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Abstract
Everyone has creativity, and it is central to survival itself; yet many don’t know this. Furthermore, our human creativity not only keeps us alive but can help us learn what we are living for. Nonetheless, in our culture, creativity—and especially everyday creativity, our “originality of everyday life”—often goes under-recognized, underdeveloped, and under-rewarded (the 3 U’s). Here are capacities, indeed a way of life, that can be both physically and psychologically healing, and not just for individuals, but for groups, cultures, and our greater environment. At Saybrook University, we are returning human creativity to its rightful place in the history of human growth and transformation, through inspired scholarship and dissemination. This article first describes the beginnings for one creativity scholar and the challenges of working off the beaten path—along with correction of misunderstandings about ways creativity contributes to mental health. It then moves to Saybrook University—a founding school in the crucial “third force” movement called humanistic psychology—where Dr. Richards fortunately became professor. Noted too are innovative Saybrook faculty and programs in creativity that have also pushed the mainstream and inspired Saybrook’s amazing students. It is our privilege to mentor and encourage them. The contributions of Drs. Stanley Krippner and Steven R. Pritzker are noted in particular, as well as the burgeoning Creativity Studies programs including a Certificate program, M.A. degree and, recently, a Ph.D.—unique offerings in this country. Ways to preserve these advances and build further on them are mentioned. Last but not least, in the second half of this presentation, we hear directly from the future—from ten remarkable Saybrook students or alumni, who tell us, first, about ways in which Saybrook mentorship and offerings have inspired them, and then, going forth from Saybrook, about ways in which they are truly changing the world.
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It is more than an honor to be asked to write here. It is a validation of what we do at Saybrook University in Creativity Studies, but I’ll get there. Saybrook is one of the founding “third force” schools in humanistic psychology and, soon to celebrate its 40th anniversary, a school which has opened vistas of higher human potential in a psychology once dominated by behaviorism and psychoanalysis. Among other creative faculty and role models at Saybrook, I am including Steven R. Pritzker and Stanley Krippner, whom you will hear more about later. You will also hear below from a full ten of our inspired graduate students and alumni.

Yet this piece is not just about faculty or students, but how we can keep that creative flow alive over time. Flow is both the metaphor and the reality. We are all about change—which means change for the better. We are the upstarts challenging the status quo. Oops, not everyone will like us. Worse yet, our creative openness will throw wide the door for every other strange and discrepant scholar and researcher—like the illustrious crowd in this journal!

Below is (a) my perspective on creativity, followed by, as requested, (b) a little personal history on how I got here, and the work that has been most influential, then (c) areas of inquiry some amazing students are expanding (with specific detail coming later from ten people), and finally, (d) how a creative and humanistic graduate college can keep this ball rolling (here, Saybrook University, known for both qualitative and quantitative inquiry, and our ability to push the edge—with rigor!). Finally—in the best part of this article—we get to (e) hear from ten Saybrook students and alumni, who tell us what helped them during their studies, and how their passions, goals, and activities have now developed toward a greater good. Why do we do this work? To keep the good flow going. To make the lives of all of us better.

**Everyday Creativity—What Do We Mean by This?**

*Everyday creativity,* which I have studied for years and especially in a mental health context, with Dennis Kinney and others at Harvard Medical School, has only two requirements, *originality* and *meaningfulness* (and beyond that it can be applied to anything). “What? I’m not creative!” you often hear people say. Surprise! We all have creativity—it actually keeps us alive, and it helps us thrive. Here are our flexible improvisations, our hunches and intuitions, our human ability to try this and try that. Truly, without creativity many of us would be dead.

We humans are not creatures of instinct who all build our homes the same way. We bring our creativity to teaching a class, raising a child, landscaping our home, fundraising for a cause. Also to seeking food when starving, to finding our way out of the woods when lost. Our creativity can also be about painting a picture—the usual stereotype—but this is only one aspect of it. Unfortunately for many of us, our creativity is underdeveloped, underrecognized, underrewarded (the 3 U’s). At least, that is a part which we, the reader, can turn around.

Meanwhile there is so much good news—yet it is often unsung—about how creativity can be both physically and psychologically healing, open our minds, boost our stress resistance, lower our depression, bring hope and new vision, and for some people become central to a spiritual path. Perhaps it can even change the world. Nor is it by accident we see a resemblance to what Maslow called “self-actualizing” (vs. special talent) creativity—hence creativity, far from optional, can truly be part of our ongoing and higher human growth and development. For some people, what
emerges can be beyond amazing. For some it can go beyond words.

People finally need to hear the message: Our creativity is a fundamental survival capacity. Not only does it help us stay alive, it helps us learn what we are living for. Our human creativity must be taken seriously.

I—Personal Notes: Taking a Road Less Travelled

How did I get here?

We all have stories of how we found our interests—and perhaps at times the courage to pursue them. Thanks so much, Grandma Helen, for showing me art as a preteen. This special grandma gave me colors and paper and faith in myself. I linked art with love, and also with the ability to change things. And to make and know beauty. Plus I learned I “was creative.” I also learned there are special ways to think and feel and imagine and these felt really good.

This is not just about me. All kids are creative—as adults some decide they are not. How quickly it can be snuffed out. In high school, for instance, art wasn’t valued compared to “college prep” courses. You could take art or English literature, art or some other prerequisite. Was this about valuing mind over hands, intellect over intuition? Whatever it was, my counselor told me not to take art. My response? I took art.

My other main interest made me a problem too; it was science. Worse yet, physics. “Girls” just didn’t do that. But I was good at physics, majored in it at Stanford. My physician dad enjoyed discussing physics with me and my two younger brothers. My mom was very good with numbers and financial figuring. Numbers were cool, physics was cool (we did used to say cool, remember?). Here were some other key languages of life (and I did take art).

Few women around

Later I was the only woman to graduate in physics. Did people think that was great? More often they thought it was weird. There were jokes at a Senior “roast” in my Stanford dormitory. One time I took an Electrical Engineering class. I was warned they hadn’t seen a woman there for years. They really hadn’t! I arrived early, sat in the middle of the room. The guys (strangers to a physics major) filed in the room, sat as far away as possible, making a ring around the edge, finally forced to spiral in and sit closer. Amazing I had the nerve to do it, honestly.

It turned out fine, we became friends, I got an A-minus, even despite an oral exam that scared me to death. The professors were all into making us self-confident, verbally powerful Silicon Valley engineer-types. Slick on our feet. Well, I coped.

I also learned a lot about being in a devalued and disadvantaged out-group. It’s awful and unnecessary (in a better world), but this does help strengthen one for the future.

One can do both art and physics

I went on to the University of California, Berkeley, in biophysics with a National Science Foundation Fellowship. I moved a little away from “hard” science. To make a long story short, I ended up pulling my interests together with a teaching credential in physics, math, and---art! What a relief to see some women in the room. And to not have to give up one interest for another. I also wanted to work more with people.

Yet the real joy was to learn that creativity was not just about art. In one education class the teacher gave us a Guilford “creativity test,” with a question something like “give all the uses that you can for a tin can.” A creativity what? We had a great time (Give it a try yourself—anything goes). Cup, bowl, drum, two of them for a walkie-talkie, cut one up for a sculpture, hang a bunch on a coat hanger for a mobile. These got scored: fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration. How amazing. This was about thinking in general! Creative thinking. And the many ways one could use it.

Studying creativity—finding it everywhere, and in everyone!

Eye-opening to me. This creativity thing could also be studied. Scientifically and broadly. To me, art had been creativity, and creativity art—and all too often, largely for famous people. Suddenly it was universal and democratic, and vitally important. A way to encounter life. A great way, a cool way, an
effective way. It could be about my precious science, or just about anything. In whatever area, creativity was about human possibility. Creativity was so important.

There was just one little problem. Many schools could care less about creativity. The focus was on getting 100% on someone else’s test, and not about making up questions of one’s own! Was this what education was really about? We knew it wasn’t. But what do you do? (Are things much better today, with No Child Left Behind? Remember, creativity is an approach, and a highly motivating one—one can use it to teach the 3Rs, rather than cut it out of the budget.) Well, I started doing scholarship and teaching and writing on creativity. And I never stopped, beginning with a Ph.D. in educational psychology and science education (I also taught English in Adult School during that time—and don’t forget, English too can be an art!).

Some amazing teachers—and some others
Lucky break. I got a job as Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology, at Boston University School of Education (which, by the way, we renamed Department of Humanistic and Behavioral Studies. Humanistic psychology always did “get” about creativity). I taught graduate and undergraduate courses in educational psychology and creativity, studied creativity in schools. We had some fabulous teachers as students, getting their masters degrees, wanting to let the kids bloom (of course, the teachers who could have cared less were not in the creativity class). We also talked about biases against creativity. Why do some people devalue these kids? Yes, they talk a lot. Yes they contradict the teacher. Yes they do have this bad habit of thinking for themselves. Does helping them require a special teacher? Or rather, should not every kid, should not every one of us, be this way?

Then there were the fears. Interesting, if the fears were not so pernicious. Would these highly “creative kids” get unstable? Better just to keep everyone in line? Or was this some other crazy stereotype, working unconsciously against thinking (colorfully) for oneself? Think about that one.

Later I tried to find out. Among other things I co-led a parent-adolescent group (now there is an education), and later went to medical school (to pull further together the hard science with psychology) with the goal of psychiatry. I worked at McLean Hospital (psychiatric affiliate of Massachusetts General Hospital) and Harvard Medical School while a medical student, a resident, and after. A Board Certified psychiatrist, I am affiliated even now with Harvard and McLean—meanwhile back home in California and teaching at Saybrook University in San Francisco. At Harvard, I researched—guess what—creativity and mental health.

Crazier and healthier?
Here’s the area I studied with colleagues at Harvard for years. It even helped lead to a coveted award from an APA division, the Rudolf Arnheim Award for Outstanding Lifetime Achievement in Psychology and the Arts. Gulp. I was truly honored. Yet, I believe, as a culture, we still have a very limited, and even distorted and prejudicial, view of creativity—in fact, one that can hurt us all. Please consider this; it is so important. Haven’t you seen creators portrayed as strange and weird, flakey and downright peculiar? Will we too get strange if we create? Some people truly fear this. Absent minded professors stumbling into walls, wild haired scientists—no time for personal hygiene? —innovators sitting all night at desks, pizza boxes piled up, artists covered with paint, maybe themselves the work of art! Is this creator, someone asks, able to cope with the world? Is this creator really normal?

There’s actually a research basis for speculation about pathology and creativity but as I have said, it seems badly misunderstood. It is truly more about health. Yet people seem to think, if it comes out of illness, it must be illness. Strange logic. Remember those self-actualizing creators. Of course, there are many roads to creativity. But do we (big question) sometimes pathologize the creator while fleeing from our own unconscious minds, our irrationality, our Jungian Shadow? Better to say they are weird than we are? (And that maybe this is what a healthy norm should
look like—whereas the statistical norm for human behavior may look more like the walking dead?) Humanistic psychologist Abraham Maslow said something like this as well, after his studies of self-actualizing persons. And Frank Barron (a hero of mine) put it best in his 1963 book *Creativity and Psychological Health* (p. 234):

“the creative person is both more primitive and more cultivated, more destructive and more constructive, occasionally crazier and yet adamantly saner, than the average person.”

**Studying bipolar disorders and creativity**

The question was worth some serious study, so we did some research, me and Dennis Kinney, Maria Benet, Ann Merzel, and others, at McLean Hospital. *We wanted to study typical people, in this case with mood disorders, and to look at their real-life everyday creativity.* Later we did related work with schizophrenia (Kinney et al., 1988a; 1988b; 1992; Kinney and Richards, 2011; Richards, 2000; 2001, 2010a; Richards, et al., 2000; 2001; Richards and Kinney, 1990; Runco and Richards, 1998).

This research was totally different than the usual sort, on famous people. Here, we began with the mental health situation (in the individual or relatives) doing research that could apply to millions. We did indeed find results supporting health benefits of creativity, as you will see. This required developing and validating, on hundreds of people (over several years), a measure of real-life everyday creativity, our Lifetime Creativity Scales. After all, how else would one find creativity wherever it happened to emerge, for an individual chosen by diagnosis? For one person, it may be in landscape design, for another, in writing reports at the office, for another, in teaching a class, or cooking a meal, or raising a child. The numerous studies of famous people (e.g., where one finds a group of eminent writers and investigates their mental health) tells us nothing about ordinary people. In fact, beyond fame or social recognition in a homogeneous area such as fiction writing, it doesn’t even necessarily define creativity!

There is nothing wrong with such studies; indeed they are very valuable. But they are also different, and cannot be directly compared.

Let me first share what it was like to study this creativity and psychopathology issue back thirty years ago. You didn’t hear much about it. It was even a bit taboo (Richards, 1994). As a medical student, I wrote a monograph on the state of the art, as part of a required senior project (published in 1981 in *Genetic Psychology Monographs*), involving both theory and research, and I defended the work in an oral exam. One professor, I recall, was very excited about this. Some others were perhaps intrigued or amused. Still there was clearly something there—one could see it!—especially with bipolar disorders, and not necessarily with the sickest people either. Something was starting to look rather healthy. Quite amazing, I thought. This was before Kay Redfield Jamison’s work, by the way, and the topic was not in the news at all. However, Nancy Andreasen had published a couple of excellent new studies on writers from the Iowa Writers’ Workshop, and I pulled together some remarkable older literature (See also edited edition by Runco and Richards, 1998, for key studies and integration).

Happily, the monograph turned some heads, including that of Seymour Kety, M.D., at McLean Hospital, Harvard Medical School Professor, and Director of the Laboratories for Psychiatric Research at McLean Hospital, with the support of my new Harvard colleague in research Dennis Kinney, Ph.D. Dr. Kety thought perhaps creativity should be included in his Danish studies of schizophrenia and mood disorders. This led to our major research over quite a few years.

Meanwhile some others thought the topic worth only a smile, if not a guffaw. I even remember exactly where one psychiatrist was standing in a hall of the Laboratories for Psychiatric Research at McLean Hospital as he made fun of us (he later denied it), roaring with laughter about “creativity and madness—ha-ha-ha!” Ironically, later—after our findings of a familial pattern of creativity in healthier relatives of bipolars made the news—certain clinicians started taking us aside instead to confide, with pride, about their manic-depressive grandparent or uncle or first-
degree relative. As it turned out, in 1988, Daniel Goleman even featured our work in the Tuesday science section of the New York Times. It was not because of our statistical significance, but because of this media coverage, that we finally became legitimate. Well thank heavens, whatever it took!

The research: Creativity as Compensatory Advantage

But what exactly was this work about? Steve Matthysse and Dennis Kinney (smart folks indeed!), had already considered a compensatory advantage genetic model as possible for schizophrenia. I discovered this my first summer in medical school when I worked with them at McLean Hospital. Might there be some health benefit for this population, they wondered? It did not take long to apply this to creativity. Or to bipolar disorders, where creativity seemed even more prominent. But what is a compensatory advantage? This is important. All this also suggests that creativity is much more than an arbitrary construct. It is related to our human "phenotypic plasticity," our broad and flexible options within our "genotype" or genetic limitations, in coping with our environments and our lives. It is likely relevant to species survival and to genetic and cultural evolution.

It is worth comparing sickle-cell anemia

Sickle-cell genetics gives a simpler but relevant model, since the genetic contribution to bipolar disorders is likely more complex. With sickle cell, the person with the disease, who inherits alleles from both parents, develops a severe anemia, has painful crises, and likely dies an early death. It is terrible. Meanwhile, the more numerous carriers of one allele may have only a mild anemia at best. Better and better, they manifest the compensatory advantage: resistance to malaria. And guess where these genes are geographically found? Where malaria is indigenous. Could something similar, we wondered, be happening with creativity? Where creativity serves as a compensatory advantage?

Needed: A different research approach

Our Lifetime Creativity Scales assessed not only what people did but how they did it. As we often say, this is partly about process—and even a way of life. Here, we could start with diagnosis (not fame) and do studies to include everyone. Are there many people to study? Indeed. Once you focus on everyday creativity, the group is huge. Bipolar I or manic-depressive illness is found in about 1% of the population. According to Akiskal and others (see Runco and Richards, 1998), when one adds the milder “spectrum” variants (e.g., bipolar II—with milder mood elevations, but still major depression—or cyclothymic personality), the spectrum of bipolar disorders may be found in 3-5% of the population. Hence, if a creative or compensatory advantage should appear, it could generalize to millions of people in the general population. Just think. It could give hope, remove stigma. Perhaps even suggest treatments. Fantastic. And let us add in a few so-called psychiatrically normal relatives, who might well also show an effect. Now are we talking perhaps about 5-10% of the population? Many current readers will have families where this applies.

Evidence for a compensatory advantage

Yes, we found, looking at people diagnosed manic-depressive, cyclothymic, and psychiatrically normal, along with various control participants, we did find a compensatory advantage for creativity. An advantage that evidently spoke to health more than illness. This is very important.

If one is in doubt, the details of our studies (cited above) are well worth studying because we controlled in so many exhaustive ways for bias. And we published in major journals of the American Psychological Association, among others.

There it was, a creative advantage, a compensatory advantage, an elevation in real-life creativity from our Lifetime Creativity Scales, which meant anything but the “sicker the better.” Everyday creativity was higher in better functioning individuals at risk for bipolar disorders, and it followed a hypothesized” inverted U” association.

It is vital not to romanticize these findings, since bipolar disorders involve
huge amounts of pain and suffering. Indeed there is a significant mortality for the untreated. How important if there is another side to it. And our results suggested that treatment—including very powerful medications that have changed the whole landscape for recovery—might not only decrease pain and suffering but potentially increase the realization of creative potential. That is, if someone wants to “stop their meds” thinking they will get more creative, they are wrong—they have it backwards! Treatment in general will help both suffering and creativity.

Combining more than one study, “peak” everyday creativity was higher in the following:

(a) With all else being equal, in people at familial risk for bipolar disorders vs. others lacking this risk. Notably, family as well as personal history becomes relevant. In some cases, family history, and not necessarily psychopathology, at all, may make the difference.

(b) In persons with milder bipolar spectrum diagnoses (e.g., cyclothymic personality) vs. more severe disorders. (A trait issue)

(c) In persons during milder vs. more severe mental states (a state issue), often as part of a more severe clinical course (typically mild mood elevation). It is vital for people not to resist treatment thinking “the sicker the better,” creating unnecessary suffering and loss of creativity.

(d) For persons with unipolar depression who have a family history of bipolar disorder vs. people with unipolar depression but lacking the bipolar history. This one is not well known—and there are even more offspring with unipolar than bipolar disorders in these families. Might healthy subclinical effects, a subclinical mood elevation, influence their creativity? Clinicians don’t usually ask about mood elevation unless there is a problem. In clinical work, we much too often look for what is going wrong, rather than what is going right.

(e) Even in psychiatrically normal relatives of persons with bipolar disorders, compared to controls, there are strong suggestions of elevated creativity and, thus, a compensatory advantage. Hence, such an advantage is not necessarily about illness and suffering—not at all. Is creativity yet another manifestation of an underlying bipolar diathesis? So it may be.

There is much more to be said about this topic, both for eminent and everyday people, and the reader is referred to a range of papers by the leaders in these areas, cited above, and in Mark Runco and Ruth Richards (Editors), Eminent Creativity, Everyday Creativity, and Health (Ablex, 1998). Let us also highlight three areas worth further study.

- **Is it most often about health?** Although there are many roads to creativity, here is a link between creativity and bipolar disorders (including unipolar depression in a bipolar family!) that may initially be based in pain—or familial pathology—but in the long run may heal. This needs study. (Some of our students are looking at this.)

- **How many millions might be affected?** We are no longer talking about a handful of eminent creators, for instance artists, or famous writers, however amazing they may be. Results now may apply to literally millions of persons in the general population, in their everyday lives. How many people might actually be helped?

- **Might creativity not only serve as adjunctive treatment, but even be useful for primary prevention?** We need more research on this. Did you hear how Virginia Woolf reacted, upon a hospitalization for bipolar disorder, when asked to stop writing? It’s bad for her, said the doctor; just look how much it upsets her. From her end, this command was tragic; creativity was one of her best medicines.

Much more to say here, including how related results have emerged, at a more subtle level, for schizophrenia spectrum conditions. Keep your eye out for this one. And let us, in general, remember the healthy aspects of creativity, and beware of pathologizing someone just because they are different. (Abnormal is not the same as pathological; it is just different, and may mean usefully exceptional!) As some believe, including many humanistic psychologists, creativity may even be a road to higher forms
of consciousness and more advanced stages of human development. Creativity as process brings us mindfully into the present moment, beyond ego, where we can be richly aware of our options, and can flow with the currents of change in life. Not at all surprising that for some this can become part of a spiritual path. It is well worth comparing, in this context, Eastern definitions and models of creativity.

Other efforts
Other areas of my inquiry and interest very much include chaos theory and creative insight, and issues of beauty, awareness, and the fractal forms of nature. Also important, are the educational implications of creative development. Then there is the vital area of social action and creative courage. What keeps us mindfully and creatively present, so we dare to see, and then dare to act rather than run away, particularly with painful issues we might rather avoid. How do we stay present to help and to innovate? How too do we understand creativity on a spiritual path, and does this, for one thing, help explain the magic when we help each other (this opens the whole vital area of relational creativity)? Can we move toward a realm of spiritual grace, indeed of lovingkindness, compassion, equanimity, and sympathetic joy, known in Buddhism, as the four immeasurables (with their equivalent across world wisdom traditions) (Richards, 2001; 2007a; 2007b; 2010a; 2010b; 2010c).

Remember that Abraham Maslow (1968) had his hierarchy of needs for a reason. Even if we first seek to eat and find shelter, eventually the creative urge, the human quest beyond the obvious to the realm of self-actualizing activities (and beyond!), may well be what it is all about. We humans can definitely go higher. And creativity can help lead the way.

In this context, perhaps one is wondering about creativity and evil. Certainly creativity has been turned toward terrible and destructive deeds. This summer in Washington DC, at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, I am taking part in a divisional debate, basically: Creativity and creators: Angels vs. Demons. Happy to say I will be representing the angels! Although nothing is this simple (since we all have many capacities), all else being equal, the evidence suggests—and this also fits with an evolutionary view of creativity—that creativity tends to work in the service of health.

Let me here thank, very much, our students at Saybrook, many of whom are mid-career adults, and who bring as much to us as we do to them. For instance, through the kindness of one of them, a remarkable Zen Master, I went to Vietnam, visiting regularly at a Zen monastery and nunnery, and had some extraordinary experiences that have inspired my research and teaching and practice and writing—and living—for some years now. But that’s for another time.

II—Go! Talented Graduate Students—Second Step in the Chain of Creativity
The Graduate School of Psychology and Humanistic Studies at Saybrook University does not have a cookie cutter program, and we certainly don’t tell people what to research. Why would we? Our students bring intense interests and concerns. Here are four semi-arbitrary categories for masters’ or doctoral research topics I have seen. You will hear later from two or more people in each of these, although these researchers and their topics could easily be put in other areas too. After a nod to mentoring, I have asked these graduate students or alumni to tell us about themselves, their interests, and goals. After all, it is the students we attract, what they do, and where they go from Saybrook that really says it all. In a moment I’ll outline four areas.

But first, please note we faculty do give a little help! This is quite often on the methodology end. You bring a powerful thought or concern and, then, we really help you shine that research question and craft a rigorous research design. That way, not only will you learn something important but others can believe the evidence too. We faculty also serve (we hope) as role models, door openers, cheerleaders, and bolsterers of energy at those times of doubt (we all have these). I must say, sometimes we are also a Royal Pin in the A. You heard it first from us: Rewrite this, shorten that, reorganize, revise your research question, and consider this
new reference. Hey—it is all in a good cause. It is also good professional practice, what any decent journal editor would request. But from us, it is additionally because we care. (Do remember that on a bad day!) Here are the four semi-arbitrary research categories.

(1) Wounded healers. The general situation: someone who has—in certain ways—been to hell and back, or seen someone else make that trip. Maybe it’s a mood disorder, substance abuse, a difficult childhood or family situation. The researcher wants to explore what has happened, what can help, and discover a better path. Some people heal and grow through the arts, some take other resilient paths. We still need much more research on this experience and more qualitative research in particular. For some people, there can even be an inspiring trajectory from Maslow’s “deficiency creativity” toward “being creativity” (Rhodes, in Runco and Richards, 1998). What joy may result, as one moves from personal and survival needs toward more universal themes and a wish to help others more broadly. The Wounded Healer. His Holiness the Dalai Lama told us the secret of happiness in only one word: Compassion. Why not combine it with creativity? A bit later, Mindy Atkin, Claire Jones, and Gina Smith will address different aspects of this category.

(2) Visionaries, cultural creatives, and story-tellers. Here are graduate students—teachers, artists, entrepreneurs, clinicians—who see new and altered ways of thinking and knowing, and envisioning future realities. Included are creativity coaches, healers, teachers, and trainers of professionals—and these persons can exponentially influence so many more. The Wounded Healer. His Holiness the Dalai Lama told us the secret of happiness in only one word: Compassion. Why not combine it with creativity? A bit later, Mindy Atkin, Claire Jones, and Gina Smith will address different aspects of this category.

(3) Treading anomalous and esoteric ground. Some perhaps (shhh) dare to study certain esoteric theories of creativity or anomalous creative manifestations. I even once wrote in 1994 a short piece for the Creativity Research Journal (called Psi Fi?) asking why these are such “taboo topics” even despite adherents including Prime Ministers, Fellows of the Royal Society, Sigmund Freud and Carl G. Jung. We should laud the creative courage it takes even today to address unpopular (or threatening) topics. Remember, the world is much more than what we see. Even the rainbow goes off into colors that to us, right now, are invisible. There are faculty members such as Stan Krippner and Harris Friedman, who have co-edited scientifically ultra-respectable books, yet on strange topics indeed. Get ready, folks, for a paradigm change! Hot off the press is the 2010 Debating Psychic Experience (authors including Elizabeth Loftus—and I, by the way, were honored to write the Foreword). A related symposium for the August American Psychological Association Meeting has a room scheduled for 410 people! It is no longer just quantum physicists and string theorists taking such issues seriously. So too is the APA. Saybrook students and alums including Harvey Cheatham, Ruth Crocker, and Stefan Kasian will share topics below you won’t find in a mainstream psychology program!

(4) Creating relationally. Does creativity have anything to do with psychotherapy? With how we relate to each other in general? Of course it does. I learned this powerfully as a clinician but we also have the research at Saybrook to prove it! Any relationship between living beings is potentially creative, once you frame creativity as process (remember, it need only be original and meaningful), and see the process as also the product. Here is improvisation, learning, intuiting, adapting—growth, co-creation, co-originality. At times one even finds the magic of synergy (perhaps treading some anomalous ground again) within a group, between a couple. Or the mystery of “I and Thou.” We can reach new spiritual levels and awarenesses. Relational creativity, despite all of this, has not even made it (yet) on many peoples’ radar screens. How can we
enhance new levels of connection, understanding, collaboration, meaning? Can the arts also help? Can we find greater peace and understanding? Surely. What about true love? Better try it yourself and see. Terri Goslin-Jones and Robert Kenny will share some of their own work and perspectives.

III—Creative College Programs “On the Edge”—They Keep Things Going
What more could our innovative students need? Ongoing refuge, support, advice, and enthusiasm could help. Our brave and creative alternative universities provide a home for divergent thinkers, students and faculty alike, and can help keep things going.

Finding Saybrook
Luckily I found Saybrook—very luckily, in fact, since it happened more by good fortune than design. I had returned to California, was Visiting Scholar at the University of California, Berkeley in Education, was practicing clinically, and considering certain other teaching positions. But then the late humanistic psychology founder, student of Maslow, and friend, Myron (Mike) Arons, along with innovator Howie Whitehouse, said “we’re going over to Saybrook for a celebration. It is for Rollo May’s book with Kirk Schneider.” (Sadly Rollo May had passed shortly before.) Want to come along, they asked? Well, OK, I said, but can you tell me more about this Saybrook? (Note—I did know who Stan Krippner was!)

As it worked out, in 1995, I joined the Saybrook full-time faculty. Loved it from the start. A hotbed of creative thinking, and unlikely suspects. I kid you not, a visiting colleague holding an endowed chair from a major school once had tears in his eyes, at our “Saybrook Dinner” at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. This was upon discovering the freedom of inquiry, the enthusiastic and transgressive conversations, that not only could we have, but were having right then and there (with rigor, of course!).

Early days of creativity studies
Naturally, before I arrived, Saybrook already had a creativity course, written (of course!) by none other than the inimitable Stanley Krippner. Stan has a longer list of creativity credits than most lifetime experts in this field. Steve and I counted them! (Steve who?—stay tuned, below.) And this is just one piece of Stan’s numerous other contributions—in consciousness studies, shamanism, dream studies, hypnosis, parapsychology and more. This year, Stan mentioned as an aside, the way one might say one would give a talk, that he will be editing two books. I do not know how he does it.

After the Krippner opening, do know that creativity studies at Saybrook first became truly official through our SIGs, our Student Interest Groups, back in the 1990s. Yes the graduate students were there first! Doctoral student Skip Robinson (then also Saybrook Student Body President), along with Tom Greening and others of us faculty (who were allowed in as advisors—thank you) developed this as an “interest area.” Later I held Saybrook jobs including Faculty Co-Chair and Concentration Chair and helped develop the original areas of concentration. We kept creativity in a good home—and then added a second story and a porch. Then with Steve’s arrival—and who is Steve you ask again—things really took off. See further below.

Creative process more than product.
One can see, by the way, some of the richness (not to mention transgressive thinking, a term from creativity expert Stephanie Dudek) in a 2007 book for the American Psychological Association I was privileged to edit, Everyday Creativity and New Views of Human Nature: Psychological, Social, and Spiritual Perspectives. Aside from defining and operationalizing the concept of everyday creativity, this book highlights the vital importance of creativity as a way of life, one that crosses domains, and all else being equal, tends to work in the service of health, for individuals and for cultures. At its higher levels it is not unrelated to what Maslow meant by self-actualizing creativity.

Included in this book are five Saybrook faculty members, Stanley Krippner, Steven R. Pritzker, Ruth Richards, Mark Runco, Tobi Zausner. And two honorary Saybrook Ph.D.’s, Riane Eisler and David Loye. Among others, humanistic psychology pioneer Mike Arons, who
introduced me to Saybrook, also did a chapter, and positive psychology co-founder Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, author of *Flow*, wrote the Foreword. This is visionary material—but that’s what you’d expect here. Frankly, I was surprised at what we got away with! Nonetheless, this is everyday thinking at Saybrook.

**Force for change in the mainstream**

At the same time, let me stress that Saybrook is a major player in the mainstream. One year we had four Presidencies among the 50 APA divisions, surely more than any other school, probably including Harvard where I remain affiliated. And we have quite a few Saybrook faculty members who are not just APA Members but APA Fellows. To be so selected, Fellows must have had major national or international “impact” (as taken from the APA criteria for Fellow). Our job at Saybrook: *to push the mainstream!*

OK, finally, here is the mysterious Steve, Steven R. Pritzker, with us from 1999, currently Chair of our Psychology and Creativity M.A. degree and Certificate (we’ve just expanded to include Human Science students too), and these M.A. programs are *rare as hens teeth* in this country. Plus ours are the only ones with a humanistic and transpersonal perspective. Plus Steve has just spun off our Creativity Certificate into a new one for Organizational Systems.

Steve Pritzker is beloved of students (though he is tough and rigorous!) and also brings a huge Hollywood cachet. In a previous lifetime, Steve wrote prizewinning Hollywood sitcoms including Mary Tyler Moore, that is before he “saw the light” and got a Ph.D.! He now produces “dream theater” and the like at our Saybrook Residential Conferences, where you don’t want to miss Stanley Krippner acting out a villain or a befuddled waiter from somebody’s dream. Of course Steve has studied both collaborative creativity and humor. I think some of his yet to be revealed results on creativity and humor will... (Well I’d better not say).

**A major creativity reference, national influence, international reputations**

Thanks again to Steve Pritzker along with Distinguished Consulting Faculty Member Mark Runco, because Saybrook is the home (or co-home) of the *Encyclopedia of Creativity*, of which they are co-editors. (Mark also holds the Torrance Creativity Chair in Education at the University of Georgia.) The Encyclopedia is now in its 2011 2nd Edition, reportedly the best selling encyclopedia published by Academic Press. Steve generated the encyclopedia idea during his own doctoral work as he ran from psychology library to business to education libraries at University of Southern California, wishing there was one resource that pulled it all together.

We can also thank Steve who works with the Education Directorate of the American Psychological Association, representing Division 10, Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts (where we have both held elective office and are Fellows) for not only getting creativity into a list of national educational objectives for Congress—thanks fully to Steve that creativity made the cut—but for creating a video feature to tell us (and teachers) more on the APA website. Surely Saybrook can help change the world. But we’ll start with Congress.

Our Distinguished Consulting Faculty are drawn from a Who’s Who in Creativity list. They include Dean Keith Simonton (expert on genius from the University of California, Davis), Mark Runco (just mentioned, and Editor of the *Creativity Research Journal*), and Louis Sass (from Rutgers University, with distinguished work on creativity and mental health, who co-edited a special issue of the *Creativity Research Journal* on Creativity and the Schizophrenia Spectrum). Other distinguished faculty too, will soon join us (Again, I had better not say).

**Unique new doctoral program soon to launch**

When I started writing this, I had submitted a proposal for a Ph.D. in Psychology and Creativity, and this is now moving through the channels, soon to emerge. A happy day, indeed. Again, we thank humanistic psychology for nurturing us! As with our M.A. in both Psychology and Creativity, and Human Science and Creativity, the doctorate is already approved in Human Science and Creativity. Our innovative core faculty and
part-time Saybrook faculty who will take part in creativity dissertation work, in addition to those above, as just a partial list of Creativity affiliates, include the beloved Tom Greening, Zonya Johnson, Eugene Taylor, Abbe Blum, and Linda Riebel, along with Tobi Zausner (author of a new Jungian web-based course in Art and Healing), Arne Collen (Director of Research and author of an advanced research course in Art-Based Inquiry), and Willson Williams (Faculty Co-Chair and Director of the Saybrook Institutional Review Board).

In the USA, there are no other psychology (or human science) programs like ours. Does the reader know one? If so, this is good—the more the better. But for now, we can lead the way.

Yet what if Creativity Studies goes away?

A doctoral candidate represented in this very journal issue once asked in an online forum—what if, someday, for unforeseen reasons, the innovative Saybrook atmosphere fades? What if the risk-taking scholars depart from the faculty, or are mainly retired? What if our truly exceptional students (and you will hear from them shortly) depart to study something else—or somewhere else? What if the passion for creative inquiry and transformation fades? A Golden Age passes? How might we prevent this?

Please remember—this is so important—many people still don’t take creativity seriously. It can still get lost. Diminished, minimized, pathologized, replaced by some academic fad. We need structures that can weather the changes in faculty and administrations, and can keep creativity and all it represents central in the university curriculum. It is relevant to everything—whether in education, clinical work, organizational development, social change, or—you name it. Creativity is not as much about what we do, as how we do it. Hence a 3-part wish list:

- First, an endowed chair. We do have a Consciousness Chair. Time for a Creativity Studies Chair. Let’s make sure, over the years, that there is a secure and passionate and fully funded voice to advocate, advise, research, write, and mentor those who care about creative change and why we humans still have a lot of evolving to do. A professor to support those who want to move our lives, and our world, forward.

- Secondly, a major student award or scholarship. Let’s offer our risk-takers and visionaries a bit of financial security to help them on their academic way—with an award that encourages excellence at the same time. If you’re reading this and don’t know how to leave your huge fortune (congratulations on that!) do consider helping initiatives that can radically change the world, not perpetuate our all too scary status quo.

- Thirdly, build and disseminate the programs we have begun. If they are unique at the moment—well, that in itself is a problem. Let us help others see the value. Let us model the teaching and dissemination and value of creativity for other schools and universities. We can also partner or collaborate with some of them along the way.

We joke that, at Saybrook, we offer Psychology-Plus. You get your Ph.D. to teach or do whatever you were planning. But now you can also be a doctoral level expert in why psychology (or human science) is so important in the first place—as we see it. One big reason: creativity. Want to explore what makes us uniquely human? What directs us to higher knowing and living? To a self-actualizing path? A transpersonal opening? With this Ph.D., you can ask some of life’s key questions while learning to be a better teacher, clinician, entrepreneur, spiritual leader, and person.

Let us not lose the mission, and the potential to do this very good work.

IV—Voices of Graduate Students and Alumni

We’ve looked a bit so far at one faculty career, at some ways circumstances may cause us to challenge the mainstream, and at some healthy benefits of creativity. Do note that faculty on the “edge” should be more able to help students who are also poised
there! As Step II we looked in general at where some current students/alumni are poised (areas of student research) and for Step III, at some history and structures of Saybrook University (now and hopefully in the future) that can help continue and advance the creative flow.

Now let us hear directly from ten students and alumni, ranging from the early days of creativity studies at Saybrook to recent graduates to people in the beginning stages of doctoral research. Our distinguished alumna Judith Kolva, Ph.D., a specialist in memoir (now commissioned to research, do interviews, and write a celebration book for Saybrook’s 40th Anniversary), will present these contributions. She is ideally positioned for this task. Who were/are these students at Saybrook? What has helped them? Where are they going? Here is a stunning mosaic of talent, purpose, and innovation that speaks as loud as anything.

Dr. Kolva’s Introduction: A New Level of Creativity
Ruth Richards. If I were asked to put a picture next to the word joy in the dictionary, in half a heartbeat I’d be on the phone stating: “Ruth, send me your latest photo. Hurry!”

Why? Ruth Richards, M.D., Ph.D., literally, changed my life. If it weren’t for Ruth Richards I’d still be selling couches at Ethan Allen (more about that later).

When Ruth asked me to co-author this article for a special mentoring issue with NeuroQuantology, I was beyond honored. Before she even finished her sentence, I was in. “Ruth, I’ll do anything for you.” No matter that I had four books, including a celebration book for Saybrook University’s 40th Anniversary, on short-leash deadlines, Ruth Richards is a Number One priority in my life.

It is now my pleasure and privilege to introduce you to an array of talented, accomplished, creative students and alumni from my alma mater, Saybrook University. Drum roll please... in alphabetical order, I present scholars and practitioners who do take creativity seriously, who do have the rigor, discipline, and verve (thank you, mentors at Saybrook University), to take creativity to a new level.

Mindy Atkin
Saybrook University Doctoral Student

There is a light at the end of the tunnel—and it isn’t a train—it is a feeling of amazement—I am completing my third year at Saybrook University! It has been a remarkable journey. I am privileged to work with eminent researchers in psychology and creativity such as Dr. Ruth Richards—my dissertation chair, board certified psychiatrist, scholar, psychologist, and author; Dr. Steve Pritzker, screenwriter, and co-editor of the Encyclopedia of Creativity; and Dr. Tobi Zausner, fine artist, art historian, author and clinician. Dr. Zausner, my thesis advisor for my Master’s thesis in Creative Arts Therapy, focused on two outsider artists (Atkin, 2008; 2009), suggested that I pursue my doctorate at Saybrook—an innovative cutting edge institution with a passion for creativity and creative thinkers, and I am very happy that I did. Dr. Richards has extended her vast knowledge of psychology and creativity and has tolerated my learning curve with patience, guidance, and direction, going so far as to mail to me (many) articles (hard copies!) relevant to my research.

My dissertation—An Exploration of the Transformative Potential of Creative Expression as seen in the Art and Lived Experience of a Psychiatric Patient, is a case study investigation of Issa Ibrahim—an artist, musician, writer, and diagnosed paranoid schizophrenic. Arrested and convicted of the murder of his mother while in a floridly psychotic state, he was sentenced to life in Creedmoor Psychiatric
Center in Queens, New York. Twenty years passed during which time he painted, drew, wrote music and lyrics, and performed music among other psychiatric patients four days a week at the Living Museum at Creedmoor under the guidance of Dr. Janos Marton. Issa reported feeling depressed, and at other times high—he responded by turning to creative expression. Though he was prescribed helpful anti-psychotic medication he was not given other medication for these symptoms—and they dissipated. Issa believes that creativity is his best medication. Many people live with psychopathology such as schizophrenia and bipolar disorder. I believe that it is essential that we investigate the possibility that, although medications may at times be life saving, adding creativity may potentiate wellness and help transform pain and distress in uniquely valuable ways, into a more satisfying life experience.

Earlier important groundbreaking work in the field of creativity by Dr. Richards and her colleagues at Harvard Medical School demonstrated a hopeful, healthy link between everyday creativity and personal or familial psychopathology. Richards argued that for relatively healthier people at risk there might be a compensatory advantage. She painted a much healthier picture and pointed out that their creating may be helpful to them! We need to know more about this part. Next steps may even (as we do more qualitative studies such as my own case study of Issa) help us understand exactly in what ways creativity may be healing for people at major psychiatric risk. Thus we can understand the phenomena much more deeply and hopefully we can use this to help others.

Dr. Tobi Zausner (2007) has done remarkable inquiries with artists with various problems and handicaps; much more of this work is needed as well. For my part, I focus on one highly outstanding individual with a major psychiatric disorder and very difficult beginnings over many complex years. I am very hopeful for this work and Dr. Richards is hugely enthusiastic about what I am doing!

Dr. Richards continues to advise and correct me, insisting that I look deeper still (rigor!), explore other possibilities, write, edit, rewrite, cut, rewrite again, and cite, cite, cite! I admit there were times I wondered why I had chosen Dr. Richards for this process—surely other students had chosen an easier path and were at the end of their journey - in the light. Perhaps. However, I believe that my journey will elicit both the scholar and professional that I set out to be when I complete my education at Saybrook.

If you are an individual who is interested in achievement, quality research, reaching deeply inside yourself and learning what it means to be mentored by those eminent in the field of psychology and creativity, you may want to pencil your name in on Dr. Ruth Richards' waiting list, along with Dr. Steve Pritzker and Dr. Tobi Zausner—it is worth the “wait”!

Harvey Cheatham: Saybrook University Doctoral Student; Retired businessman; Director of two nonprofits

I entered Saybrook University’s graduate program in psychology at age 60 after a successful, but not particularly nourishing business career. When I took my first course on creativity with Ruth Richards, almost 35 years had elapsed since I had completed my M.B.A. at Emory University. I thought that as I eased my way back into academic life, it would be prudent to take a few fluffy courses. After all, how hard could this arts and crafts stuff be? Well, I was in for a big surprise and totally unprepared for what awaited. Ruth showed me a broader vista of creativity than I thought existed, and this analytical businessman got hooked along the way. The course was not about art; it was about painting the picture of one’s life. I came to learn that creativity is about human possibility—what humanistic psychologists call self-actualization.

I learned to meditate many years ago after reading an article in the Wall Street Journal about benefits of this practice for
both health and concentration. As a byproduct, I slowly over the years developed a passion for esoteric studies. Therefore, with some trepidation, I approached Ruth about doing my master’s thesis on creativity but from an esoteric perspective. To my surprise, she not only approved the topic and agreed to chair my committee but also got Stan Krippner on board as the other faculty member (which violated school policy of having two executive faculty members on the same thesis committee—but hey, Ruth is not one to be stopped by a few rules). I had not even known Stan and was somewhat in awe of his accomplishments. Yet Ruth contacted him and within a day, I got his email from South America saying that he was on board. I felt like the dog that chased the bus and finally caught it. Oh my goodness, what do I do now?

So our journey began to investigate creativity from Alice Bailey’s perspective. She had advanced a longstanding and rich tradition of esoteric thought that was pioneered in modern times by Helena Blavatsky. The 24 volumes of Bailey’s work, written from 1922 to 1949, offer an extensive esoteric explanation of the creative process, but these writings have been considered by the mainstream as fringe and as a result, never received serious attention in academic psychology. However, Ruth and Stanley were prepared to help me address this oversight. As this research unfolded, we saw that Bailey’s perspective on creativity revealed an innate tendency of all things to convert into concrete form that which already exists in abstract form. In the highest forms of creativity, Bailey felt that the mind or intellect has learned to grasp what the Higher Self already knows and then to transmit that information to the physical brain (Cheatham, 2010).

The faculty at Saybrook have inspired and guided me all along the way. They believed in me at times when I may not have believed in myself. Oh, they can be demanding! I still cringe every time I open my email after an essay submission, knowing that tough comments are making their way back to me. Openness to alternative thought does not equate to slack scholarship in Ruth’s book; quite the contrary. She taught me that one must be prepared to defend every single statement related to alternative thought from forthcoming mainstream challenges, and she is not above playing the role of critic herself.

Ruth talks about keeping the chain of creative flow continuously moving in ever-widening spirals. I understand this to mean that each of us receives so that we pass it along to others. In recognition of what I have received from my mentors, I dedicated my master’s thesis, which she chaired, as follows: We honor and thank all those who came before us, all the teachers from whom we have learned and who have been there for us with infinite patience, love, and wisdom.

**Ruth Crocker: Ph.D.**
**Saybrook University ’03, Contributing Faculty, School of Psychology, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Walden University**

I am a creative person who actually can draw a portrait (and lots of other things too). After earning two master’s degrees and establishing a professional career in librarianship, I subsequently completed 48 undergraduate hours in the visual arts. I was preparing my portfolio for application to M.F.A. programs when I became engrossed in the role of the mind in the perception of art. When I realized that I was spending my noon hours reading cognitive psychology journals I decided that I should instead pursue a Ph.D. in psychology and get credit for my psychological investigations. Then I discovered Saybrook and I soon enrolled. Little did I realize then the impact Saybrook would have on my own creativity. I learned what it meant to live the creative life.

For a course on Women and Narrative, I told the story of Georgia O’Keeffe through a close examination of her art (Crocker, 1995). At the urging of my instructor I submitted the resulting paper to
the American Psychological Association’s (APA) Division 32 (Humanistic Psychology). It won the Sidney M. Jourard Memorial Award in 1995 and I presented it at the APA annual convention in New York.

Intrigued by the specialty of a new faculty member, Ruth Richards, and appreciative of her enthusiastic, free spirited approach to academic inquiry I took the Psychology of Creativity. I was hooked. I could see how her “everyday creativity” could relate to so many of my other areas of interest. Along the way I started and ran the Independent Scholars Student Interest Group (SIG) for students interested in functioning as scholars outside of the academic system, and joined the Creativity SIG too. I was a regular at Stanley Krippner’s dream table and moderated it a few times in his absence. At Ruth’s urging I applied for and won the Rudy Melone Scholarship in 2002.

I chose my committee members (Ruth Richards, Stanley Krippner, Sabrina Zirkel) based both on their expertise and on their sense of humor (a sign of creativity), reasoning that being able to laugh at the same things indicated that we would be able communicate well. My mixed methods dissertation on creativity and divination in the feminist spirituality movement (Crocker, 2003) was a runner up for Saybrook’s Outstanding Dissertation Award in 2004, thanks to the support of my chair, Ruth Richards.

After graduation, Ruth alerted me to an on-line psychology graduate school that was hiring. I believe that two things helped me land the position. First, the interviewer liked the fact that, at Ruth’s request, I once helped a Saybrook peer with her Intitutional Review Board (IRB) form for Protection of Human Participants, and succeeded in the task even though working at a distance. Second, I maintained that on-line students were highly creative persons, with all the positive aspects and challenges that this implies, because they were willing to solve the problem of acquiring a graduate education in a non-traditional way. I landed and held this position for two years before migrating to another large on-line school, where I remain employed today. I am also an artist - I paint on silk using dyes.

So what did I learn at Saybrook? From Dr. Ilene Serlin I learned the importance of gracefulness and beauty in all forms of expression. From Sabrina I learned balance and fairness. From Stanley I learned open mindedness and the importance of precision in language. From Ruth I learned creativity, resourcefulness, and the importance of compassion.

I am often complimented by students for my thorough feedback, my fairness, my interest in their work, my concern about their progress, my belief in them, my enthusiasm, and my humanistic touch. I am complimented by graduates about my ability to mentor and provide compassionate support after they hear horror stories from other students. I tell them that we faculty mentor as we have been mentored, that I was mentored by the best, and it is my duty and privilege to pass it on.

Marta Davidovich Ockuly
Incoming Saybrook University Doctoral Student; Adjunct Professor, Creative Process, Eckerd College; Creativity Coach/Catalyst; Founder/C.E.O. JoyofQuotes.com

Ruth Richards is a master cultivator of everyday creativity awareness and creativity scholarship. She defines creativity along the lines of Frank Barron, as anything original and meaningful, and believes passionately in the creative potentialities alive in each of us (Richards, 2007). Being mentored by Ruth Richards is like being a seed watered by loving kindness from a rare and precious pond. Saybrook’s pioneering scholars Ruth Richards, Steve Pritzker, Stanley Krippner, and Natalie Roger share a depth of experience, credibility, and a passion for creativity which is truly treasured by mentees. Sir Ken Robinson describes
mentors such as these as doing the “exalted work” of those who go beyond raising self-esteem and sense of purpose, to spotting “...rare talent that could blossom into something extraordinary if nurtured” (Robinson, 2009, p. 179). I have been blessed with Ruth Richards’ extraordinary mentorship. It is particularly amazing because I had no connection with Saybrook when it started. In fact, I have yet to meet Ruth or anyone from Saybrook. This is where the real story begins.

In the final months of my Master of Science degree program at the International Center for Studies in Creativity Buffalo State College (SUNY) in New York, I composed an e-mail inviting Ruth Richards to be my “adopted scholar.” My “Current Issues in Creativity” instructor Dr. Cynthia Burnett, brilliantly assigned a scholar experience rather than a paper. Ruth responded promptly and graciously agreed to participate. In our first (and only) phone conversation, she answered scores of questions, agreed to send support material, and playfully rejected my idea for a full-size cut-out poster made from her photograph. She moved right into the role of co-creator—suggesting I use a full length mirror so each student in my class could see, in their own reflection, an up-and-coming creativity scholar. The experience exceeded expectations and launched a valued relationship.

My Master’s Project (Ockuly, 2011), Keys to Unlocking Creative Potential: The Expressive Path to Personal Growth, combined my passions for using expressive arts to activate creative potential and social media (QuoteJoy on Twitter and http://JoyofQuotesBlog.com) to promote creativity issues. Ruth celebrated my successes with Steven Pritzker, who, in turn, offered me a work-study opportunity to bring social media magic to Saybrook. I am happy to report I will begin my Ph.D. in Psychology studies at Saybrook University in Fall 2011.

From the beginning of our association, I knew working with Ruth and Steve while earning a creativity focused Ph.D. would be the experience of a lifetime. My delight multiplied when Ruth orchestrated a connection with my expressive arts shero Natalie Rogers. As a result, I have been invited to join the 2013 Expressive Arts Certificate cohort as part of my Ph.D. program. This is truly an academic dream come true and it happened as a direct result of Ruth’s mentorship. In the words of Natalie Rogers, “Those of us who can facilitate the healing of the grief, anger, and sense of hopelessness that exist today are called on to help humanity recover joy, creativity, and a sense of personal empowerment” (2011, p. 11).

This challenge points right to my purpose. My research interest is exploring the role of joy and creative action in activating creative potential. As a creative change leader, I am prepared to pay forward the gifts of my mentors by mentoring others, and starting a chain reaction of creative learning and action around the world. People need to understand all the ways they are creative. I believe a new definition which clearly identifies creativity as a process of acting on inspiration could be paradigm shifting. My visions also include raising awareness of Saybrook as a dynamic center for creativity scholarship, starting an annual Saybrook Creativity Conference and a National Museum of Creativity, all while conducting and presenting research which positions me as a creativity catalyst and scholar.

Terri Goslin-Jones: Ph.D.
Saybrook University ’10;
Founder, Discovery Consulting

I enrolled at Saybrook in 2004, after searching for a doctoral program that offered alternative thinking and a willingness to explore the mystery of life, a school where I could explore my burning questions about human potential.

On the surface I fit into the conservative Midwestern, business
environments where I worked as a consultant. My clients were leaders in banking, finance, healthcare, public relations, and pharmaceutical sales. My business focus was leadership development and executive coaching. An exhilarating part of my consulting practice was offering creativity seminars with executives. I wanted to go further into the research and development of meaningful work and creativity in the workplace. I was 49 years old and part of a two-career family, raising two sons, aged 13 and 14.

I chose Saybrook because of its focus on humanistic psychology, extensive coursework in creativity, consciousness and spirituality, expressive arts, and organizational development. When I attended the Saybrook residential orientation, during the first dinner, I had the good fortune to sit between faculty members Ruth Richards and Steve Pritzker. Their enthusiasm, generous spirit, and intellectual curiosity pulled me into the Saybrook vortex. Ruth and Steve became my guides and mentors, and my relationships with them have continued to this day.

At Saybrook, many students impacted my life and we developed co-mentoring relationships. Judith Balian, a marketing professional in the two-year expressive arts program at Saybrook, showed me her expressive arts creativity journal and told me stories about the deep relationships she was developing with other students. Person-Centered Expressive arts is a creative process using multiple modalities such as art, movement, sculpting, music, and writing, in a safe, open and trusting environment to facilitate creative expression for individuals and groups. While listening to her stories, I realized that I needed to enroll in the program.

As I turned 50, I joined 12 other colleagues for a two-year adventure and immersion in Person-Centered Expressive Arts with Natalie Rogers, Ph.D. My work with Natalie changed me from the inside out. Not only was I studying consciousness and creativity in textbooks, but now I was studying dimensions of my inner consciousness and creativity through the use of Person-Centered Expressive Arts. This journey began in my corporate creativity workshops. Now I could go much deeper into a personal, creative experience through the mentoring that took place with my professors and the experience of working with Person-Centered Expressive Arts.

As I progressed in my doctoral program, Ruth became the chair of my dissertation committee and Steve Pritzker and Natalie Rogers became the other two committee members. Ruth’s exceptional work in everyday creativity fueled my research. She was open, and at the same time offered much-needed direction and advice. Ruth’s experience as a parent was valuable to me—she had a deep understanding that creativity could be expressed in many dimensions of one’s life, including parenting. Steve introduced me to important research about creativity in the workplace and inspired me with his personal and professional interest in the healing and integrative nature of writing. My dissertation was The Perceived Effects of Person-Centered Expressive Arts on One’s Work Experience (Goslin-Jones, 2010).

In 2010, I graduated with a Ph.D. in psychology from Saybrook University. Even in the throes of completing my dissertation and hosting my son’s senior graduation party, my professors continued to challenge me. Ruth invited me to develop a presentation for the poster session at the Saybrook Residential Conference. A few months later, she invited me to submit a proposal to the American Psychological Association. Even though I was no longer her doctoral student, Ruth took time to read my proposal drafts and give me advice on making them stronger. Both proposals were accepted, and thanks to Ruth’s support, I will make my debut as a doctoral-level scholar of creativity.

Claire Jones
Saybrook University Ph.D. Candidate
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Mine is a story of finding light in the darkness. Saybrook is a beacon on my path for the continuation of my PhD creative endeavors, as well as for my personal growth. It was one that I hoped for, but did not expect to find, at least not twice. You see, I explored creativity during my undergraduate and masters work at the State University of West Georgia (Jones, 2002). There, over 40 years ago, Dr. Myron (Mike) Arons, whom Dr. Ruth Richards mentioned earlier, developed a rare and unheard of holistic program in humanistic psychology. His emphasis and passions also revolved around the power of creativity and I experienced this while attending his and other courses. My research curiosity soared as I realized I could actually study what interested me most. I wanted more – but where would I find more?

Magic happens, sometimes when we expect it least and need it most. During a dark time, as I was wandering in the wilderness, needing and yearning to continue my studies - IT happened. Mike and I had a series of conversations which proved to be life changing for me. He told me about Saybrook and how they offered an expansive and flexible venue for humanistic and transpersonal research with faculty who were leaders and heroes in their diverse fields. For instance, he told me about Stanley Krippner, whose work I was already familiar with and excited about. He also told me about Ruth -- and then he told Ruth about me.

So, let me tell you about Ruth. Ruth immediately opened her arms and was the representative who welcomed me to Saybrook. She has served as my advisor, mentor, friend, and life-line - providing encouraging and informative feedback as needed. She has suggested research materials, suggested I use myself for my research practicum (which proved to be beneficial for my personal growth and my dissertation research), and suggested that I apply for numerous scholarships. Most importantly – she has played a critical role in making sure I didn’t give up by reassuring me of my progress and reminding me that my research is important and I am not alone. She is now the chair of my dissertation committee, along with Stanley Krippner and Steve Pritzker. Independently, they also mentored me during my candidacy essays, and then nominated one of these for an essay award! Just in doing this, I felt I was a winner. Research life doesn’t get better than with this intelligent, diligent, authentic, and caring line-up who chose Saybrook to be their home! They challenge me to rise to my highest potential. I have felt honored, sometimes frustrated, and always blessed. This continues to be my experience at Saybrook. I feel supported and get to research a subject that matters to me most.

So what does matter most to me and why do I do what I do? I feel my research path has chosen me and I have lived what I study. I am in the interview stage of my dissertation entitled, *An Exploration of Experiences and Expressions of Artistic Creativity During Adversity and Resilient Recovery*. The purpose of the study is to further clinical and scientific knowledge regarding creativity as it pertains to aspects of wellness, resilience, and actualizing human potential during times of difficulty and how and if creativity may aid in coping and resilience mechanisms. Unfortunately, many do not experience recovery or self-actualization - sometimes due to lack of support and feeling their creative spirit has died. I know that feeling. I was born into the hardships of financial and emotional poverty, lack of education, and passed down patterns of mental and physical abuse and experienced, first hand, what that does to the human psyche. I have watched many suffer the abject cruelty of losing meaning in their lives which then led to hopelessness, depression, anger, despair, and unhappiness. And I have watched as this “dis-ease” manifested into unhealthy and abusive ways of behavior and attempts at coping -- which only hastened the sickness of the mind, body, and spirit. Several have been family members who lived the torture of an unfulfilled life and died young. We need positive change and my research is crucial. In this, I invite the questioning of long held beliefs, actions, and perspectives which are not true and do not serve us individually or collectively. From this, I aspire to find ways of reconnecting with our creativity and breaking the unhealthy patterns contributing to adversity before they continue to be passed on. The good of the planet depends on it – every minute of every day, so the
positive creative momentum must continue and expand, Saybrook, and all those associated with it, is helping me to let my light shine and to do this.

Stefan J. Kasian: Ph.D.
Saybrook University '06, Professor of Applied Transpersonal Psychology; Akamai University; Founder, The NaturalAnti-AgingSecret.com

When inquiring minds want to know about Saybrook I say: “Attending Saybrook was like Harry Potter’s Hogwarts School.” Earning a Saybrook doctorate guided me to discover and grow my gifts and talents yet in a rigorous, disciplined manner. So they are practical and useful.

As a Duke University undergraduate, I thirsted for a worldview beyond the pre-medical curriculum. So I founded the Mind-Body Medicine Study Group, bringing to campus and hosting leaders in the healing arts, including Deepak Chopra, M.D., and intuitive/energy medicine practitioners.

Meanwhile, after my brief stint at a Wall Street investment bank, my H.R. director invited me to teach intuition to executives. I also worked at The Monroe Institute in Faber, VA, a consciousness lab, researching expanded awareness facilitated by Hemi-Sync™ audio technology to optimize brainwaves (Kasian, 1995a; 1995b; Lane et al., 1998). There I met former special-ops “Remote Viewer” Joe McMoneagle, who gathered Intel on remote locations by intuitive perception alone. After graduating I bought my first of many properties for only a $100.00 down payment (and take over the mortgage). Inspired by McMoneagle, I began working with gifted intuitives, assessing properties to enhance outcomes (Kasian, 2004).

At Saybrook, Dr. Ruth Richards, my faculty advisor for my Creativity Studies Certificate, first introduced me to “everyday creativity.” An inspiring example is Dr. Steve Pritzker’s work as a Hollywood comedy writer. I discovered everyday creativity in my critique of feng shui, which evaluated the creative dimensions of rearranging my home’s furniture to enhance its “flow.” My master’s thesis documented the illuminating creative process of adult group studies of Anthroposophy, which engaged multiple ways of knowing, e.g. painting, sculpting, dance, and literature (Kasian, 2001). Drs. Richards (Chair) and Allan Combs served as committee members. Expanding internationally, I accompanied Dr. Stanley Krippner to Mexico, Cuba, and Brazil, to teach graduate students and speak at conferences on anomalous experiences.

Meanwhile, recognizing my meteoric real estate successes, nationally-recognized trainers handpicked me to lead workshops, teaching hundreds. This led me into publishing, copywriting, information marketing, and hosting webinars with leading authorities (Kasian and DeRoos, 2007). Applying anomalous experiences to enhance day-to-day results, I published my dissertation on precognitive dreams in real estate, in which Drs. Richards (Chair), Krippner, and Combs served as the committee (Kasian, 2006). In this study I interviewed ten participants who had dreams leading to the acquisition (or resale) of real estate. Overall, this group exhibited high absorption and creativity, and considered their housing experience especially meaningful. I presented these findings at a Saybrook Residential Conference (featuring Anastasia Parks, a participant who dreamed the cross-streets of her future home), at the Applications of PSI, in Curitiba, Brazil, and at the Rhine Research Center (formerly the Institute for Parapsychology). Adapting to the collapsed the real estate market, my group helps homeowners by providing them unique strategies that offer relief from their housing crises.

Grappling with health challenges caused by negligent dentistry, I discovered natural detoxification and studied raw-food cuisine at the Tree of Life Rejuvenation Center in Patagonia, AZ. A year later after surviving a head-on collision, I underwent...
emergency brain surgery. By my creative, proactive, eclectic approach to healing, I recovered marvelously, to the astonishment of hospital staff. Several years ago, I befriended Bernando LaPallo, born 1901, and still alive today thanks to his healthy habits, which I practice religiously. I coordinated various media appearances for us, e.g. Blog Talk Radio and a call-in show KFYI 550AM (D’Atri, 2010). Also I arranged and hosted public events featuring his work, e.g. at the Sedona Creative Life Center and conscious-living Raw Spirit Festival gatherings.

My work in anti-aging, rejuvenation, and regeneration led to a “Heal Your DNA/Awaken Your Genius” 2-CD audio featuring guided imagery to activate the body’s natural anti-aging capacities (Kasian and Namaste Publishing, 2010). As faculty at Akamai University, in Hilo, HI, I guide innovative, self-directed distance learners to earn M.A.s and Ph.D.s in psychology. Recently I was accepted for admission to the Southwest College of Naturopathic Medicine, in Tempe, AZ, where I can integrate my diverse background. In the eclectic world of Saybrook, a real-world Hogwarts school, these creatively-charged challenges are child’s play.

Robert M. Kenny: Ph.D.
Saybrook University ‘10; Associate Professor, Transformative Leadership Program, California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS); Mentor, Organizational Systems Renewal Program, Seattle University; Fellow, Fetzer Institute Fellows and Senior Scholars Program; Founder and Principal, Leaderful Teams Consulting.

I vividly recall my first experience of Ruth. Upon joining Saybrook 16 years ago, she proposed to students that bipolar disorder provided a compensatory advantage in everyday creativity. What daring, novel thinking: a “dis-order” as a benefit! This rigorous scientist conveyed her inspiring message by combining compassion, humor, wisdom, paradox, and playful puckishness, thus gently loosening the constraints of rigid, narrow thinking.

After Ruth’s talk, I asked her to be the reader of one of my candidacy essays. Although all my prior essays had been accepted without revision, Ruth requested a major rewrite! Because I was appointed shortly thereafter to the Fetzer Institute’s Fellows and Senior Scholars Program (based upon a nomination by my advisor, Stanley Krippner), I withdrew from Saybrook. So it was only upon my return six years later that incorporation of Ruth’s excellent recommendations led to my essay’s (Kenny, 2008) publication in a special issue of World Futures.

Ruth was even more challenging when she read the second draft of my dissertation (Kenny, 2010a). She suggested 142 revisions! I use the word, suggested, intentionally. As a mentor, Ruth recognizes that her students are mostly mid-career, adult learners, often with significant expertise. Because Ruth respects their knowledge, she invites pushback, where warranted, in the form of robust argument and alternative interpretation.

How else is Ruth a fabulous mentor? First, her expertise is interdisciplinary, so she can partner with mentees to find creative syntheses across apparently isolated domains. Second, she connects students, so they can discover unexpected synergies. Third, Ruth urges Saybrook to recognize creative, scholarly work. She wrote recommendations for two Saybrook awards I received, the Rollo May Scholarship and the President’s Scholarship. The former recognized my essay (2010b), which another professor, Steve Pritzker, invited me to publish in a creativity anthology. The latter honored my essay (2009) regarding the ways that my work extended the ideas of May and Maslow into the domain of sociocultural creativity. Fourth, Ruth encourages mentees to publish. She contacted another faculty member, Eugene Taylor, and solicited his advice regarding appropriate publishing venues for one of my papers (Kenny, 2010c).
The Director of Research, Arne Collen, incorporated it into an advanced research course he will teach next semester. Fifth, Ruth shares her own experience publishing cutting-edge ideas in mainstream journals, helping mentees avoid discouragement and accurately interpret feedback.

My dissertation chair, Stan, and my other committee member, Jeanne Achterberg, have provided similarly invaluable mentoring. They and Saybrook have created a superb "mentoring environment" (Daloz, 1999), where mentoring is a shared responsibility among a team of adult learners, all contributing their expertise in a dynamic creative collaboration.

This environment helped me look beyond the typical Western view of creativity as a "lone ranger" endeavor, to fairly common, but often ignored, examples of collective creativity (what Ruth calls relational creativity). Through ongoing dialogue with my team and by synthesizing an unusually large body of cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural research and theory from domains not typically associated with creativity, I elucidated this theory:

(1) As the latest neuroscientific and parapsychological research and as Eastern and Western wisdom and mystical traditions suggest, our consciousness may essentially be unitary, allowing access by skilled groups to a profound source of creativity.

(2) Through multi-perspectival dialogue groups can elicit ideas of extraordinary quality.

(3) The capacity for creative collaboration can grow significantly over the life span, especially during the transpersonal stages of ego development.

(4) Development broadens identity. Correspondingly, defined in-group membership (potential collaborative group) expands to ever-widening, diverse, and inclusive circles of care and compassion, increasing creative collaboration.

While my mentoring team demonstrated openness to these cutting-edge ideas, they challenged my assumptions and required critical thinking. Due to the latter demands, mainstream organizations have honored my innovative theory with the APA Science Directorate Award and David Pilon Scholarship; and invited presentations to the APA's divisions for the Psychological Study of Social Issues and of Humanistic Psychology and to two divisions of the Academy of Management. My gratitude to my team is consequently deep and abiding.

Judith Kolva, Ph.D.
Saybrook University '04:
Founder/CEO Memoir Shoppe
www.memoirshoppe.com

Did you ever allow yourself to be convinced to do something so foolish that it was beyond foolish? I did.

From the time I was eleven I wanted to earn my Ph.D. I wanted to investigate meaning in life. During the 60s, however, a small-town girl was supposed to get married. Okay. If she had to have a career, there were three choices: secretary, nurse, or teacher.

I managed to squeak out a C- in typing and threw-up around blood. By default, I enrolled in Michigan State University's teacher education program. I loved teaching. Still, I had a quest for more.

Hummm... Why not combine my people and business skills and get a master's degree in human resource management? Degree in hand, I became the HR Director for Weyerhaeuser, followed by a “dream job” as the General Manager of a large resort in Maine. No one understood my mantra: Is this all there is?

One day, a synchronous experience unveiled an amazing discovery: a graduate school, named Saybrook, located in San Francisco, where I could earn a Ph.D. at a distance. I couldn’t wait to tell my then-husband. His response reminded me of rotten eggs. “Just how to you think you’re going to pay for this fabulous opportunity? Certainly not with family money!”

Okay. Regroup. I'll get a student loan. Six months later, I boarded a flight to
San Francisco to attend my Residential Orientation Conference (ROC). Finally, I’d found my tribe—like-minded, like-spirited, creative folks—folks who didn’t think it was “strange” to investigate meaning—folks who were willing to dedicate time to rigorous inquiry—folks who were willing to invest money in their future. (My then-husband stayed home.)

An important part of a Saybrook ROC is to meet faculty. I’d read about this Ruth Richards, M.D., Ph.D.—educated at Stanford, UC Berkeley, and Harvard—world renowned in creativity—an accomplished author. The list went on.

Someone directed me to a break-out room and pointed to a lively, laughing woman, sitting cross-legged on the floor. She had short red-blonde hair, sported big round glasses, and wore a green pantsuit accessorized with a long red and gold scarf. What? Twice-Doctor Richards should be—ah—staid, academic.

Well, Twice-Doctor Richards went far, far beyond an academic professor (and I had data from a large control group): she mentored me in creativity classes, she praised my re-written (!) papers, and she guided me through the rigors of essays. When it came time to write my dissertation she introduced me to Steve Pritzker, who became my respected chair. She also agreed to work on my committee and helped me select Arne Collen, my third committee member. In short, she supported my quest to find meaning in life.

So, with coursework and essays behind me and my dissertation proposal approved, I started my research—the relationship between meaning in life and telling life stories. All was well in my world, until—

Flashback to then-husband: with student loans maxed out, he convinced me to quit. I was, after all, earning big money selling couches at Ethan Allen.

I called Steve. “I quit.”

Silence

“Excuse me? You what?”

“I quit.”

There were no dots to connect. I simply quit.

A year later, my phone rang - digital clock blinked 11PM.

“Hi. This is Steve. Apply for the Rudy Melone scholarship. You have until tomorrow to write an essay.”

“Ah, Steve, that’s an hour. I’ve had more than three glasses of wine. I—”

“Ruth says, ‘Do it!’ So do it!”

Click

And as the saying goes, the rest is history. I was awarded the scholarship, finished my Ph.D., and started Memoir Shoppe. I write heirloom quality memoirs that preserve stories that link generations. Thank you, Ruth. Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Arne. Thank you, Saybrook. Because of your belief in me, my work, indeed, demonstrates “telling life stories can serve as an interpretative lens that helps [individuals] focus on who they were, who they are, and that which is meaningful” (Kolva, 2004, p. 155).

Gina Smith
Saybrook University Doctoral Student
APA Presenter ‘11;
Working Journalist;
New York Times best-selling author

With people in the tech industry – especially here in Silicon Valley – the one title they do NOT associate with my name is the term “grad student.” In the last 20 years covering the rise and now the tsunami of “tech,” I’ve covered tech for the journals, wrote several nationally-syndicated pieces nationwide, showed up weekly on Good Morning America, World News Tonight and other network shows as the first female (and
probably youngest at the time, it was 1994) covering that then-scary area of technology. Since, I’ve written two award-winning books, (Smith, 2005, 2007), one, called iWoz, the autobiography of Steve Wozniak, and am now re-launching the famous (to techies) BYTE Magazine.

But thanks to Dr. Richards, Dr. Pritzker and Dr. Krippner, all of whom I met in my earliest hours at my first Saybrook Residential Orientation, before I even had decided how and whether to split my fulltime writing career with role of student getting a Saybrook M.A., I knew it. The mentoring began immediately, with deep conversations long into the night. Not just of creativity and my chosen topic for my thesis project– but also about my own self-investigation, figuring out what made me different from my family of origin, a group of rollicking, out-of-control and abusive alcoholics.

It gets dangerous here in my mind, all alone. That is why the wise and consistent Saybrook style mentoring from Dr. Richards (my dissertation chair), Dr. Pritzker and Dr. Krippner in particular, has kept me on the road, and finding creative ways to build my real-life (did I mention I am a parent to a third-grader), in a way that makes room for what I’ve come to learn are important questions I want to investigate in the field of Creativity and Psychology. Thank goodness, the APA has an “app” for that. A division, I mean.

I met Dr. Richards in 2007 through a friend who regularly takes her informal creativity workshops when they are here in San Francisco. We made sculpted models of ourselves as females. At the end of this three hour workshop, I was in tears. I could see that poorly sculpted but screaming-with-truth sculpture exactly for what it was. It was my mother. I was bound. I was not free yet, even after her death and becoming a mother myself. And then I learned there’s an app – ah, a school – for that. It’s called Saybrook. I wanted to investigate. Not just my obvious mother issue, which had come up before in therapy. But about how this was possible – what was Dr. Richards able to do with a group of strangers in a few hours that gave me more insight than much therapy yet had?

She told me about Saybrook. I enrolled as an M.A. student a few weeks later. I graduated in June 2010 with an M.A. – my master’s project, Shaken Not Stirred: How Creativity Plays into Resilience among Adult Children of Alcoholics (ACOAs) resulted (Smith, 2010). I learned remarkable strides had been made in the literature surrounding my field of interest, primarily through the continually active and engaged mentorship of educators like Dr. Eric Lehrman and Dr. Giorgi, Dr. Eugene Taylor and Dr. Krippner, of course.

My master’s project – after much discussion with professors and especially my M.A. chair and my reader, Drs. Richards and Lehrman – focused eerily on a question that quietly has echoed deep within me since my early 20s. Why did three of us raised in an identically dysfunctional and active alcoholic home all emerge differently – with major substance abuse problems, related issues, and even early death, or, by contrast, me, who to all apparent views, seems fairly normal and at least accomplished in my line of work? Perhaps I am resilient. Can resilience be taught? Could my constant creative acts as a child, as I read in Dr. Richards’ classes, have provided the escape or resilience I needed to survive? Can we learn more about this through further research, and share it with ACOAs, families, and professionals? Here is work that could change lives.

Dr. Kolva Concludes: Welcome Home!
Yes, indeed, we, the faculty, mentors, alumni, and students at Saybrook University, are about creative flow. We are about rigorous creative inquiry that challenges the status quo. And that’s okay. Why? Because challenging the status quo via creativity can lead to important change.

Think about this: if Alexander Graham Bell hadn’t used his creativity to challenge the status quo, we might still be sending smoke signals; if Thomas Crapper hadn’t used his creativity to challenge the status quo, we might still be running to the outhouse with our Sears Roebuck Catalog; if Harriet Beecher Stowe hadn’t used her creativity to challenge the status quo, we might still be a nation divided.

And if in 1971 a young woman by the name of Eleanor Criswell hadn’t used her creativity to challenge the status quo and
shake the very foundation of traditional psychology, we, the faculty, mentors, alumni, and students of Saybrook University, might still be searching for our place in the world (Stay tuned for the full story of Eleanor Criswell, Saybrook’s founder, in the soon-to-be-released book celebrating Saybrook’s 40th Anniversary).

When was the last time you used creativity to challenge the status quo? It could be that you baked a cake, or planted a garden, or painted your bedroom. Challenging the status quo with creativity doesn’t always change the world. It must, though, be taken seriously. Remember this: although eminent creativity is powerful and not to be discounted, everyday creativity is like breathing—it can and will keep you alive.

The bad news is there are people who do not take creativity seriously. The good news is there are people who do take creativity seriously (Can you say “Saybrook University”?). As we heard directly from faculty, mentors, alumni, and students, Saybrook University is a haven for creative ideas, creative purpose, and creative projects. It is a vanguard University where we can and do turn around creativity’s 3 U’s.

Before we close, write this in indelible ink: Saybrook University is indigenous to the best creativity mentors on the planet. At Saybrook University you will find enthusiasm, guidance, support, and, yes, an occasional kick in the pants. You will find your tribe. You will find an oasis where for forty years (and counting!) divergent thinkers push the edge—with rigor.

Don’t wait another second. We are excited to embrace you with a heartfelt, “Welcome home!”
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