Articles

Perls With Gloria Re-reviewed: Gestalt Techniques and Perls's Practices

ROBERT H. DOLLIVER

In his filmed interview with Gloria, Perls demonstrated some standard Gestalt therapy techniques; examples from the film are identified. Also identified are discrepancies between Perls's description of Gestalt therapeutic processes and his interview behavior. Reflections are made on the inherent difficulties with the concept of the emerging Gestalt. Similarities are pointed out between the processes in Perls's interview and "driving the other crazy." Gloria's reactions to the interview are quoted from her earlier published comments.

From my first viewing of the Perls portion of the *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy* film (Shostrom, 1965), I had an uneasy feeling about it. As I saw the film more, I began to formulate the reasons for my uneasiness and clarify what it was about the film that caused me to react so strongly. I wrote a content analysis of the film with two other persons (Dolliver, Williams, & Gold, 1980) that helped to further clarify my concerns. As I re-reviewed the film, I began to see that there was a positive aspect that I previously had not clearly conceptualized: the film's demonstration of some standard Gestalt techniques as described by Passons (1975)—for example, nonverbal awareness and fantasy approaches. I also began to see that there was a highly troubling aspect that I had not clearly conceptualized: the discrepancies between what Perls reported he was doing and what he seemed to be doing. Gloria seemed to notice a number of those discrepancies but found that Perls was closed to considering any such perceptions.

GESTALT TECHNIQUES DEMONSTRATED

At the beginning of the film, before he had talked with Gloria, Perls said, "In contrast to [Freud's] depth psychology, we try to get all of the obvious of the surface of the situation in which we find ourselves and to develop the emerging Gestalt . . ." Perls's *psychology of the obvious* is analogous to an outcropping of rock at the surface of the earth that indicates what is likely to be underneath. The phrase *develop the emerging Gestalt* identifies a major role for the Gestalt therapist—to be, as Perls said, "like an artist bringing something out which is hidden" (Shostrom, 1965). Several Gestalt techniques are aimed at bringing out obvious aspects of the client's personality: directing awareness to nonverbal behavior; exaggerating (or simply repeating) either verbal or nonverbal behavior; developing client fantasy; and exploring transference. Examples of Perls's use of each of these techniques are identified in succeeding sections.

Awareness of Nonverbal Behavior

Throughout the film, Perls directed Gloria's attention to her nonverbal behavior:

"What are you doing with your feet now?"
"Are you aware of your smile?"
"You didn't squirm for the last minute."
"Are you aware that your eyes are moist?"
"Are you aware of your facial expression?"

At one point, Perls suggested a possible concrete meaning of one of the gestures: ". . . you put your hand on your chest. Is this your corner?" Many of these comments were made in such ways and at such times that they seemed to break the flow of communication. To Perls, however, they served to "tag" Gloria's behavior in an effort to develop the emerging Gestalt.

I will comment on the apparent use made by Gloria and Perls of those nonverbal behaviors brought into awareness. Gloria reported a number of times in the film that these awareness-generating observations placed her on the defensive (in that Perls was going to notice everything she did), confused her (she thought that Perls wanted her to explain why she was moving her foot), and indicated that he did not accept her but rather was critical of her. In fairness, it should be noted that toward the end of the film, Gloria was more aware of her nonverbal behavior and she more readily focused her attention on using her nonverbal expressions to enrich her understanding of what she was expressing. Perls, however, made much greater use than she did of his observations about her nonverbal behavior. He referred to Gloria's smiling as an indication that she was being phony, that she "didn't believe a word she was saying." Perls referred to her not squirming as an indication that her communication was more congruent (which to him meant it was more honest). In my view, the benefits of this aspect of Gestalt therapy were not successfully demonstrated in this film; at no point did Gloria seem to me to have gained new understanding of herself from those emerging Gestalts formed from her nonverbal behavior.

Repeating or Exaggerating

Perls also gave ample demonstration of the Gestalt technique of having the client repeat or exaggerate a response as a means "to develop the emerging Gestalt." Examples of Perls's requests for Gloria to repeat a response include the following:

1. Gloria: "Oh, I resent that, very much."
   Perls: "Can you express this?"
2. Gloria: "I still resent that."
   Perls: "Again."
3. Gloria: (sigh).
   Perls: "Now do this again."
4. Perls: "Say this again."
   Gloria: "No."

In the following ways, Perls asked Gloria to exaggerate her statements or nonverbal behaviors:

"Can you develop this movement?"
"Develop it as if you were dancing."
"Now exaggerate this."
"What you just said, talk to me like this."
"Do this more."

Again, overall, I do not think that this had an observable beneficial effect. Early in the interview, Gloria did respond to the invitation to describe further her resentment of Perls's noting her nonverbal behavior and using the verbal-nonverbal discrepancy to label her "a phony" (see example 1 above). On the second occasion, Gloria changed the subject (see example 2 above). On the third occasion (see example 3 above) Perls asked, "How do you feel now?" to which Gloria responded, "I don't know," to which Perls responded "Playing stupid." Then Gloria refused to follow Perls's instruction (see example 4 above). To come to conclusions about why this technique was not successful (or even to judge that it was not successful) draws upon one's view of Gestalt therapy. Some possibilities are: (a) the interview was too short for Gloria to learn and accept this aspect; (b) Gloria was "resistant"; (c) Perls did not follow up on his instruction, but quickly followed newly emerging Gestalts; or (d) this process (or the specific content) just did not fit for Gloria.

Fantasy Exploration

The Gestalt use of fantasy was also demonstrated with Perls's encouraging Gloria to elaborate descriptions of her fantasy:

"Can you describe the corner you'd like to go to?"
"Imagine you were in this corner and you are perfectly safe. Now what would you do in that corner?"
"What should I do when you are in your corner?"

On another occasion, Perls strongly discouraged Gloria from exploring her fantasy of herself as a child:

Gloria: "This reminds me of when I was a little girl."
Perls: "Are you a little girl?"
Gloria: "Well no, but it is the same feeling."
Perls: "Are you a little girl?"
Gloria: "This feeling reminds me of it."
Perls: "Are you a little girl?"
Gloria: "No, no, no."
Perls: "No, at last."

Perls then went on to label Gloria "a 30-year-old girl who is afraid of a guy like me." It is at first not clear why Perls so sharply turned Gloria away from that topic, given his interest in her other fantasies (including those about him, which are identified in the next section). It seems, on reflection, to represent Perls's effort to promote Gloria's being in the "here and now" with him. The exploration, however, of Gloria's corner seems to be a similar departure from the here and now; thus, there remains the apparent inconsistency in Perls's reactions to her "safe corner" and to "when I was a little girl."

In Perls's evaluation of the interview, he referred to Gloria's "withdrawing by fantasizing of hiding in a corner." It is difficult to judge the success of this fantasy aspect of Perls's Gestalt demonstration. The emerging Gestalt for Perls was that Gloria was overly self-protective in psychologically withdrawing to her corner. I saw no indication that Gloria understood anything new about herself although she did learn that Perls reacted quite negatively to his perception of her being self-protective.

Transference

A major dimension in my earlier review was the observation that Gloria had an interpersonal orientation (wanting to talk about how she experienced Perls), while Perls had an intrapsychic orientation (wanting to talk about what was going on in Gloria's mind). The same dimension is still striking to me in this re-review, but there is now more clarity for the labels to be attached to those orientations. Gloria is focused on the *real relationship*, that is, their interaction as persons; Perls is focused on the *transference relationship*, that is, on the fantasy elements in their relationship. (These terms come from Greenson, cited in Gelso & Carter, 1985.) This difference had the effect that when Gloria offered a description of her experience of Perls, he *always regarded it as Gloria's fantasy*, representing Gloria's projected attributes (dimensions of her lost potential). As Haley (1959) pointed out, such views of transference promote therapist control. When Perls did not even entertain Gloria's comments as potentially valid, it seemed to confuse Gloria about what she was supposed to do and to undermine her confidence in her ability to perceive accurately. There is only one major time in the interview when Perls directly acknowledged his point of view concerning transference; the issue is whether Perls asked Gloria why she was moving her feet, regarding which Perls replied: "I did not ask you to explain it. It's your imagination. That is not this Fritz, it is the Fritz of your imagination. There is a big difference." (Gloria did not know that Perls eschewed "why" questions in favor of "what" questions.) Perls showed two major strategies of dealing with the transference aspects of Gloria's reactions, described in the next two sections.

Transference projections and retroflections. Demonstrations of what Perls regarded as Gloria's transference projections are clearly present in the filmed interview. (This dimension overlaps with the exploration of fantasy in an earlier section; here Perls is the focus of the fantasy.) For instance, at various times Perls asked Gloria to play out her fantasy of him:

"Can you play Fritz not liking Gloria?"
"Please play Fritz. . . . Play just what you said."

At other times, Perls requested elaborations of Gloria's fantasy of him:

"Now what can I do to you?"
"How old must I be?" [for Gloria to scold him]
"How should I be? Give me a fantasy. How could I show my concern for you?"
"What would I do? How would I conceal my feelings?"

Perls also asked for Gloria's interpersonal fantasy: "If I am really hurt, if I would cry, what would you do with me?" In another set of reactions to Gloria, Perls questioned whether Gloria had "retroflected" (turned back to herself, the opposite of projection) some of her reactions to him:

Gloria: "Ugh. It's icky. It's just icky . . . "
Perls: "Can you say this to me? Fritz you are icky."

Perls: "You did something with your hair there. Is there something about my hair you object to?"

Gloria: ". . . I feel more chokey."
Perls: "Could you choke me?"

The aim of working with Gloria's transference projections was for Gloria to recognize that she had projected her own attributes onto Perls and for her then to reassimilate (i.e., to "re-own") her projected attributes. The clearest instance where Perls tried to reassign an attribute was around the issue of respect. Gloria said: ". . . you are the type of person that seems like you demand so much respect." Soon after, when Gloria had played Perls demanding respect, Perls said: "Can you say the same as Gloria? . . . I demand respect because . . ." A short time later, after Gloria's denial that she demands respect, she said: "I'd like you to respect me more." Perls said: "Well, you see. So you demand respect."

I found that bit of reassimilation to be unconvincing. In Perls's perception, Gloria would have an important yet unrecognized issue about receiving respect, which would be projected onto him rather than recognized as a self-attribute. Gloria's statement was an admission that she would *like Perls* (specifically in her present interaction with him) to feel that he respected her. Perls's response suggests that he believed that this was a central life's issue for Gloria. There was a great deal of indication from Gloria throughout the interview that she felt attacked, judged, and criticized. I assume that Gloria's interest in Perls's respecting her was an indirect request that he treat her better than she believed he had been doing in the film.

Transference—"inviting" attack. Although it was not a standard Gestalt technique, Perls did demonstrate a manner of deflecting Gloria's stated reactions to him in a way that seemed to belittle her:

Gloria: "I want you on my level so I can pick on you just as much as you are picking on me."
Perls: "Okay. Pick on me."

Gloria: ". . . I'd say, 'I think you are [a phony] too!' "
Perls: (laughing) ". . . Tell me what a phony I am."

Gloria: "I'd like to embarrass you."
Perls: "Embarrass me . . ."

Gloria: ". . . if I could demand respect from you, I would."
Perls: "Then do it. Who's preventing you except yourself?"

Gloria: ". . . I don't feel like I've got the right to really, really tell you how mad I am [at you]."
Perls: "That's verbiage . . ."

It seems that Perls thought that Gloria had unnecessarily restricted her behavior with him (and probably also with others in her life), and he did seem to be encouraging her to be less fearful and hesitant. It is impossible for me to judge the success of this technique. There is a paradoxical quality to many of Perls's responses (cited in this paragraph) as noted by Dolliver et al. (1980). While seeming to encourage Gloria to be less restricted in her verbal behavior toward him, Perls successfully conveyed that she could say virtually anything to him without it having any effect on him. Gloria later commented about her sense of Perls "purposely staying out of contact with" her.

Overall, in the filmed interview with Gloria, Perls did demonstrate some important aspects of Gestalt therapy theory. My judgment is that there was no demonstrable indication that Gloria benefited by these interactions, nor that she learned anything about herself that she was able to incorporate into her behavior. It is certainly observable that, as he said, Perls did "manipulate and frustrate the patient"; it is not clear that he did so "in such a way that [s]he is confronting [her/]himself," as Perls stated in his film introduction.

PERLS'S GESTALT PRACTICE

In his introduction to the film, Perls made an incredible statement about his orientation to Gestalt therapy: "Principally, I consider any interpretation to be a therapeutic mistake as this would imply that the therapist understands the patient better than the patient himself and takes away from the patient the chance of discovering himself by himself and prevents him from finding out his own values and style." Can the reader, in light of the review that has preceded, think that Perls: (a) did not interpret Gloria's behavior to her; (b) did not convey that he understood Gloria better than she understood herself; or (c) offered Gloria the chance of discovering herself and promoted Gloria's finding out her own values and style? These questions will be addressed further in succeeding sections.

Interpretation

The determination of whether Perls interpreted Gloria's behavior undoubtedly revolves around the definition we employ of the term *interpretation*. Perls claimed that he shunned "why" explanations and only dealt with the "what," that is, descriptions of behavior that occurred. (It is true that many of Perls's responses to Gloria were descriptions of this sort.) For our purposes, we can define *interpretation* as an idea that connects two apparently unrelated things, especially when behavior is being connected to a heretofore unknown purpose for such behavior. Perls did offer an interpretation about Gloria: "And I think I hit a bull's-eye [regarding Gloria being a phony]. That is why you feel hurt." (The dubious implication of this is that inaccurate accusations would not hurt.) Perls did put forth other "why" explanations to Gloria regarding her "playing dumb and stupid," saying "What would it do for you to be dumb and stupid? Look at it like

this—what would it do to me, if you would play dumb and stupid?" A short time later: "If you play dumb and stupid, you force me to be more explicit." It is clear in these comments that Perls considered that Gloria had a purpose in her "playing dumb and stupid"—for the effects it had on herself and other people.

Who Understood Gloria Better?

Regarding whether Perls implied that he knew Gloria better than she knew herself, we can note the following 10 events: Perls, over Gloria's objections, confidently told Gloria that (1) she was being "phony," (2) she was "playing stupid," (3) she *did* demand respect, (4) she "either [goes] far away in the corner or so close that [she] gets melted into one with the other person," and (5) her wish to be protected and comforted is like that of a baby (this was implied rather than directly stated). Perls also indirectly communicated a number of attitudes to Gloria: that she should (6) communicate in congruent ways (i.e., so that her verbal behavior would match her nonverbal behavior); (7) reduce her fear of what other people think of her (notably what Perls thinks of her); (8) rely on herself more than on other people ("maturation" in Perls's Gestalt terms); and (9) develop her awareness of her internal states through paying attention to her nonverbal responses. Perls identified Gloria's major issue within the interview as (10) "the avoidance of the genuine encounter," due in part to her phoniness. I think of these 10 communications from Perls to Gloria as interpretations, although it is also possible to think of them as "observations" (reports of what Gloria was doing), which apparently is how Perls viewed them. All of these communications, to me, certainly imply that Perls thought he knew Gloria better than she knew herself, that Perls knew more clearly both what she was doing and what she should be doing.

Gloria Discovering Herself

By reviewing six incidents that occurred in the interview, I will consider whether Gloria had the chance to discover herself and find out her own values and style. The first two incidents are (1) Gloria's disputing Perls's accusation of her being or acting "phony" and (2) Gloria's disputing Perls's comment about their having had "a good fight." The first involves Gloria setting forth an implied definition of what it is to be phony (a definition that differs from Perls's definition):

> Gloria: "I'm not being phony. I'm not pretending that I'm so brave. I resent that. I feel like you're saying unless I come out openly and stand on my own, I'm phony. Baloney! I'm just as real sitting in that corner as I am out here all by myself."
> Perls: "But you're not sitting in that corner."

The second incident involves a dispute over another definition, this time about what constitutes *fighting*:

> Perls: "Well, Gloria, can you sense one thing? We had a good fight."
> Gloria: "No. No. I don't think you are fighting with me."
> Perls: "But I have hurt you. You came out quite a bit."

A short time later, Gloria said: "I'd rather we were angry and fought than to have no contact." She went on to explain to Perls that a mutual fight requires the possibility that either party can hurt the other.

The next two incidents are (3) Gloria's accusation that Perls was playing games with her and (4) Gloria's accusation that Perls seemed detached and did not care that she was mad at him. Here is the dialogue concerning the third incident:

> Perls: "I am Fritz. I pass judgment. Pass judgment on me now."
> Gloria: "I don't feel close to you at all, Dr. Perls. I feel that's phony. I feel that you're playing one big game."
> Perls: "Right. Sure, we are playing games. But in spite of the games, I think I have touched you now and then."

Regarding the fourth incident:

> Gloria: "But you seem so detached. You don't even seem to care that I'm mad at you. . . ."
> Perls: "This is quite true. . . ."

The final two incidents can be seen as Gloria's attempt to be the therapist. The issues here are (5) whether or not Perls was accurate in saying that he did not understand and (6) whether she or he had "bottled him up." In the fifth incident:

> Perls: "You say you are scared, but you are smiling. I don't understand how one could be scared and smile at the same time."
> Gloria: "And I'm also suspicious of you. I think you understand very well (pause) and kid to cover up."
> Perls: "Do you have stage fright?"

In the sixth incident:

> Perls: "Oh, you are bottling me up, right and left."
> Gloria: "No. I think you can do that all by yourself."
> Perls: "Oh. I think the other way around. . . ."

How do these six incidents indicate Gloria's "chance to discover herself and to find her own values and style?" The first thing that stands out is that all the incidents are interpersonal; aspects of Gloria's personality develop from the interaction with Perls. The second thing that stands out is the mix of Perls's responses, three (the third, fourth, and sixth) being *confirmatory* (in Laing's, 1962, use of the term—relevant to Gloria's responses). In the sixth incident, Perls did not agree with her, but he did agree with Gloria in the third and fourth incidents with a remarkable softening of his tone. (The latter two incidents are unique in this film in that they show Perls agreeing with Gloria's viewpoint.) Note Perls's justification, however, in the third incident, after his initial conciliatory tone in agreeing with Gloria. The other three incidents (the first, second, and fifth) seem *disconfirmatory* (Laing, 1962), with Perls making a response that is not relevant to Gloria's comments. The effect of Perls's disconfirmatory responses was to discourage further exploration and clarification. These three responses may well have tied in to Gloria's fear that she seemed "dumb and stupid." In all the incidents (with the possible exception of the fifth), I agree with Gloria's viewpoint and think that Perls's recognition and support of her viewpoint seem limited or marginal. It is clear that Perls provided Gloria with the stimula-

tion for the six incidents that occurred. It is also clear that he did not provide the needed support and assistance to help Gloria evaluate these incidents and make discoveries about herself. (Given Perls's negative attitude toward support and approval, it was a foregone conclusion that he would not provide those to Gloria.)

EMERGING GESTALT

The concept of emerging Gestalt in my mind is connected to the Gestalt therapy view that Gestaltists make no attempt to change people, but only endeavor to make people more like themselves. Roth (1973) discussed this and other confusing aspects of Gestalt therapy. Thus it is (in my mind) that Perls could criticize Gloria so freely: not because he did not like who she was, but because he did not like how she blocked her own full awareness and free expression of that awareness. In his introduction to the film, Perls said: "My aim is this—the patient should recover his lost potential." My difficulty with that approach is that *it makes all the difference in the world who defines what that "lost potential" is and who defines what the authentic person is like.* In the film introduction, Perls indicated that the authentic person would be confident, which suggests that a person lacking confidence is being inauthentic. *It also makes all the difference in the world who defines what the emergent Gestalt in the interview is, and whether the client has the recognized capacity to question the definition set forth by the therapist.* Gloria struggled but essentially was not acknowledged or supported in her attempts either to define herself or to define the emergent situation between herself and Perls.

Perls commented in the introduction to the film: "in the safe emergency of the therapeutic situation, the patient begins to take risks and to transform his energies from manipulating the environment for support into developing greater and greater self support, that is reliance on his own resources." (Perls repeated and said that he was repeating, thus emphasizing, the phrase *in the safe emergency of the therapeutic situation.*) This is another of those absolutely incredible ideas set forth by Perls that are extremely difficult to relate to observations of his filmed interview. *Emergency* seems like a play on the words *emergence of the Gestalt.* The especially puzzling part, of course, revolves around the word *safe;* by no stretch of the imagination did the interview seem safe for Gloria. The statement also contains a paradox, in that it seems to me that Perls goaded, directed, and shamed Gloria into relying less on him; there is no hint in Perls's statement that such heavy-handed interventions would be required to bring about this "natural" shift from reliance on others to reliance on self.

Perls's concept of the emerging Gestalt seems to carry along with it some apparently related conceptions or attitudes that merit close scrutiny. Somehow, in Perls's hands, emerging Gestalt gives the sense of a natural occurrence that takes place virtually unaided and places beyond question that what Perls thought happened did in fact occur. Dolliver (1981) noted "there was a tendency for Perls to regard his Gestalt therapy 'discoveries' as Truth, not needing confirmation" (p. 42). This is a *very* troubling perspective on the Gestalt therapy demonstration by Perls with Gloria.

DRIVING THE OTHER CRAZY

Searles (cited in Laing, 1962) described six techniques of driving a person crazy: "each of these techniques tends to undermine the other person's confidence in his own emotional reactions and his perception of reality" (p. 131). Three of those techniques seem especially relevant to Perls's interaction with Gloria. In the first, "*p* [the person] repeatedly calls attention to areas of the personality of which *o* [the other person] is dimly aware, areas quite at variance with the kind of person *o* considers himself or herself to be" (p. 131). Perls's accusations that Gloria was being phony and that she was playing dumb and stupid fit this category. In the second, "*p* simultaneously exposes *o* to stimulation and frustration or to rapidly alternating stimulation and frustration" (p. 131). To me, Perls's rapid opening and closing of topics fits this category. In the third, "*p* switches from one emotional wave length to another while on the same topic (being 'serious' and then being 'funny' about the same thing)" (p. 132). I find Perls's apparently serious invitations to attack him while communicating that he was mocking her ability to do so fits the last category. Obviously, the frequency and degree of such switching of emotional wave lengths would determine how seriously disorienting such techniques are. Perls would probably categorize the three aspects of his interview (which were noted earlier in this paragraph) as part of his effort to "manipulate and frustrate" Gloria into a more authentic way of being. Unfortunately, as I see it, in so doing, he undermined Gloria's "confidence in her own emotional reactions and her perception of reality."

GLORIA'S REACTIONS TO PERLS

After the three filmed interviews (the others were with Ellis and Rogers), Gloria commented, "Where I am right now, Dr. Perls could be the most valuable to me. So he isn't quite as coddling, but I think I could really get a lot from him although I'd want to battle with him too. . . ." Some 13 years later, Gloria (1980) had changed her mind:

> During the Perls portion of the film I was aware of being my most defensive self, full of distrust, confusion, and suspicion of the therapist's approach and reaction (or more appropriately—nonreaction) to me. I was afraid of being attacked and resented the position I allowed myself to be in.
>
> What I needed most at that point in my life was permission to be me. Instead I found myself with Perls in a vicious circle of game playing, of having to respond on demand in a specific manner, of being trapped into gaining approval by first knowing and then giving an expected reply.
>
> Although at the time I had no understanding of the *why*, I was surely aware of the *what* I was feeling: small, belittled, unimportant, confused—lacking wholeness. In a sense then, I felt a bit of myself destroyed at the end of that short session. . . . How shattered my whole being felt after that session. . . . (p.141)

Gloria (1980) indicated that Rogers would be her later choice of therapist, saying: "I felt whole, intact, in other words, a person with Rogers. . . . He simply helped me to recognize my own potential—my value as a human being" (p. 141). As background to her earlier choice of Perls, Gloria explained that she was (at the time of the filming) a therapy "graduate," who "felt most pleased with myself when I was able to respond openly and honestly to a situation" (pp. 140-141). "I saw the [filming] situation as a sort of secret test of myself" (p. 141). By implication, Gloria had responded at the time to the stimulation of working with Perls, was unsatisfied with her ability to interact openly and honestly with him, felt as though she needed to learn to fight, and wanted the chance to battle with him successfully. In the intervening

years, Gloria may have realized that she would never be able to successfully battle Perls, nor was there any point in trying to do so.

CONCLUSIONS

I have learned and relearned a number of attitudes about working with clients through my reaction to the Perls interview. Foremost, I have come to reassert my belief that the client is endeavoring through counseling to test his or her perceptions of the world and build a reliable framework of understanding. The major aspect of the film that troubles me is that *Perls was an unreliable guide to Gloria about her perceptions of the world*. Many times I agreed with Gloria's perceptions that Perls frequently ignored her views and rarely treated them as worthy of his support. Gloria revealed during the interview that she was sensitive about feeling dumb and stupid; Perls responded with his view that this was an interpersonal ploy that Gloria would like to use against him. Perls was distant with Gloria while accusing her of being distant with him. Perls claimed to have no preconceived ideas about Gloria, though he repeatedly invited her to explore her transference toward him. Perls claimed that he only wanted Gloria to define herself and then criticized some of the ways that she did define herself, for example, feeling that she needed to be dependent at times. Gloria felt the need to protect herself by psychologically withdrawing to her corner; Perls denied there was any need to be protected from him, and criticized her desire to protect herself. Perls promoted some value positions that he would not acknowledge, for example, that he valued confident, independent behavior. Gloria saw and stated a number of the above contradictions, but rarely received Perls's agreement with her perceptions.

Re-reviewing the Perls portion of *Three Approaches to Psychotherapy* has led me to a new understanding of (a) Perls's use of standard Gestalt techniques with Gloria (e.g., directed awareness); (b) the intentional ways that Perls tried to "manipulate and frustrate" Gloria (e.g., in challenging her views); (c) the indirect ways in which Perls communicated to Gloria about his values biases (e.g., self-support); (d) the ways in which Perls's personal style (e.g., domination) set the tone for this interview; and (e) the ways in which Gloria worked so well to identify her interview experience and to speak of her awareness to Perls of her internal reality. The film contains a wealth of possibilities for observing and conceptualizing an interaction between a client and a therapist.

REFERENCES

Dolliver, R. H. (1981). Some limitations in Perls' gestalt therapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 18*, 38–45.

Dolliver, R. H., Williams, E. L., & Gold, D. C. (1980). The art of gestalt therapy or "What are you doing with your feet now?" *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 17*, 136–140; 142.

Gelso, C. J., & Carter, J. (1985). The relationship in counseling and psychotherapy. *The Counseling Psychologist, 13*, 155–243.

Gloria. (1980). Comments on the interview with Perls. *Psychotherapy: Therapy, Research and Practice, 17*, 140–141.

Haley, J. (1959). Control in psychoanalytic psychotherapy. In J. H. Masserman (Ed.), *Progress in psychotherapy* (Vol. 4, pp. 48–65). New York: Grune and Stratton.

Laing, R. D. (1962). *The self and others*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Passons, W. R. (1975). *Gestalt approaches in counseling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Roth, M. C. (1973). Why I like Gestalt therapy, as a hole. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51*, 336–339.

Shostrom, E. L. (Producer). (1965). *Three approaches to psychotherapy: Part 2. Frederick Perls* [Film]. Orange, CA: Psychological Films.

***Robert H. Dolliver** is a professor in the Psychology Department and a counseling psychologist in the University Counseling Center at the University of Missouri–Columbia. A small portion of this material was presented earlier at the 1990 AACD Convention in Cincinnati in a session on the* Three Approaches to Psychotherapy *films, chaired by Stephen G. Weinrach. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Robert H. Dolliver, 306 Parker Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.*