

JULY

In(ter)dependence Day: Lives mattering, freedom with responsibility, and social well-being

Keith Tudor

Auckland University of Technology,
Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand

Correspondence

Keith Tudor, Auckland University of
Technology, Private Bag 92006, Auckland
1142, Aotearoa New Zealand
Email: keith.tudor@aut.ac.nz

Abstract

Taking the American Declaration of Independence as its starting point, this article critiques the Declaration's individualistic framing of "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." It offers an alternative view that emphasises the collective life in which all lives matter, freedom with responsibility, and social well-being, each and all of which both draw on and further the concept of *interdependence*. Drawing on organismic psychology, Carl Rogers's ideas about the freedom to learn, and Corey Keyes's research on social actualisation, the article argues that, in contrast to independence, and other concepts such as ego, the self/Self, and individuation, the concept, practice, and aspiration of interdependence is more consistent not only with psychotherapeutic knowledge about being human and about human development, but also with psycho-political perspectives that favour more connected and just societies.

KEYWORDS

Black Lives Matter, collective life, freedom, happiness, independence, interdependence, national days, social well-being

1 | BACKGROUND

On the 4th July 1776 the then 13 United States of America declared their independence from Great Britain. *The Declaration of Independence* famously states that: "We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." At the time, these rights and their assertion were considered revolutionary—and, indeed, a number of the founding fathers (and they were exclusively men) did have revolutionary ideals that were inspired by the English and Scottish Enlightenment and the French late Enlightenment, by thinkers and activists such

as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Thomas Payne in England, by Francis Hutcheson, David Hume, and John Anderson in Scotland, and by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet) in France (see O'Brien, 1998). Indeed, one of the more revolutionary of the founding fathers (and, later, third President of the United States), Thomas Jefferson, perhaps taking inspiration from the ideals that would underpin the French Revolution whose motto included *égalité* and *fraternité* alongside *liberté*, had, in an earlier, rough draft of the American declaration (Jefferson, 1776), included a reference to the abolition of slavery. This clause was subsequently deleted by Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, thereby compromising at least two of the inalienable rights they held self-evident. Despite their ideals and principles, a number of these men presided over a federation of states which were then—and later—far from united, and which were founded on the genocide of the indigenous First Nations peoples, and, until 6th December 1865, nearly 100 years after the Declaration, the maintenance of slavery.

Since the first Fourth of July, the day has been widely celebrated with the usual festivities. However, it is understandable that many of the American First Nations peoples, whose generosity towards the new settlers (i.e., colonisers) is often forgotten on America's "Thanksgiving Day" (celebrated on the fourth Thursday of November), as well as many Black Americans, are ambivalent about such celebrations. Indeed, less than 100 years after 1776, Frederick Douglass (Douglass, Foner, & Taylor, 1999), a notable early Black civil rights activist, gave a speech on the 4th July, 1852, in which he said:

What, to the American slave, is your 4th of July? I answer; a day that reveals to him, more than all other days in the year, the gross injustice and cruelty to which he is the constant victim. To him, your celebration is a sham; your boasted liberty, an unholy license; your national greatness, swelling vanity; your sounds of rejoicing are empty and heartless; your denunciation of tyrants, brass fronted impudence; your shouts of liberty and equality, hollow mockery; your prayers and hymns, your sermons and thanksgivings, with all your religious parade and solemnity, are, to Him, mere bombast, fraud, deception, impiety, and hypocrisy—a thin veil to cover up crimes which would disgrace a nation of savages. There is not a nation on the earth guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than are the people of the United States, at this very hour.

Reading this today, some 166 years later, the content is chillingly contemporary (injustice, cruelty, and cover up), and Douglass's criticisms are still valid.

Ambivalence about, critique regarding, and resistance to celebrations of such national days is expressed, for instance, by many Aboriginal Australians and their allies, who have challenged the concept of "Australia Day", Australia's "National Day," which, somewhat ironically, commemorates the proclamation, on 26th January 1788, of Australia as a colony of Great Britain! Nonetheless, and as Americans do the Fourth of July in and beyond the United States of America, the majority of Australians celebrate Australia Day as their independence day. While the majority of Americans—and Australians—claim their respective countries to be multicultural, this term ignores the first (nations') indigenous culture(s) that existed before the arrival of settlers and colonisers who claimed "discovery" or, in the case of Australia, that the territory they had found was "terra nullius or empty land, a perspective that was only overturned as recently as 1992—in the Mabo judgement (*Mabo and Others v Queensland* (No. 2) [1992 HCA 23]). In this context, it is understandable that some prefer the term "biculturalism," which acknowledges the binary relationship between indigenous and other, between the first people(s) of the/a land and those that follow. By definition, such national days date back to and celebrate a particular and relatively recent history and a particular perspective on nationhood. In this context, it is also understandable that the first peoples and/or nations of these and other countries refer to such a day as "Invasion Day" or a "Day of Mourning and Protest"; for a critique of the public relations involved in the creation and promotion of Australia Day, see Macnamara and Crawford (2010).

Whether or not Independence Day in the USA can be celebrated in a way that acknowledges this perspective of history, as well as the original spirit of independence (originally from British colonialism), and the revolutionary ideas that some of the founding fathers embodied, this article points to the fundamental individualism inherent in the

framing of the *Declaration of Independence*. In the spirit of a psychotherapy of politics (Totton, 2000) or, at least, of this particular aspect of the political world, this article critiques and expands the three themes of the *Declaration* – of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness – in an attempt to articulate perspectives that support interdependence.

2 | LIFE—INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

When the American constitution refers to “life,” it refers to individual life. This, together with liberty and the pursuit of happiness, are themes framed in a constitution which extols individualism and autonomy, in contrast, for instance, to the Canadian constitution which refers to “the common good,” a sentiment that reflects a sense of community and the common, communal, or collective life. Both the American constitution and much of Western intellectual tradition and psychology extol rank individualism and the expression of this individualism in concepts such as “the self,” a concept that is often capitalised and reified (for a critique, see Tudor & Worrall, 2006).

Nowhere is this focus on the individual life and the protection of that life more apparent than in the Second Amendment to the US Constitution which defends the individual's right to bear arms—almost at any cost. Interestingly, the Amendment (which was adopted in 1791), was framed in the context of the need for “a well regulated militia ... necessary to the security of a free state” (Young, 2007, p. 222), a statement and an argument that point to a collective need and a plural right (“the right of people”) rather than an individual one (to do with the person). This constitutional right to bear arms is the subject of much debate in the US, especially following mass shootings and considering the fact that 31% of such shootings in the world occur in the US (Lankford, 2016). While it is also the case that, following a mass shooting in the US, gun sales tend to increase (Gopal & Greenwood, 2017), there does appear to be an increasing questioning of the centrality and sanctity of this right, and an advocacy of increased gun control. Most recently and notably, following the shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida on 14th February this year (2018) in which 17 students and staff were killed, this has found expression in the foundation of the #NeverAgain and #EnoughisEnough movements.

There is a dialectical relationship between capitalism, imperialism, and isolationism, whether embodied by the US, the UK, or any other country, and a focus on the individual, supported by approaches to psychology and psychotherapy that, by and large, focus on the individual, the self, and the goal of autonomy. As Natalie Rogers (1993, p.1) put it: “We live in a culture that extols rugged individualism. The isolation and alienation that this has engendered is now being challenged as we look to former cultures that cherished community and practiced rites to enhance group cohesion.” She then went on to advocate the expressive arts “as a bridge between the individualism we have inherited and the sense of community many of us long for”.

In order to challenge such individualism and to promote community, in addition to good practice (expressive arts and other therapies), we also need good theory and, in this case, theory that offers us a view of the organism as distinct from the self (see Goldstein 1934/1995; Tudor & Worrall, 2006); of the trend towards homonymy, or a sense of connectedness, alongside the trend to autonomy (Angyal, 1941); and of the importance of belonging (Maslow, 1943; Miller, 1976), of mutual recognition (Benjamin, 1995), of universality (Yalom, 1967), and social actualisation (Keyes, 1998). These concepts, all rooted in the Western (and Northern) intellectual tradition, together with similar as well as other concepts from Eastern and indigenous wisdom traditions, provide a different ontology, epistemology, and methodology for a more other- and outward-looking, relational, and interdependent psychology. I see the relevance to clinical practice of this shift in thinking when a married client who sees himself very much as an individual (and one who operates in and impacts on the world very successfully) begins to talk more about himself as a husband and a father.

In this context, the U.S. citizen's right to bear arms can be seen not only as an individual(istic) right but also as somewhat defensive in that (originally) the establishment of a well-regulated and plural militia was perceived as necessary to “the security of a free state” against external threat (originally from Great Britain). It was not seen as something for the promotion or, one might argue, the pursuit of life. Another movement which, like #NeverAgain and #EnoughisEnough, originally came out of opposition, in this case to systematic racism, racial profiling, racial inequality

in the US criminal justice system, and police brutality, is #BlackLivesMatter (BLM), founded following the acquittal of George Zimmerman, a Florida police officer, for the shooting in 2013 of Trayvon Martin. While BLM still organises protests and demonstrations against systemic racism (in response to deaths, killings, and inequalities), its focus is, I think, an interesting one in that its identity is based on life—and lives—mattering. This is an affirmative statement and, according to the BLM website, “an ideological and political intervention”, which, in turn, is based on certain fundamental “guiding principles”—of diversity, globalism, loving engagement, restorative justice, collective value, empathy, and intergenerationality (BLM, 2018). It is also inclusive as it is “committed to a Black women affirming space free from sexism, misogyny, and male-centredness”; to supporting extended families and Black “villages”, to being queer and transgender affirming; and to being “unapologetically Black”. (ibid, 2018).

We live in a diverse world, politically and psychologically. Talking about difference and diversity in terms of safety and commonality, John F. Kennedy (1963), the 35th President of the USA, offered the following response, which offers a basis and a call for interdependence:

So let us not be blind to our differences, but let us also direct attention to our common interests and the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's futures. And we are all mortal.

3 | LIBERTY, OR FREEDOM WITH RESPONSIBILITY

In philosophical and political discourse a distinction is made between external liberty, which describes the freedom or various freedoms *from* restraint (such as the assumption of innocence in law, and free trade in commerce), and internal liberty, which refers to (or *for*) self-expression (for instance, in free speech). Internal liberty involves the creation of conditions (internal and external) necessary for individuals to develop their fullest potential (see C. Rogers, 1957, 1959; N. Rogers, 1993, 2000).

Liberty has always been closely tied to the concept of equality, as that term was used during the French Revolution, when liberty became associated with equality of opportunity. Arguably, inequality of opportunity as well as inequities, are the greatest obstacles to individual development and liberty and greater than any form of internal restraint. In this sense, the French Revolution took the American Revolution a step further by trying to equalise as much as possible in such areas as education, health, housing, and establishing freedom from want and fear, so that every individual might have an equal opportunity for self-realisation. Here again we see the importance and significance of an organismic/social perspective as the organism cannot be understood outside of its environment, which supports and promotes or thwarts and demotes its actualisation and expression.

The concept of freedom as internal liberty has echoes in Rogers's ideas about creativity (Rogers, 1967a) and about learning (Rogers, 1969), the former of which are not necessarily very well known, and the latter, insufficiently applied.

Rogers's ideas about creativity inform his work on education, *Freedom to Learn* (Rogers, 1969), which takes its inspiration and title from a quotation from Albert Einstein: “It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry; for this delicate little plant, aside from stimulation, stands mainly in need of freedom” (cited by Rogers, 1969, p. iv). In his work Rogers (1969) identified two types of learning on “a continuum of meaning” (p. 3): from a meaningless “learning”, driven by syllabi, to “significant, meaningful, experiential learning” (p. 4). His critique is well made and, nearly 50 years after the publication of the first edition of his book, is still relevant with regard both to the school and education system in general, and to the education and training of psychotherapists (see Tudor, 2018). While Rogers was more of a quiet revolutionary (see Rogers & Russell, 2002), his ideas about education had a lot in common with those of Freire, who was more overtly revolutionary in his thinking and praxis (for a comparison of their work, see O'Hara, 1989).

If the student is encouraged to develop this inner freedom, or internal liberty, then he or she can, of course, process feedback from the environment; after all, Goldstein, 1995, Perls, 1969 and other organismic theorists

acknowledge, the organism (human and otherwise) cannot be understood outside of its environment and, therefore, social and cultural context. This encompasses an awareness of realities, such as course requirements, and any further external requirements of course accreditation and validation and professional accreditation and registration. In *Freedom to Learn*, Rogers reported on an experiment in person-centred learning, observing that, amongst other things, the pupils were not only aware of the (external) realities, but also came up with creative solutions to problems posed by social realities through group problem-solving, such as contracts for grades. “The point,” Rogers (1969) reflected, “is that when freedom and self-direction are given to a group, it is also easier for the members to accept the constraints and obligations which surround the psychological area in which they are free” (p. 24). Children as well as adult learners are mindful of external requirements, can be encouraged to question their necessity and extent, and can be facilitated to come up with creative solutions for those which they and the institution decide to accept. I write “to question,” partly in the spirit of a reflexive, enquiring approach, and partly as, in my experience, what are often presented and understood as given “requirements”—such as the requirement for a practitioner to be registered with or by the state in order to practice psychotherapy—are not necessarily so. A crucial part of reflexivity, or critical reflection, is to question and to have the freedom to question. Such questioning is crucial, for instance, in response to claims about the right to free speech, which are often framed in absolute and individualistic terms. An approach that promotes responsibility accounts for the impact of such speech and debates about being offensive and being offended, hate speech, and assaultive speech (see Gelber, 2002).

I refer to Rogers' ideas about freedom as they seem, at least to me, to reflect and represent not so much an individualistic conception of freedom *to*, sometimes at all costs and at the expense of others, but rather a freedom *for*—and *with* others. Psychotherapy, with its common goal(s) of insight rather than insight, adaptation rather than action, cure rather than healing, self-actualisation rather than social actualisation (for more on which, see the next section), and of self-development and autonomy (or self-determination) stands accused, especially in its individual form, of promoting “I” over “we” and “me” over “us,” let alone “you” or “they,” as part of a broader Western or Westernised “me culture” rather than a “we culture” (see Tudor, 2016). In the case of the client referred to above (p. 3), part of the therapeutic work focused on how he understood freedom or, rather, liberty. Initially he expressed this in terms of a desire to pursue his individual pursuits without having to seek permission from his wife; over time, this changed to a point when he was willing and wanting to discuss this more with her, and did so without a sense of constraint.

The categorical difference between freedom *to* and freedom *for* or *with*, parallels the discussion (in the previous section) of individualistic conceptualisations of life, and the discussion (in the next section) about what makes human beings happy. The view and slogan of autonomy or freedom *with responsibility* counters this individualistic paradigm and offers a strong challenge to any form of politics, psychology, and psychotherapy that sanctions self-obsession (narcissism), self-centredness, and selfishness.

4 | INDIVIDUAL HAPPINESS OR SOCIAL WELL-BEING

The pursuit of happiness was written into the American Declaration of Independence by Thomas Jefferson who, influenced by John Locke, the English empirical philosopher, viewed this pursuit, along with life and liberty, as an unalienable right of man and a self-evident truth. Moreover, the U.S. constitution links rights to happiness with safety, thus:

That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. (United States Declaration of Independence 1776, paragraph 3).

This links happiness, or its pursuit, to safety—and to the right to bear arms to defend this right against external threat (alteration or abolition). In this sense, as John Lennon (1968) suggested, “happiness” may, indeed be “a warm gun”!

Again, notions of happiness in the Western and Northern intellectual traditions are predominantly individualistic and, in the context of the society in which many of us live, often satisfied in terms of the possession and consumption of material goods. However, there are other ways of thinking about and embodying happiness. Drawing on differences elucidated by different Greek words, we can usefully distinguish between *hedonia*, the pleasant life and *eudaimonia*, which encompasses both the good and the meaningful life, thus:

- *Hedonia*, the “pleasant life”—emotional well-being

In its extreme form, this consists in having as many pleasures as possible (and hence hedonism). Research into this examines how people experience, forecast, and savour the positive feelings that are part of normal and healthy living such as happiness, life satisfaction, affect balance, and so on.

- *Eudaimonia*, the “good life”—psychological well-being

Rogers, 1967b described this as a *process*, not a state of being, a direction, not a destination, and an organismically selected and valued direction at that. He summarised the good life as: “the process of movement in a direction which the human organism selects when it is inwardly free to move in any direction, and the general qualities of this selected direction appear to have a certain universality” (p. 187). In his view of fluidity, which he acknowledged as a social value judgement, Rogers is close to Aristotle's view of the good life as one of contemplation, and to Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) concept of flow. This, for Rogers, was the essence—or, more accurately, the *process*—of the fully functioning person: a being in process, experiencing life with immediacy, in an environmental and relational context. This a very different vision from Maslow's (1943) teleological view of the self-actualised, integrated, and, to use the vernacular, “sorted” individual. It follows that research into the good life investigates the beneficial effects of such contemplation or flow. For instance, Seligman (2002) suggested that, for an individual, the good life consists in knowing what his or her “signature strengths” are, and then using those strengths to have more flow. Elsewhere, and in the language of transactional analysis, I have framed this as a feature of the “integrating Adult” ego state (Tudor, 2003).

- *Eudaimonia*, the “meaningful life”—social well-being

Despite his emphasis on the therapeutic relationship, Rogers consistently undervalued the social dimension and implications of his work (for a discussion of which, see Tudor & Worrall, 2006). One example of this is his incomplete reference to the work of Angyal (1941), who developed the concept of homonomy. In his seminal paper on motivation Rogers (1963) referred to his earlier (Rogers, 1959) paper in which he had summarised the development of the actualising tendency as toward autonomy and away from heteronomy or control by external forces. What he omitted, however, was that, according to Angyal, the human organism also tends or has a trend towards homonomy, or connection, participation, and belonging. These organismic trends exist in the context of and in response to heteronomy or difference and external laws. Unfortunately, Rogers's partial reading, or, at least, his partial reporting, of Angyal has contributed to a view of the human organism and life that is more an individualistic than a social one.

Keyes (2007) made a similar criticism, that: “Within the eudaimonic tradition, there was scant recognition of the social dimensions of an individual's functioning in life”; in response to which, in his research over a number of years, Keyes has made a major contribution in developing a social dimension the understanding of, and research into, subjective well-being (Keyes, 1998, 2005, 2007; Keyes & Shapiro, 2004). With reference to the concept of signature strengths, Seligman's (2002) view of this dimension is when the individual uses her strengths in the service of something greater. The client referred to earlier (pp. 3 and 5 above), who had been struggling with what might be considered aspects of his individual life and individualism, came to realise not only that he could pursue what he wanted and be supported by his wife, but also that he could contribute to her and his children's happiness and well-being. Research into this “life of affiliation” asks how individuals derive a positive sense of well-being, meaning and purpose

from belonging, being part of, and contributing to or serving something larger and more permanent than themselves. This sentiment is famously epitomised in John F. Kennedy's Inaugural Address (on 20th January, Kennedy, 1961):

And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.... [and]

My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

These views about the importance of belonging and affiliation and the social good also challenge the focus in much of Western psychology on individual autonomy as the outcome of therapy. This individualism is, of course, represented in the way that most therapists work, that is, with individual clients. If, however, psychotherapists recognised themselves as political or social beings, they might focus in their therapeutic practice more on working with groups. Elsewhere (Tudor, 1999), I challenged this presumption of individuality and explored the implications of regarding and promoting group rather than individual therapy as the “default setting” or “therapy of choice,” one of the implications of which would be that therapists would tend to put or at least invite clients into groups, and (only) then make an additional assessment to ascertain whether they were suitable for or particularly needed individual therapy. In this sense, the context of, transactions in, and dynamics of the group and those in and of the therapy group are much more relevant to working with and through issues of social well-being, as well as of social dis-ease, and the problems the client has in and with their various groups (family, work, social, etc.).

5 | INTERDEPENDENCE

The term interdependence appears in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) in which Marx and Engels described the universal interdependence of nations, in contrast to the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency. Some 80 years later, in 1929, Gandhi echoed this contrast as cited by Baldwin and Dekar (2013, p.220):

Interdependence is and ought to be as much the ideal of man as self-sufficiency. Man is a social being. Without interrelation with society he cannot realize his oneness with the universe or suppress his egotism. His social interdependence enables him to test his faith and to prove himself on the touchstone of reality.

Some hundred years after the publication of the communist manifesto, the American philosopher, Will Durant, drafted a *Declaration of Interdependence*, which aimed to promote human tolerance and fellowship through mutual consideration and respect (Will Durant Foundation, n.d). Since then a number of other such declarations have been drafted, many of which have been inspired by ecological perspectives (see Table 1).

Interdependence is a neurological, developmental, relational, social, political, and environmental fact of life. It encapsulates a dynamic of being mutually responsible to others and sharing a common set of principles with them. Some people, cultures, and societies advocate independence and freedom as a kind of ultimate and abstract good; others advocate kinship, attachment and loyalty to one's family, group, tribe, community, or society. Interdependence recognises the reality of each trend. However, when the dominant paradigm is one that extols individualism, we need to argue for such diversity and pluralism. To this end, in this article, I have argued:

1. that the biological entity that is the organism and its qualities offer an ontological basis for a relational, cultural and social human being;
2. that the concept of freedom, as developed, for instance, by Rogers, provides us with a sense of what constitutes internal liberty, in an interdependent relationship with external, environmental conditions (whether in learning, or a familial, social, organisational, etc. context)—and, thus, offers an epistemological basis for exploring and knowing what we know; and
3. that the pursuit of social happiness or well-being is more commensurate with a pro-social perspective on life and liberty and is entirely consistent with the pursuit of individual happiness—and, in this sense, may be viewed as the methodology of this current enquiry.

TABLE 1 References to Interdependence

1936	Henry Wallace made reference to a declaration of interdependence in a political context, i.e., the desirability of interdependence among nations and cultures.
1936, July	Walter P. Taylor wrote an article "What is ecology and what good is it?" (published in the journal <i>Ecology</i>) in which he cited Henry Wallace's reference to a declaration.
1944	Will Durant referred to a declaration of interdependence in a social and cultural context, speaking about racial and religious tolerance within a community.
1945, 22 nd March	Durant launched the <i>Declaration of Interdependence</i> (Will Durant Foundation, nd)
1968	After witnessing a massive oil spill in Santa Barbara, Roderick Nash and other staff at the University of California Santa Barbara became active and founded an environmental studies programme (from which there have been some 4,000 graduates). Nash later gave a television talk about ecology which was called <i>A declaration of interdependence</i> .
1969, September	Cliff Humphrey, the founder of Ecology Action, his friend Thomas Jefferson, and others wrote a manifesto titled <i>The unanimous declaration of interdependence</i> , which was published with 52 signatories, in the <i>Whole Earth Catalogue Supplement</i> (Humphrey & Jefferson, 1969). Humphrey and Ecology Action were direct influences on Bob Hunter, one of the founders of Greenpeace.
1970	Stewart Brand, the editor of <i>Co-Evolution Quarterly</i> , reports Gary Snyder as having used the term "Declaration of Interdependence" at least in conversation and possibly in the journal.
1974–1975	At Greenpeace, the term "interdependence" was being used regularly.
1976	Greenpeace's <i>Declaration of Interdependence</i> was published in the <i>Greenpeace Chronicles</i> (Winter 1976/1977). This was a condensation of a number of ecological manifestos written by Bob Hunter over a number of years and included what were referred to as the three laws of ecology, namely: interdependence, stability related to diversity, and limits to growth. These had been developed by Patrick Moore, drawing on Barry Commoner's "four laws of ecology", published in <i>The Closing Circle</i> (Commoner, 1971). (See Greenpeace UK, 2018; The Greenpeace Book, 2013.)
1990	Referencing both peace and ecology, <i>A Declaration of Interdependence</i> was composed by writers and poets including Victor Hernandez Cruz, Anne Waldman, Rick Fields, Allen Ginsberg, Joanne Kyger, Antler, Jeff Poniewaz, Ed Sanders, Gary Snyder, Peter Warshall, Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Mary Kean, Dave Cope, and others at the Naropa Institute, Colorado (Antler et al., 1990).
1992	David Suzuki and others wrote a <i>Declaration of Interdependence</i> for the Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (David Suzuki Foundation, 2018).
2000	Suzuki's <i>Declaration</i> inspired the composition of a Symphony, no. 6 "Interdependence" by the Finnish composer, Pehr Henrik Nordgren (2000) (see also Sawyer, Gomme, Fowler, & Jallow, 2008).
2002	Wade Davis, a devoted naturalist, used the term politically: "We must aspire to create a new international spirit of pluralism, a true global democracy in which unique cultures, large and small, are allowed the right to exist ... a global declaration of interdependence." (The Greenpeace Book, 2018)
2005	Nordgren's symphony inspired the development of the Agile Project Management (2005) and CivWorld (n.d.)

Finally, I want to acknowledge that, in my thinking and writing, I am not an island, and that I have developed these ideas (and, indeed, most if not all of my other ideas) in relationship with others. In this context, it seems appropriate to leave the last word to another, in this case, a colleague (and an Associate Editor of the journal), who, commenting on an earlier draft of this article, wrote about the importance of:

the parallels between the human society we hope to co-create in the world today through collective dreaming (including the mass political action which would be the action step of that dreaming), and the psychotherapeutic relationship we hope to co-create with our clients to enable them to become the fully alive human persons they hope to be. The dream of democracy and social equity or equality in difference—the Western civilisation which Gandhi thought would be "a good idea"—in the world at

the macro level runs parallel with genuine empathy towards self and others (rather than defensive privileging of the self) at the micro level in psychotherapy. (J. Fay, personal [e-mail] communication, 5th February, 2018).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is based on an invited lecture, originally delivered on 4th July, 2007, with the title, *Independence Day: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness, or, Interdependence Days: Organismic Life, Freedom, and the Pursuit of Homonomy* to students on the Counselling Diploma Course at Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK. My thanks go to Caro Kelly for the original invitation, and to Jonathan Fay for his feedback on an earlier draft of this updated article.

REFERENCES

- Agile Project Management. (2005). *Declaration of interdependence*. Retrieved from <http://pmdoi.org/>
- Angyal, A. (1941). *Foundations for a science of personality*. New York, NY: Commonwealth Fund.
- Antler, Collom, J., Cruz, V. H., Fields, R., Ferlinghetti, L., Funkhouser, C., ... Warshall, P. (1990). *A declaration of interdependence*. Retrieved from <https://web.njit.edu/~funkhous/2000/declaration.html>
- Baldwin, L. V., & Dekar, P. R. (2013). *'In an inescapable network of mutuality': Martin Luther King, Jr. and the globalization of an ethical ideal*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.
- Benjamin, J. (1995). Recognition and destruction: An outline of intersubjectivity. In *Like subjects, love objects: Essays on recognition and sexual difference* (pp. 27–48). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- BLM (Black Lives Matter). (2018). *Guiding principles*. Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20151004200336/http://blacklivesmatter.com/guiding-principles/>
- Commoner, B. (1971). *The closing circle: nature, man, and technology*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). Flow: The psychology of optimal experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24(1), 93–94.
- David Suzuki Foundation. (2018) *Declaration of Interdependence*. Retrieved from <https://david Suzuki.org/about/declaration-of-interdependence/>
- Douglass, F., Foner, P. S., & Taylor, Y. (1999). *Frederick Douglass: Selected speeches and writings*. Chicago, IL: Lawrence Hill Books.
- Gelber, K. (2002). *Speaking back: The free speech versus hate speech debate*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Goldstein, K. (1995). *The organism*. New York, NY: Zone Books. (Original work published 1934)
- Gopal, A., & Greenwood, B. N. (2017). Traders, guns, and money: The effects of mass shootings on stock prices of firearm manufacturers in the U.S. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0177720>
- Greenpeace UK. (2018). *Greenpeace UK*. Retrieved from http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/eng/Greenpeace_UK?View=embedded%27%27s%20anatomy
- Humphrey, C., & Jefferson, T. (1969). The unanimous declaration of interdependence. In S. Brand (Ed.), *Whole earth catalogue supplement*. Menlo Park, CA: Portola Institute.
- Jefferson, T. (1776). The Declaration of independence: The want, will, and hopes of the people. Rough draft text retrieved from www.ushistory.org/declaration/document/rough.htm
- Kennedy, J. F. (1961, 20 January). *Inaugural address*. Delivered at the Capitol, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://www.jfklibrary.org/Research/Research-Aids/Ready-Reference/JFK-Quotations/Inaugural-Address.aspx>
- Kennedy, J. F. (1963, 10 June). *Commencement address*. Delivered at the American University, Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=9266>
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121–140.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2005). Mental health and/or mental illness? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 539–548.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2007). Promoting and protecting mental health as flourishing: A complementary strategy for improving national mental health. *American Psychologist*, 62(2), 95–108.

- Keyes, C. L. M., & Shapiro, A. (2004). Social well-being in the United States: A descriptive epidemiology. In O. G. Brim, C. Ryff, & R. Kessler (Eds.), *How healthy are we? A national study of well-being at midlife* (pp. 350–372). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lankford, A. (2016). Public mass shooters and firearms: A cross-national study of 171 countries. *Violence and Victims*, 31(2), 187–199.
- Lennon, J. (1968). Happiness is a warm gun. In *On The white album*. London, UK: Apple Records.
- Macnamara, J., & Crawford, R. (2010). Reconceptualising public relations in Australia: A historical and social re-analysis. *Asia Pacific Public Relations Journal*, 11(2), 17–34.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). *The communist manifesto*. Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf>
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396.
- Miller, J. B. (1976). *A new psychology of women*. New York, NY: Beacon Press.
- Nordgren, P. H. (2000). Symphony No. 6 Interdependence for soprano, tenor, mixed choir and orchestra, Op. 107.
- O'Brien, C. C. (1998). *The long affair: Thomas Jefferson and the French Revolution 1785–1800*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- O'Hara, M. (1989). Person-centered approach as conscientização: The works of Carl Rogers and Paulo Freire. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 29(1), 11–36.
- Perls, F. (1969). *Ego, hunger and aggression*. New York, NY: Vintage. (Original work published 1947)
- Rogers, C. R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95–103.
- Rogers, C. R. (1959). A theory of therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships, as developed in the client-centred framework. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science* (Vol. 3) *Formulation of the person and the social context* (pp. 184–256). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Rogers, C. R. (1963). The actualizing tendency in relation to “motive” and to consciousness. In M. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation 1963* (pp. 1–24). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rogers, C. R. (1967a). Toward a theory of creativity. In *On becoming a person* (pp. 347–359). London, UK: Constable. (Original work published 1954)
- Rogers, C. R. (1967b). A process conception of psychotherapy. In *On becoming a person* (pp. 125–159). London, UK: Constable. (Original work published 1958)
- Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Rogers, C. R., & Russell, D. E. (2002). *Carl Rogers: The quiet revolutionary: An oral history*. Roseville, CA: Penmarin Books.
- Rogers, N. (1993). Sacred space: Using expressive arts to build community. *Earth Circles*, 4(3), 1–3.
- Rogers, N. (2000). *The creative connection*. Llangarron, UK: PCCS Books. (Original work published 1993)
- Sawyer, D., Gomme, G., Fowler, W., & Jallow, A. (2008). *Africa: Communities in action resource kit: Instructional guide*. Salmon Arm, BC: School District # 83. Retrieved from http://rover.edonline.sk.ca/system/guides/africa_communities_in_action.pdf
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Taylor, W. P. (1936). What is ecology and what good is it? *Ecology*, 17(3), 333–346.
- The Greenpeace Book. (2013). *Declaration of interdependence: A brief chronology*. Retrieved from <http://rexweyler.com/greenpeace/greenpeace-history/declaration-of-interdependence/#6>
- The Greenpeace Book. (2018). *Greenpeace history*. Retrieved from <http://archive.is/JEFAU>
- Totton, N. (2000). *Psychotherapy and politics*. London, UK: Sage.
- Tudor, K. (1999). *Group counselling*. London, UK: Sage.
- Tudor, K. (2003). The neopsychic: The integrating Adult ego state. In C. Sills, & H. Hargaden (Eds.), *Ego states* (pp. 201–231). London, UK: Worth Reading.
- Tudor, K. (2016). “We are”: The fundamental life position. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 46(2), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0362153716637064>
- Tudor, K. (2018). *Psychotherapy: A critical examination*. Monmouth, UK: PCCS Books.
- Tudor, K., & Worrall, M. (2006). *Person-centred therapy: A clinical philosophy*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Will Durant Foundation. (n.d.). *The declaration of interdependence* (1945, March 22nd). Retrieved from <https://web.archive.org/web/20120310225853/http://www.willdurant.com/interdependence.htm>

Yalom, I. (1967). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Young, D. E. (2007). *The founders' view of the right to bear arms: A definitive history of the second amendment*. Ontonagon, MI: Golden Oak Books.



Keith Tudor is Professor of Psychotherapy at Auckland University of Technology, Aotearoa New Zealand, where he is also currently Head of the School of Public Health & Psychosocial Studies. He is a Fellow of The Critical Institute, and the editor of *Psychotherapy and Politics International*. He is the author and/or editor of over 500 publications, including 16 books, the latest of which are: *Psychotherapy: A Critical Examination* (PCCS Books, 2018), *Pluralism in Psychotherapy: Critical Reflections from a Post-Regulation Landscape* (Resource Books, 2017), and *Conscience and Critic: The Selected Works of Keith Tudor* (Routledge, 2017).

How to cite this article: Tudor K. In(ter)dependence Day: Lives mattering, freedom with responsibility, and social well-being. *Psychother Politics Int*. 2018;16:e1447. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ppi.1447>