



enneagram monthly

May 2013

Issue 197

Enneagram Field Guide: Ones

A short-cut for therapists or students of human nature in getting to know how the nine types present themselves differently in life or in therapy; what usually brings each type in and what approach works best.

Presentation in Therapy

- One clients can be self-critical and self-deprecating
- They tend to avoid or analyze emotions; may be workaholic
- They may be depressed or have relationship problems
- Can be prone to compulsive behaviors, anxiety disorders or obsessive-intrusive “bad” thoughts (ego-dystonia)
 - Their personal stories may center on resentment for being overlooked or comparing themselves to others
 - Ones can be overly fair and truthful; they can deny their pain by comparing it to something worse
 - In couples therapy, they may act self-righteous and portray their partner as the identified patient
 - Ones may abuse substances in an effort to relax or quiet their over-active super-ego. Substances also allow Ones to express the shadow side of being so

Carolyn Bartlett



moral, sometimes referred to as “trap door behavior.”

Healthy Ones have humanitarian natures. They want to do their best, give of themselves and make the world better for everyone. They also allow themselves to have joy and pleasure, accepting their own and others’ flaws with compassion and humor.

When caught in their unhealthy pattern, Ones are obsessive about what seems wrong and how it should be corrected. They become angry; critical of themselves and others and unable to let in any perspective other than the one they think is right. They can see themselves as alternately bad and good in a black and white world. The usual One attention style fixes on ethics, fairness and “work before pleasure.” They notice what needs improving and feel compelled to act on this perception.

Ones often express their moral intensity through political action. Ideologically, they fall on either end of the political spectrum; however, the prevailing power of the religious right is a cultural embodiment of One-flavored righteousness.

Ones often get a double message in American ...CONTINUED ON PAGE 19

The Emotionally Healthy Leader

Karenza’s grandfather was a big drinker and gambler and had gassed himself in the oven when his son was just 13 years old. That boy, Karenza’s father, had grown up on a housing authority estate in Manchester, England, and spent much of his youth moving in and out of various institutions. At around 17, he found himself in front of a magistrate who told him he had two choices: staying on his current path and finding himself in prison before long, or changing course by joining the armed forces. He joined the navy.

Later, when Karenza was about the same age, she also made a choice. Like her dad, she’d been an angry kid. She was kicked out of school more than once and became involved in drug taking. There came a day when she was sitting in a room with a number of other drug

Gayle Hardie & Malcolm Lazenby



takers and was handed a dose of heroin for the first time.

‘I remember it vividly. Everyone else stuck it in their arm, and then it was my turn.’ She paused. ‘I said to myself, “I haven’t done this before – am I going to do it or not?” And for probably the first time in my life I realised that I had courage and bravery and could make choices. I didn’t have to follow what other people felt was right, or be the norm.’

Karenza got up and left. ‘I actually chose to get up and leave and change my life.’

Karenza went back to school – she had to talk her way back in after previously being expelled – and finished her education. She subsequently got a university degree and started building a career, and life, for herself.

...CONTINUED ON PAGE 17

In This Issue

letters
editorial
page 2

Preface to Ch. 11
Susan Rhodes
page 4

Ch. 11 Integral Enn.
Susan Rhodes
page 5

Three/Five Couple
J. Schneider / R. Corn
page 10

William James on Rebirth
Thomas Garrett Isham
page 13

Dear Jennifer and Ron,

Thank you for your great article in the Enneagram Monthly on the 6-8 relationship. I am a phobic Six married 27 years to a “big fat Eight.” I believe we both center about on the same level of development (a la Riso/Hudson) and we’ve certainly been instrumental in each other’s growth to these levels (or at least staying there!) I felt that you really captured the dynamic of this relationship so very well. Thank you.

I so often say that the Six and Eight make a great team (and oh I do love teams!). But I also appreciated your pointing out the challenges—I had forgotten some of them that we have grown through in the course of years!

One of the areas that we have had a lot of learning around is how to use his energy to get me in motion. It is an extremely fine balance. I need and appreciate

Letters

his ability to get stuff done. He sees exactly what I need to do and just wants to make it happen for me.

But it can become either controlling or in our case, where we have a lot of love, it feels too paternalistic (which is of course, also controlling). I have learned to take his energy, suggestions and actions and then keep what I want and let go of the rest.

He has learned that I will not move as fast, decisively or confidently with his input as he would like, but to accept it. In a way we could say that we let the other person play out their role, but then accept that our partner will not behave fully as we would.

One other area that you only briefly touch on is humor. I do believe that I, the Six, bring more lightness to our relationship. I can be quite silly which is really out of his repertoire, but he enjoys it.

On the other hand, he brings the “lightness” of the Eight optimism, which I’ve learned to appreciate (but didn’t in the beginning as I didn’t think he was grounded in reality).

Thank you again. I look forward to reading your book when it is published.

For background, I teach the Enneagram to high level business executives in Europe and Asia during leadership retreats (R/H trained.) It never ceases to be powerful.

Warmly,
Searl Vetter

Picking up on a theme I touched on in last issue’s editorial, (inspired by Rafael de J. Henriquez Theran’s article on *Enneatypes and Fingerprints* where he makes a clear distinction between our “temperament that is immune to environmental changes, and our learned behaviors induced by external pressures”). Our temperament obviously includes or is the basis of our enneagram type, whereas most methods/tests of determining our enneagram type lean heavily on the interpretation of our behaviors. Our behaviors can have their origin in our temperament or may have been formed in response to external pressures regardless what our basic temperament or enneagram type is. Recapping, from the last issue:

“if our type is genetic and we have it from conception (or let’s say birth), what effect does our environment have on us after we are born? Aside from our immediate circle or family and friends, the environment is mostly oblivious and indifferent to our arrival. Like a river, in which we are just like a leaf, twig or rock (according to our type) that happened to drop in its water, barely making a few ripples here and there, as we float (or sink) along with other leaves, rocks or twigs down the stream of time. So, if our type is that of a leaf, twig or rock, that’s how we’ll respond to the current. But will the current be a smaller or larger factor in how we move along and where we will end up?”

From the Editor

Thinking back about my own tribulations figuring out my type (20, 19, 18 years ago and even today), and after hearing countless stories how others “successfully or not” made a switch from “being” one type to another (quite a few did it more than once or twice), I was struck how rapidly, once triggered, such a shift in self-assessment could take place. Like having scales removed from the eyes, some would find a flood of reasons supporting the new type. Others would struggle for years and never settle on a type or remain undecided between two or more options. I’m not talking about rank beginners but serious students of the enneagram who read most of the important books, sat on panels, were typed by experts, and took or graduated from training courses. How can this be?

There is a large divergence in typing between the genetic/karmic DNA based type as for example indicated by fingerprints (let’s call it *nature*) our behaviors or the circumstantially formed stance (let’s call it *nurture*) we “ended up” with as our main M.O. If this is so, then our *nature* type is much more stable, about as stable as

our DNA, our constitution and our karmic baggage...Whereas the *nurture* type imposed by our response to the environment (if different!) is only as stable as our external environment. Imagine (or remember) you move to a new place or different country. Immediately there is a change in so many factors, that you find yourself in a situation where you may have to build a whole new set of adaptive strategies. What you brought with you to the new environment is your basic *nature* that may respond with a set of new behaviors to the new environment. Looking back you may think, “strange, I thought I was an introvert and now I can’t stand it and crave lots of interaction.... It need not always be so and at times nature and nurture aspects are the same in which case it’s easy to be “solid” about one’s type as long as that situation persists, which can be for a lifetime.

In an age where mobility is commonplace, it’s easy to be uprooted and transplanted. No wonder that many of us will have a dilemma when sorting out our *nature* from our *nurture* selves (from personal experience after living several years each in four countries and a year or less in six more, exposed to eight different languages half of which I did not speak, I can vouch for how hard it can be separating nature from nurture). This of course has no bearing on the validity, structures and theories of the enneagram itself; they remain accurate and their internal logic intact. It is we—the subjects ruled by the *nature* and *nurture* forces that alternately dominate us—that are confused about who’s turn it is to be on top.

And, we have not yet begun to take time into consideration and how it “heals all wounds...and ultimately does us all in” speaking of which, on a sad note, last week we lost one battle against both, nature and nurture when our dog Lola died peacefully and naturally on a Tuesday morning, having suffered hardly at all. RIP. She was 12 and for her breed that was a good ripe age.

In this Issue:

Carolyn Bartlett has revised and improved her already excellent *Enneagram Field Guide* first published 10 years ago, — now adding a decade’s worth of experience and new insights. Her focus in this article is on Type One, a type so often associated mainly with correctness and perfectionism. Here she highlights the passion of healthy Ones for both humanitarian causes and their potential for compassion, both for themselves and others. She also talks about how they get a mixed message from the culture regarding their feeling that moral

ERRATUM

In last month’s issue #196 on page 18 the (in the paper version of the EM only!) the captions between type 1 and 8 were switched. See below the correct fingerprints and captions.



Enneatype 9
Tented Arches



Enneatype 1
Flat Arches



Enneatype 8
Composite Arches

We were too late for the printer to make the correction, the papers were already printed and mailed.

As to the pdf version, we mailed a corrected issue. If you want to make sure you kept the corrected issue, check page 18 top right and compare with this.

enneagram monthly

Volume 19, Number 4, Issue 197

Enneagram Monthly

748 Wayside Rd.
Portola Valley, CA 94028

Phone: 650-851-4806 Fax: 650-851-3113

Email: em@guna.us

Editor and Publisher Jack Labanauskas

Staff Writer Susan Rhodes

Assistant Editor Sue Ann McKean

Consulting Editor Andrea Isaacs

The Enneagram Monthly, Inc. was founded by Jack Labanauskas and Andrea Isaacs as a not-for-profit corporation. Its purpose is to gather and disseminate information in the field of the Enneagram, that is most commonly known as a personality typing system.

For subscription and advertising rates see back cover.

contents

Enneagram Field Guide: Ones	Carolyn Bartlett	1
The Emotionally Healthy Leader	Gayle Hardie and Malcolm Lazenby	1
Letters		2
From the Editor.	Jack Labanauskas	2
Preface to Chapter 11	Susan Rhodes	4
Ch. 11 The Integral Enneagram: <i>Integrating the Vertical and Horizontal</i>	Susan Rhodes	5
The Achiever-Observer (Three-Five) Couple	Jennifer Schneider & Ron Corn	10
The Gospel of James and the Dialectic of Rebirth	Thomas Garrett Isham	13
Teacher's Listing		23
Subscription Forms and Ad Rates		24

Visit www.enneagram-monthly.com for subscriptions, renewals and 6 sample issues in PDF format

values are important. And she discusses how difficult it is for Ones to really “own” their anger, even to the extent of being overly pleasant in order to deny it!

“Enneagram Field Guide: Ones” is a chapter from her book that has undergone a long period of distilling and refinement. It provides just the kind of specific insights what Ones value so highly—and that therapists can use for supporting their One clients.

In “The Emotionally Healthy Leader,” **Gayle Hardie** and **Malcolm Lazenby** show what it takes to become an effective leader, whatever our personal style of leadership. They note that there is no set formula that makes one a leader, and there are countless circumstances that may awaken leadership impulses. It’s up to us to stay open and recognize them in ourselves if we happen to be in leadership positions, or in others if we are in need of leadership.

Gayle and Malcolm also make a distinction between the development of ‘horizontal’ leadership (the kind of leadership that requires a good grasp of the subject matter and adequate people skills) and the development of ‘vertical’ leadership (which makes leadership sustainable and empowering), noting that this distinction describes the difference between good and truly great leaders. They have found that leadership styles can be described by reference to the nine Enneagram Type behavioral descriptors at the higher emotional health levels. However, they note that healthy leaders of any type display relatively little self-centeredness and greater behavioral freedom than individuals at less healthy levels. So it is by increasing *emotional health* that leadership skills become more vertically developed.

Susan Rhodes is also looking for ways of integrating the vertical and horizontal in “Chapter 11, The Integral Enneagram” but more in the context of the relationship between the enneagram and Ken Wilber’s Integral Operating System (IOS). She explores the differences between the personality enneagram and Wilber’s IOS in great depth in her latest book, *The Integral Enneagram*,

now available on Amazon. There are two articles, a longer main article (presenting material from Chapter 11 in *The Integral Enneagram*) and a shorter Preface designed to provide a little background, since this chapter occurs late in Susan’s book. Briefly, the focus is on how an understanding of differences in horizontal perspectives (such as those associated with the nine enneagram points of view) can help us better understand the many vertical lines along which we can develop, e.g., moral, social, ego-based, descent-based, intellectual, service-oriented, innovative, leadership, or mystical. (Hint: Do you see a pattern here?) Traditionally, Wilber has particularly emphasized vertical lines of development, although integral theory has been edging towards a more horizontal perspective in recent years. However, at this point, integral theory has not as yet focused on the contribution of horizontal perspective-taking as much as enneagram theory. The material discussed in the excerpt from Chapter 11 is designed to show the advantages of bringing together the horizontality of the enneagram with the verticality of IOS—and to do it in a way that doesn’t privilege one dimension over the other.

Jennifer Schneider and **Ron Corn’s** “The Achiever-Observer (Three-Five) Couple” is this month’s chapter from their forthcoming book *Understand Yourself, Understand Your Partner: The Essential Enneagram Guide to a Better Relationship*, due to come out within weeks. In this article, the authors describe how both the Achiever and Observer appreciate their partner’s willingness to give them the time and space to keep busy with their individual activities so they can avoid feelings given their fear of intimacy. This is because they are more comfortable being more logical than emotional, so neither is very emotionally demanding. Achievers consider feelings messy and inefficient holding them back from being successful; while feelings scare Observers as potentially invasive and often cause them to retreat into their heads when they feel overwhelmed, or else, they can feel drained or smothered by others’ needs. Achievers fear

that closeness may reveal their emotional immaturity or the emptiness inside. Even when Achievers and Observers get on each other’s nerves, they can feel attracted to each other if they, for example, can collude in avoiding feelings and intimacy. After all, it is safer to live separate, parallel lives than opening yourself up to the other.

Thomas Garrett Isham on “The Gospel of James and the Dialectic of Rebirth,” draws not from the Bible of King James but William James’s classic work, *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. An unsurpassed classic, *Varieties* is about the “good news” (the meaning of *gospel*) on many different levels: spiritual, psychological, philosophical, and literary. The narratives of conversion/rebirth it contains are superb, and focus upon (as the title suggests) a great variety of religious experience. But the most compelling thing for Thomas about the system is how it opens us to a trifold “dialectic of rebirth,” in the tradition associated with G. F. W. Hegel. Using a Hegelian approach, we can break down a process of rebirth into three phases—thesis, antithesis, and synthesis—in which the first phase (thesis) can be likened to egocentric stasis, the second (antithesis) to our growing discomfort with this static state of affairs, and the third (synthesis) with liberation into a state that transcends our static egocentric state, giving us a greater sense of freedom. This same approach, he suggests, can be used in enneagram work, which is so deeply rooted in triadic formations. He gives as an example the relationship between our type and its two connecting points, where we could liken our enneatype to the thesis, our stress point to the antithesis, and our integration point to the synthesis. This, to the author, is the single most compelling thing about the system: how it opens us to a “dialectic of rebirth,” in which we move from the sterility of dualistic thinking (in which we divide things into good and bad, black and white, love and hate) to a threefold dialectic in which dueling opposites are converted into some sort of synthesis. •