not all reach the end. If people would be born free. Obviously, they are not born both powerful and <illegible>. It is what they become. Ergo, the task to prove how the higher is possible in man requires the motion from lower to higher, it requires development. (ibid., p. 224)

Deliberation and the Development of Autonomy

The higher levels of organization in humans are thus deliberate and self-controlled ones, and as such they cannot proceed automatically, but rather require some effort and energy supply. It was prominent French psychologist Pierre Janet (1929) who still earlier than Vygotsky defined personality in terms of self-regulation and, more specifically, inner work. According to Janet, personality is the result of formative societal influences on the individual; gradually the individual becomes an active agent giving shape to oneself through some inner work, “the labor of personality.” This inner work requires an effort, and the feeling of effort is viewed by Janet as the marker of our freedom. Effort is an indicator of the originator of the action. We feel free when we make an effort that produces action. Janet described the development of personality using the term “evolution,” which suggests progression from simple to more complicated forms, from restricted to varied capacities, and from dependence to autonomy. Personality thus evolves toward integration, awareness, acceptance of responsibility, and self-government.

The development of agentic capacities and psychological mechanisms of self-determination, besides the maturation of the biological (including neurophysiological) bases of all activity and socialization, stems from the internalization of accumulated collective experience stored in objectified cultural forms. It refers to the development of the personal in personality, of emerging agentic and self-regulatory capacities based on the option of taking a detached self-reflective attitude to oneself. The vector of personality development is directed toward increasing psychological complexity and flexibility that makes for a choice of appropriate behavioral elements or creating new ones rather than being rigidly tied to some of them (Rathunde & Csikszentmihalyi, 2006). This third type of developmental process, facilitated by the cultural environment but resulting in self-organization transcending adjustment to this environment, can be labeled as cultivation. The essence of personality cultivation is defined as “ordering of

psychic energy at the individual level, the level of broader community and social institutions, and the level of environment at large, creating temporal order from a potential randomness”

(Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981, p. 13).

Humans widely vary in this capacity of self-governance or mastery over their own lives. The basic level of its development suggests acquiring the capacity of controlling one’s impulses and following non-biological urges; further development suggests the developmental transition from being determined to self-determination, from the competition of biological and social drivers to (optionally) the prevailing role of the self-determined person investing one’s efforts into one’s own development. This way leads from self-actualization (the actualizing tendency is not specific for humans alone; see Goldstein, 1939), self-esteem, and self-realization, which are important for every human being, to more complex and less universal mechanisms of self-transcendence, self-reflection, self-investment (Kelly, 1970), and finally self-assembling (Jung, 1934/1954; Mamardashvili, 1997). A mature human being becomes the agent of one’s own development in line with the autonomous goals above and beyond universal biological mechanisms and social institutes supporting this development and giving it a direction. The transition from reactive biological patterns of adjustment through socialization and internalization of normative social guidelines for development and further to the awareness of one’s uniqueness, development of the inner world and emerging personal autonomy is most comprehensively described in Jane Loevinger’s theory of ego development (Loevinger, 1976; see also Leontiev, 2006b; 2020).

Conclusion

There has been one historical prototype of what is being announced in Paul Wong’s synthesis. It was Viktor Frankl’s philosophical justification of his approach in the late 1940’s

(see Frankl, 1982). He claimed to combine Logos and Existenz, meaning and existence, the reason that gives direction to our activities and the specific living quality of our activity which makes it (not all of it, to be sure) unpredictable and uncontrolled, but rather self-determined. These two aspects complement each other, and Frankl used to call his approach logotherapy AND existential analysis, the first part referring to logos, and the second to existence. This is why Frankl's teaching is based on a combination of existentialism with Max Scheler's philosophical anthropology, rather than pure existentialism, which makes it a target of criticism for the existentialist puritans (e.g., Yalom, 1980). At the same time, it is this impurity which allows Frankl's approach to embrace the domain of human spirituality, self-transcending logos, rather than human mental mechanisms alone (see Leontiev, 2016). This impurity is a great merit, in my view, but because of it, orthodox logotherapy is regrettably denied by the recently emerged international community of existential therapists (Leontiev, 2021).

What Paul Wong proposes in terms of Existential Positive Psychology is not equal to Frankl's bold communion of existentialism with philosophical anthropology, but is in a sense similar to it and inherits its spirit. It looks like a *via regia* for both existential psychology and positive psychology – for the former, to embrace the self-transcendent quality, or intentionality (May, 1969) of human being-in-the world, where positive psychology may be a helpful roadmap, and for the latter, to give due recognition to human self-determination based on freedom and responsibility (see, e.g., Sheldon et al., 2018), rather than treating a life worth living as conditioned by intrinsic and extrinsic factors and evidence-based interventions alone.

The focus of this chapter was the claim that the central issue of the emerging PP 2.0 is the person's developing capacity of taking control over one's own development and well-being and investing oneself in these processes. This is what height psychology—in both Frankl's and

Vygotsky’s interpretations—is about. Personality development and maturation proceeds not totally by itself (though spontaneous growth processes take an important place in our development); it acquires a new quality when a developing person becomes able to take an active and conscious attitude to one’s own life, a mature personal life position (Leontiev, 1993). If we take an active and conscious position toward ourselves, we can then learn the ways we can relate to our emotions, needs, genes, environment, values, choices, and fate, to be advanced users of ourselves. The key moderator of the processes of positive development toward psychological maturity seems to be the investment of goal-directed efforts to one’s own development (“the labor of personality” in Janet, 1929; “self-cultivation” in Csikszentmihalyi & Rochberg-Halton, 1981). This psychological maturation does not make us happier, but our happiness is becoming more self-determined, less contingent on uncontrollable obstacles and the benevolence of other people. This is the humane way to a life worth living!

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to Dr. Martin Lynch for valuable editorial comments.

References

- Aristotle. (2006). *Aristotle’s Nicomachean ethics* (R. C. Barlett & S. D. Collins, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bugental, J. F. (1991). Outcomes of an existential-humanistic psychotherapy: A tribute to Rollo May. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 19(1), 2-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08873267.1991.9986748>
- Carver, C. S., Johnson, S. L., & Joormann, J. (2008). Serotonergic function, two-mode models of self-regulation, and vulnerability to depression: What depression has in common with impulsive aggression. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 912-943.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013740>
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2010). Optimism. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30, 879-889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.01.006>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1993). *The Evolving Self*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rochberg-Halton, E. (1981). *The meaning of things: Domestic symbols and the self*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Deurzen, E. van. (2008). *Psychotherapy and the Quest for Happiness*. London: SAGE publications.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542>
- Frankl, V. (1938). Zur geistigen Problematik der Psychotherapie [On the spiritual problems of psychotherapy]. *Zentralblatt der Psychotherapie*, 10, S. 33-45.
- Frankl, V. E. (1969). *The will to meaning*. New York, NY: Plume.
- Frankl, V. E. (1979). *Der Mensch von der Frage nach dem Sinn: Eine Auswahl aus dem Gesamtwerk* [Human being facing the question of meaning: A selection from all writings]. Munich, Germany: Piper.
- Frankl, V. (1982). *Der Wille zum Sinn: Ausgewählte Vorträge über Logotherapie* [The will to meaning: selected papers on logotherapy]. 3., erw. Aufl. Bern: Huber.
- Frankl, V. E. (1987). *Logotherapie und Existenzanalyse* [Logotherapy and existential analysis]. Munich, Germany: Piper.
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York, NY: Rinehart.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The art of loving*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Fromm, E. (1964). *The heart of man: Its genius for good and evil*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Fromm, E. (1976). *To have or to be?* New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Galati, D., & Sotgiu, I. (2004). Happiness and positive emotions. *Ricerche di Psicologia*, 27(1), 41-62.
- Giorgi, A. (1992). Whither humanistic psychology? *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 20(2-3), 422-438.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08873267.1992.9986807>
- Goldstein, K. (1939). *The organism: A holistic approach to biology derived from pathological data in man*. Salt Lake City, UT: American Book Company.
- Huta, V. (2017). Meta-positive-psychology. In M. White, G. Slemp, & A. Murray (Eds.), *Future directions in well-being* (pp. 175-180). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Ivtzan, I., Lomas, T., Hefferon, K., & Worth, P. (2015). *Second wave positive psychology: Embracing the dark side of life*. London, UK: Routledge.
- James, W. (1896). *The will to believe and other essays in popular philosophy*. New York, NY: Longmans.
- Janet, P. (1929). *L'évolution psychologique de la personnalité*. Paris, France: Éditions Chahine.
- Jung, C. G. (1954). The development of personality. In G. Adler, & R. F. C. Hull (Eds.), *The collected works of C. G. Jung: Development of personality* (Vol. 17, pp. 167-186). London, UK: Routledge. (Original published 1934)
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Kelly, G. A. (1970). A brief introduction to personal construct theory. In D. Bannister (Ed.), *Perspectives in personal construct theory* (pp. 1-29). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Leontiev, D. (1993) *Ocherk psikhologii lichnosti* [An essay on personality psychology]. Moscow, Russia: Smysl.
- Leontiev, D. (2002). Activity theory approach: Vygotsky in the present. In D. Robbins, A. Stetsenko (Eds.) *Voices within Vygotsky's Non-Classical Psychology: Past, Present, Future* (Pp. 45-61). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Leontiev, D. (2006a). Meaningful living and the worlds of art. In A. Delle Fave (Ed.), *Dimensions of well-being: Research and intervention* (pp. 529-537). Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli.
- Leontiev, D. (2006b). Positive personality development: Approaching personal autonomy. In M. Csikzentmihalyi, & I. S. Csikzentmihalyi (Eds.), *A life worth living: Contributions to positive psychology* (pp. 49-61). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Leontiev, D. (2008). The challenge of dialectics for positive psychology: Toward “blossoming complexity.” In T. Freire (Ed.), *Understanding positive life: Research and practice on positive psychology* (pp. 155-165). Lisboa, Portugal: Climepsi Editores.

- Leontiev, D. (2012). Why we do what we do: The variety of human regulations. In D. Leontiev (Ed.), *Motivation, Consciousness, and Self-regulation* (pp. 93-103). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Leontiev, D. (2014). Extending the contexts of existence: benefits of meaning-guided living. In A. Batthyany & P. Russo-Netzer (eds.) *Meaning in Positive and Existential Psychology*. (Pp. 97-114). New York, NY: Springer.
- Leontiev, D. (2016). Logotherapy beyond psychotherapy: dealing with the spiritual dimension. In A. Batthyany (ed.). *Logotherapy and Existential Analysis. Proceedings of the Viktor Frankl Institute Vienna. Vol. 1.* (P. 277-290). New York, NY: Springer.
- Leontiev, D.A. (2020). Cultural-Historical Activity Theory in the Framework of the “Functional Paradigm”. *Kul'turno-istoricheskaya psikhologiya = Cultural-Historical Psychology*. Vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 19—24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17759/chp.2020160203>
- Leontiev, D. (2021). Comments on Paul Wong's paper. *International Journal of Existential Positive Psychology*, 10(1), 29-31. <https://www.meaning.ca/ijepp-article/vol10-no1/comments-on-paul-wongs-paper/>
- Locke, J. (1999). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Philadelphia, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press. (Original published 1690)
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories*. San-Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lomas, T., & Ivtzan, I. (2016). Second wave positive psychology: Exploring the positive-negative dialectics of wellbeing. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(4), 1753-1768. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9668-y>
- Lomas T., Waters L., Williams P., Oades L.G., & Kern M.L. (2020). Third wave positive psychology: broadening toward complexity. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1805501>
- Lyubomirsky, S. (2001). Why are some people happier than others? The role of cognitive and motivational processes in well-being. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 239-249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.239>
- Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 111-131. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.111>
- Maddi, S. R. (1971). The search for meaning. In W. J. Arnold, & M. M. Page (Eds.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation 1970* (pp. 137-186). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Mamardashvili, M. K. (1997). *Psikhologicheskaya Topologiya Puti: M. Proust "V Poiskakh Utrachennogo Vremeni"* [Psychological Topology of the Way: M. Proust “In search of lost time”]. St. Petersburg, Russia: Russian Christian Humanitarian Institute Press.
- Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Van Nostrand.
- May, R (1969). *Love and Will*. New York (NY): Norton.
- Metcalf, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review*, 106(1), 3-19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.106.1.3>
- Peterson, C. (2006). *A primer in positive psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (Eds.). (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rathunde, K., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2006). The developing person: An experiential perspective. In R. M. Lerner, & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (pp. 465-515). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Ryff, C. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-

1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
- Saint-Exupery, A., de (1979). *The wisdom of the sands*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Schneider, K. (2011). Toward a humanistic positive psychology: Why can't we just get along? *Existential Analysis*, 22(2), 32-38.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1990). *Learned optimism*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sheldon, K.M., Gordeeva, T., Leontiev, D., Lynch, M. F., Osin, E., Rasskazova, E., Dementiy, L. (2018). Freedom and responsibility go together: Personality, experimental, and cultural demonstrations. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 73, 63 - 74. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.11.007>
- Sheldon, K. M., Kashdan, T. B., & Steger, M. F. (Eds.). (2010). *Designing positive psychology: Taking stock and moving forward*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1983). Istoriya razvitiya vysshikh psikhicheskikh funktsii [Developmental history of the higher mental functions]. *Sobraniye Sochinenii* [Collected Works] (Vol. 3, pp. 6-328). Moscow, Russia: Pedagogika. (Original published 1931)
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1984). *Sobranie Sochineniy* [Collected Works], Vol. 4. Moscow, Russia: Pedagogika.
- Wong, P. T. P. (2009). Existential positive psychology. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of positive psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 361-368). Oxford, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Wong, P. T. P. (2010a). Meaning therapy: An integrative and positive existential psychotherapy. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 40(2), 85-93. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-009-9132-6>
- Wong, P. T. P. (2010b). What is existential positive psychology? *International Journal of Existential Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 3(1), 1-10. Retrieved from <http://journal.existentialpsychology.org/index.php/ExPsy/article/view/166>
- Wong, P. T. P. (2011). Positive psychology 2.0: Towards a balanced interactive model of the good life. *Canadian Psychology*, 52(2), 69-81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022511>
- Wong, P. T. P. (2019). Second wave positive psychology's (PP 2.0) contribution to counselling psychology. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly* [Special Issue]. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2019.1671320>
- Wong, P. T. P. (2021). What is existential positive psychology (PP 2.0)? Why is it necessary for mental health during the pandemic? *International Journal of Existential Positive Psychology*, 10(1), 1-16. <https://www.meaning.ca/ijcpp-article/vol10-no1/what-is-existential-positive-psychology-pp-2-0-why-is-it-necessary-for-mental-health-during-the-pandemic/>
- Xenophon. (2013). *The Memorabilia: Recollections of Socrates* (H. G. Dakyns, Trans.). (Original published 1897)
- Yalom, I. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Zavershneva, E., & van der Veer, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Vygotsky's notebooks: A selection*. Singapore: Springer.