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INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this report is to demonstrate a systematic approach to modifying the traditional psychiatric "case history" for use in family diagnosis, treatment, and research. Although there are still unsolved problems of data recording, assembly, and analysis in clinical work with individuals, these are enormously magnified in therapy and research with families. At the same time, there is a rapidly accelerating growth of interest in the family as the unit for psychiatric study. Behavioral scientists continue to focus upon the reciprocal relationship between the individual and his family as a natural field situation. There is, simultaneously, a shift in emphasis from viewing the psychiatric patient as the unit for diagnosis and treatment to regarding him as the "symptom" of a variably pathological family system. Increasing numbers of clinicians and their research colleagues report active therapeutic intervention with the conjoint family unit as essential for achieving sustained functional improvement in the labeled patient, particularly one with a borderline or overtly psychotic disorder. These new orientations on the role of the patient dictate the need for techniques of data collection that will focus on the patient, his family, and his environmental milieu. The family case history method put forward in this report is offered as a way of meeting this need.

A corollary aim of this report is to demonstrate the use of a sociological approach to the analysis of a family case history as a diagnostic tool. Although this case history method needs not be limited to such an approach, there is a growing conviction that no family study is complete without some reference to the
wider cultural field in which the family moves. Even though the traditional emphasis of psychiatric work has been expanded to include awareness of the interplay of forces within the patient's family, there has been little work published that links pathology with stresses and strains arising from incompatible cultural norms that a given family structure may be called upon to cope with or to reconcile. It may be that the difference between families wrenched by conflict and those that have a fairly smooth, vigorous life is significantly linked to the degree of conflict in cultural value orientations. In that case, pathological process in the family—or healthy functioning—can be effectively described by a specification of role conflict and role complementarity in the family as these in turn are governed by the fit or clash of cultural values. This idea underlies the approach to family pathology used in the analysis of a Puerto Rican family here chosen to illustrate the case history method. It is felt, however, that the case history method is sufficiently flexible to be a useful tool for family therapists and investigators proceeding along other lines.

Chapter 1 discusses the usefulness of family case histories and some of the difficulties of collecting and organizing them. Chapter 2 discusses a workable schedule for reconstructing a family case history. In Chapter 3, the history of the Mario C. family is summarized under the major headings of such a schedule. (The complete schedule is presented as Appendix A and the essentially complete family history as Appendix B.) Chapter 4 considers the cultural contrasts between Puerto Rican working-class values and American middle-class values. The Mario C. family is then reconsidered in the light of these contrasts. Chapter 5 looks at the nuclear family of Mario and Rosa C., and Chapter 6 at their extended families. This final chapter with its attention to the wide family network points up the value of the collected data. The more data gathered on the greater proportion of extended family members, the more complete the family case history. And, the more complete the history, the greater its usefulness in the diagnosis of a disturbed family member.

The case history method is probably as old as medicine itself. It has always been deemed necessary to arrange the data of illness in chronological sequence so that recurrent patterns characteristic of a specific disease in many individuals could be compared. From these data there has emerged the "typical picture" of a disease—a pattern against which the history of illness in any individual can be viewed for purposes of diagnosis and prognosis. In taking a history from a sick person, a physician is trained to look for the onset and course of a given complaint or of a group of signs and symptoms that are thought to refer to the process of an underlying disease. Although such history-taking directs attention primarily to the patient's present and recent past, one usual line of inquiry concerns his family history. This search for relevant information within the patient's family, either in the recent or remote past, aims toward establishing a diagnosis and considers any of the hereditary and congenital elements that may come to light.

In general medicine, the history that is taken is of short range. Except in cases of chronic disease where the illness itself is long, the time covered by the history is brief and of the recent past, since its use is to throw light only on the particular, present illness. The past and present are viewed as sharply in contrast—the past, a disease-free time of health and normal development without details that would illuminate the illness under treatment. The case history, then, consists only of the recent past history,
plus data from the physical examination and laboratory findings, and those details of family history directly relevant to the illness. Within the case history, these data are related to each other in an orderly and meaningful way.

Psychiatric case histories for use in the treatment of individual mentally ill patients differ from other medical case histories in especially recognizing the relevance of family data. Regardless of the particular theory of psychodynamics underlying the clinician's thinking, the family has always been thought to play a major role in the formation and maintenance of the patient's illness. Whether conceived in terms of Meyerian “life-curve,” Adlerian “life style,” or Freudian “genetics,” contemporary dynamic psychiatry regards the modes of adaptation, as well as those settings in which patterns of adaptation are established from the earliest infancy to the present, as inseparable from the pathology of illness.

Social work, since its inception, has stressed the need for helping people through helping all members of the family. The child-guidance movement has, for 30 years or more, emphasized the importance of working with parents as well as with the disturbed child. Aside from these specifically psychiatric interests in the family, sociologists and anthropologists have long focused on the relation of the family both to social organization and to the character of individuals. During the past 15 years, these kinds of investigators have been joined by those interested in group dynamics and group therapy, for whom the family is one example of “small-group behavior.”

Now there is the need for consolidating all these points of view and for using family data in practice. In the past, dealing with the family was often honored more as an ideal possibility than as an actual procedure. Today, persistent attempts are being made to carry out the procedure in a variety of contexts. There is a widely felt need to formulate a psychodynamics of family life and to establish, through research and empirical practice, the principles of family therapy. Both in the clinic and the hospital, the family unit is increasingly sought out for treatment. Family welfare agencies and children's bureaus in communities throughout the country are attempting to classify the families they deal with and to discover more appropriate methods for helping them solve their problems. Medical schools are establishing family-care programs in which the medical student is given responsibility for the emotional as well as the physical health and illness of all members of a family. Besides such clinical efforts, basic research into the etiology of mental illness, particularly of schizophrenia, has focused sharply upon the family as the primary vector of psychopathology.

The need for family studies is, then, acutely recognized, but efforts to organize such studies encounter numerous obstacles. The family is not an easy entity to deal with. Technical difficulties emerge—for example, what to do about the “resistant” family member who refuses all therapeutic contacts. Other obstacles are primarily conceptual and theoretical. It is not easy to define “the family”; where are its boundaries in time and space? are in-laws and grandparents to be considered part of the family? There is no problem in determining whether an individual patient has kept an appointment or not, but what of the family of four members of whom two appear for a conjoint family therapeutic session; has the family kept its appointment? Does the family have a particular problem if two members affirm and two others deny the problem's existence? Can a family be said to have benefited from treatment if two members show improvement while a third becomes worse? How can change be assessed at all when so many different persons are involved in the change?

Such questions are provocative and challenging. Unfortunately, each group working with families is likely to answer them in terms of its own research and therapeutic needs, so that few of the data gathered in research and empirical work are cumulative. Methods and findings from one group of investigators cannot be translated into the plans and procedures of another. Such confusion points to the need for a uniform instrument, analogous to the case history method in medicine and
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psychiatry, for gathering and recording the data of family behavior. If there could be consensus about what data should be collected and uniformity in the method of collection and the format for recording, there would emerge, for the first time, a means for comparing the findings of one group with those of another. Then the family, like the patient, would begin to emerge as an entity, undergoing characteristic patterns of change, stress, and suffering that could be understood just as a case of physical illness is understood. Once a “typical picture” of a family pathology were available, comparable to the “typical picture” we have for a disease, categories of diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment could be established. But it is premature to search for such categories until many family case histories, collected in a uniform manner, become available for systematic comparison and analysis.

Agreement on the need for accumulating such case histories is merely a starting point. Once this goal is established, how can it be attained? The format for taking medical and psychiatric case histories will have only limited application to family case histories. The family history of a patient is not analogous to the history of a family. We still need to learn how to conceive of the family as an entity that persists and yet changes through time, that undergoes stages comparable to birth, development, reproduction, and dissolution over a time span that exceeds the life span of any individual. One is reminded of those family sagas set down by novelists that carry a history through several generations. The novelist, though, is guided by an artistic design and can invent, select, change, rearrange his material to fit that design. Those who study real families have no such freedom, but must find ways to record and analyze the less tidy data of the real world.

One aspect of the difficulty is the number of people involved in a family history, generations in the direct line of descent as well as those descending along parallel branches of extended families. Most investigators currently working in therapy or research confine their observations to a nuclear family—husband, wife, and their children. But, just as his relationships with his nuclear family have relevance for the individual’s personality problems, so it seems reasonable to assume that the nuclear family’s relationships with other nuclear families within its extended family have relevance for its problems. This means that taking a family case history requires the recording and keeping track of many individuals related to each other in a variety of ways. Aside from the difficulty of sheer numbers, there are problems stemming from limitations in vocabulary; for some of these relationships, the language provides no good names.

It seems essential, furthermore, that any consideration of the family as an entity take into account the cultural orientation of the family and of the environment with which it is surrounded. The specific structure of a family is always related to the dominant value orientations of a culture. In the United States, the dominant, middle-class orientations are toward the small, nuclear family living in isolation from the extended family network. Working-class families, particularly those who may have recently arrived from Southern Europe, usually retain for some time orientations typical of the cultures left behind, and their values emphasize the intactness of the laterally or vertically extended family—several related nuclear families living in close proximity. For this reason, the composition of the household is as important as the composition of the nuclear family in any family case history.

Cultural variation is not confined to family structure; it also patterns the family members’ behavior toward each other and to the world outside. When a family history is taken, the family should be “placed” in the cultural matrix that formed it, and the effect of alternative cultural systems upon the lives of its members should be considered. It is obvious that the investigator must keep his own cultural bias in mind so that he is alert to its influence in his definitions of pathological or normal behavior. If those studying family histories are to take into account possible distortions arising from such bias, the cultural backgrounds of investigators must form part of the data.
A final and perhaps the most vexatious problem inherent in any plan for obtaining a family case history is that of maintaining a balance between the family as an entity and its individual members. Clearly, data must be organized in terms of the family as a whole if the aim is to construct a family case history. If, however, the data are arranged only within the institutional and organizational continuities of the family over time to the neglect of forces within the personalities of individual members, then the reason for the therapeutic or investigative project may be forgotten altogether. At the present time, the chief motive behind all such efforts to study families is to help a disturbed member. This focus upon the individual may be a product of our cultural bias, but, for good or ill, it seems dominant in most current investigations.*

The need for family data in forms accessible to comparative study is apparent. Though many difficulties in meeting this need are equally apparent, these can be overcome through patient and systematic approaches toward the collection, arrangement, and recording of family histories. The chapters that follow propose a method of approach and carry the plan through for one family. They do not constitute a monograph on family therapy. The data they include, organize, and interpret could prove useful in a variety of contexts, including family therapy, where such data could form a vital addition to other biological and psychological data.

* This statement is not to be construed as a slighting of other motives. An increasing number of investigators and therapists are coming to regard the family as the primary object both of research and treatment. This is particularly evident in the treatment of so-called "hard core" or "multiproblem" families. In such families, almost all the members are adversely affected in one way or another by the pathological process in the family and no one person can be singled out as "the patient." An extensive review of the principles involved in total family therapy is provided in I. Boszormenyi-Nagy and J. L. Frum, eds., INTENSIVE FAMILY THERAPY: THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL ASPECTS, Harper & Row, New York, 1965.

The basic plan of solution here proposed to the problem of maintaining a balance within a family history between the family as a whole and its individual members is to designate categories of data to be gathered and reassembled in a prescribed sequence for individual family members. The sequence jumps from the situation in which study of the family is initiated back to the earliest point in time for which data are available, then moves forward to the present time. This is not an unusual pattern, but is typical of most histories of individuals, groups, or institutions. Its advantage for a family history lies in showing how specific events within the family affect the dynamics of family process.

The investigator must, in order to carry out this procedure, have a clear picture in mind of the relation of nuclear families within the extended family network. Some graphic representation of a typical network is required. The traditional representation, the "family tree," does not really serve our purpose because it is not designed to represent families at all. A family tree shows individuals forming marriages in the male line of descent. Since its original usefulness had to do with keeping track of inheritance of title and property in a patrilineal society, only selected offspring are entered in the representation. A study focused on the history of the family rather than its property clearly needs a better instrument.
The scheme of representation shown in Figure 1 has been developed to meet this need.* The design is not meant to encompass all possible interrelations of nuclear families in societies throughout the world, but only the typical arrangements in monogamous family systems characteristic of most western societies. Each nuclear family is represented in the diagram by a schematic box of four cells. The upper cells represent the parents; the lower cells, the children. The upper left-hand cell stands for the husband; the right-hand cell, for his wife. For the sake of this generalized design only, the lower left-hand cell represents a son; the lower right-hand cell, a daughter. In any representation of an actual family system, of course, there would be as many lower cells as there are children, each labeled for sex and numbered for ordinal position.

A unique feature of this design is its “double-entry” system for each individual. Any family member who has married appears twice in the diagram—once as a child (lower cell) in his family of orientation, again as a spouse (upper cell) in his family of procreation. This double-entry system formalizes W. Lloyd Warner’s distinction between these two kinds of family membership and treats his terminology as a fact that can be graphically represented. The arrangement enables us to keep track of both married and unmarried family members. Furthermore, each person appears properly related to his own generation, since all members of a generation are represented between the same pair of horizontal lines.

The design in Figure 1 has been made symmetrical and very general for the sake of developing a method of notation for the various nuclear families in the network. Our usual kinship terms, e.g., cousin, aunt, etc., are not really precise descriptions

---

* The concept of “family fields” and their graphic representational design were originally devised by the research group co-directed by John P. Spiegel and Florence R. Kluckhohn working on the NIMH-supported project entitled “Family Transactions in Mental Health and Illness” in the Department of Social Relations, Harvard University. The manner of labeling the cells in the family fields was devised by Norman W. Bell, Professor of Sociology, University of Toronto, who was then a member of the Harvard family project.
of relationships. In order to ascertain how an aunt comes to be related to an individual, more language beyond the word “aunt” is needed: Is she the mother's or father's sister or half-sister; or is she the first, second, or third wife of a mother's brother or a father's brother? Even if we had terms to carry this burden of information, they would not be suitable, since they merely refer to relationships between individuals; the same person who is an aunt in one relationship is a wife, mother, niece, daughter, or cousin in others. We need a way of referring to relationships between nuclear families.

For this, we have worked out a set of symbols that function as locators, establishing the position of any nuclear family in relation to the family under observation. The nuclear family that is in treatment or is being studied for some clinical or research purpose is the point of reference for all other nuclear families in the network and is called “the focal family.” The centering of all other families in the network around the focal family creates three main divisions or sectors, which we call “family fields.” Of these three fields, the first two are ascending, one on the husband's side, one on the wife's. These two fields contain the families in the direct line of ascent, marked by heavy lines, and the families in the indirect line of descent, shown by lighter lines. The third field contains descendants of the focal family. (This field is not developed in Figure 1, which describes a focal family with unmarried children.)

The relationships marked by heavier lines, that is, the direct lines of ascent, constitute a series of reference points within a field. By means of these points, we can locate any collateral family in the indirect line of descent through the following system of notation. The first term of any particular identification indicates whether the biological relationship of ascent is traced through the husband (H) or the wife (W). The second term is a Roman numeral (which may be followed by a letter) that designates the family unit in the directly ascending series to which reference must be made in order to find a common ancestor.

By convention, the focal family (FF) is designated by Roman numeral I, the first or present generation. The wife's family of orientation, the second generation of ascent, is W II. The wife's father's family of orientation is designated W III A; her mother's family of orientation, W III B. In the fourth generation of ascent, the wife's father's father's family of orientation is designated W IV A; the wife's father's mother's family of orientation, W IV B; the wife's mother's father's family of orientation, W IV C; and the wife's mother's mother's family of orientation, W IV D. A comparable set of designations can be used to describe the husband's family field.

The first term of a designation (H or W), then, refers to the husband’s or wife’s field; and the second (a Roman numeral sometimes followed by a letter), to that family in the direct line of ascent to which reference is made. The third term indicates a lateral step in the sibling group of this family. This lateral step will be either to a brother (Δ) or to a sister (>). Sibling order may be designated by an Arabic numeral inside the symbol. Once the sibling from whom descent is to be traced has been indicated, the next, or fourth, term will indicate the steps of descent necessary to reach a specific unit. These steps are indicated by a series of male (Δ) and female (>) symbols, each one representing a step of one generation. Sibling order of the individuals at each generational step is indicated by an enclosed Arabic numeral.

For families in the direct line of descent from the focal family, the symbols required are much simpler. The first term, FF (focal family), denotes the field; the second term indicates the child from whom descent is traced plus the number of steps of descent required.

This generalized graphic and notational scheme makes the typical relationships in the family fields quite clear, but it neglects some empirical facts that may be important in an actual family system. It provides, for example, no way of indicating such events as remarriage following the death or divorce of a spouse, or the adoption of a child. Some of these events can
be indicated by special signs and symbols. As experience with the scheme accumulates, we will acquire some sense of how practical it would be to represent all empirical events that affect the structural interrelations of nuclear families. For the moment, we have, at least, a systematic way of referring to most of the relationships within the extended family.

It is obvious that an increase in knowledge about the characteristics of families depends on an accumulation of comparable family case histories. Only when a number of such histories becomes available will it be possible to group families in various ways and to determine what identities families can possess. Typologies of family systems already exist in other disciplines; in anthropology, for example, there are classifications like “patrilineal” and “patrilocal,” “matrilineal” and “matrilocal,” among others. Such classifications, though, are based on specific structural and relationship characteristics of families. It is unquestionably helpful for us to be aware of the various structural patterns that give stable form to the family in various cultures, but, as psychiatrists, we are primarily interested in the process within the family as it affects the adaptive capacities of individual members. Our concern is with the dynamic properties of family systems, the adequacy of their functioning, and the pathogenic and pathologic properties that may be discovered within them. We are obliged, therefore, to search for a typology that has diagnostic significance, one that can help us determine and predict which type of family functioning can be expected to have an adverse effect, leading to maladaptation and mental illness, in one or more family members, and which type a beneficial effect associated with mental health.

To arrive at this classification, we need not only a large number of families to compare with each other, but a sample that contains a range of functional processes studied in a variety of ways. It is necessary that the sample include “successful” families in which all members are making good adjustments, highly problematic families where some members show severe psychopathology, and all gradations between these extremes.

The family history contained in this report is merely one in a continuum that eventually should cover this wide range.

Just as various degrees of family success and difficulty should be represented in the body of histories, so should there be a range of investigative procedures in the accumulation of these histories. If we are to include so-called “normal” families in the sample, it is clear that we cannot confine ourselves to psychotherapeutic investigations in the collection of histories, nor to any methods based on efforts to intervene or produce changes in behavior. “Normal” families will present no clinical needs; attempts to tamper with their behavior might be scientifically inadvisable and ethically questionable. In such families, the function of the investigator would be to observe, to inquire, to conduct interviews, and to maintain contacts with various family members. Such a procedure would need to be carried on long enough for the investigator to assemble a clear picture of the current structure and functioning of the family and to piece together its past history. The result would be a naturalistic account, over the generations, of similarities and differences in the interpersonal relations of members of various nuclear families within the extended family and of the levels of individual physical and mental adaptation to those relations. Several such accounts could provide us with something we now lack: a reliable picture of family “health” or “normality.”

We also need naturalistic accounts of states of pathology within families, accounts gathered by investigators who do not intervene or attempt to produce changes of behavior. It may be more difficult for psychiatrists to accept this position, dedicated as they are to improving or correcting maladaptive interpersonal relations. The Mario C. case included in this report is an example of this procedure. Insofar as possible, the two observers attempted not to intervene, but merely to watch and record the unfolding and resolution of the husband’s psychosis as it was related to the process of the family. Mario was in treatment during various periods in the history taking, but other persons treated his episodes of illness.
One must allow for the fact, though, that, even where non-intervention is rigidly attempted, the behavior of observers will influence family members to an unknown degree. Indeed, inactivity may quite correctly be viewed as one form of intervention. In the Mario C. case, one observer, Dr. Z., was viewed to some extent as a sympathetic ally by the husband and as a threat by the wife, despite his best efforts to remain neutral. Furthermore, an observer's neutrality, his refusal to take sides in family disputes, to make decisions, to give advice, may be perceived as a set of implicit instructions that family members act in a more individualistic fashion, that is, take responsibility for their own decisions and welfare. So pervasive is the influence of value orientations in human affairs that even non-action is almost certain to be given a value interpretation. It is part of the observer's job to assess, insofar as possible, how his role, whether interventive or noninterventive, is being perceived by family members in the light of their value orientations.

The collection of a body of family case histories, then, should be undertaken with full awareness of two intersecting parameters. One parameter describes a range of investigative activity that extends from intensive therapeutic intervention to inflexible nonintervention, including various degrees inside these limits. The other describes the range of families to be studied from most disturbed to least disturbed. The pursuance of such a plan can result in an array of family case histories on which a realistic assessment of family process can be based. Such a sample would serve as a needed corrective to the highly skewed, extremely fragmentary case histories (e.g. of "schizophrenic families") now accumulating in the literature.

Our method of assembling a family case history takes into account four groups of determinants of family functioning: cultural, interpersonal, psychological, and biological. The cultural area includes the profile of value orientations associated with the cultural affiliation of the family and the belief systems that pattern all role activities, including domestic roles, as well as the structure of the nuclear and extended family. The interpersonal area is composed of overt, day-to-day interactions between family members in maintenance of their role relations—their communications, alliances, and coalitions; expressions of feeling; ways of reaching decisions; methods of child rearing and control; handling of illness, finances, education, religion, recreation, and losses through death or separation. The intrapsychic processes of individual members, including their unconscious cognitions, emotions, defenses, and object relations, comprise the psychological area. The biological area embraces the physical constitution of family members, including their age and sex, the state of their physical health, and the patterning of biological functions in nutrition, sleep, excretion, and motility.

The cultural determinants are represented first in the case history by an identification of the family's social background, its racial, ethnic, and national origins, its regional (urban, rural, northern, southern, etc.) affiliations, its religion, and its position in the socioeconomic class system. It is regrettable that, in current practice, some of these variables are not even mentioned in case histories, let alone described. A fully diagnostic approach would include not only these cultural determinants of family behavior, but also the situation of the nuclear family within the extended family. The problem within the nuclear family achieves its form and definition only in the context of the extended family. This principle holds even where family units in the vertically or laterally extended field are not physically present. The family field manifests psychological properties that persist over time, shaping the course of events long after death or the departure of its component elements.

There is one further point to be kept in mind with reference to a fully diagnostic approach. In traditional medicine, diagnostic systems are always hierarchically arranged from the broader and general to the narrower and more specific. Broad classifications, such as diseases of the circulatory system or the nervous system, are cross-referenced with other broad classifications such as infectious or neoplastic processes. By continuous
cross-referencing and the specification of subclasses or combinations, the diagnostic procedure arrives at a particular pathological process—for example, a neoplastic process in the brain characterized by a specific location and by a specific type of proliferating neural cell. On heuristic grounds, one could safely expect that such a hierarchical model would apply to any system of family diagnosis. The goal, then, is to find the appropriately broad, general classes of phenomena for cross-referencing and recombining in the program so that classifications can be set up.

It seems reasonable to assume that, for family process, whether pathological or healthy, the broad classes that will prove significant for cross-referencing will include the cultural determinants and the nature of the extended family field, as well as the interpersonal, psychological, and biological data of individual members. This assumption is largely untested and unrefined and must remain so pending the accumulation of a large number of family case histories. When such a collection becomes available, it will be possible to determine how useful the traditional medical model is and what the most valid broad classes for cross-referencing are. Only through the study of a body of case histories can we arrive at ways for identifying those categories with the greatest predictive value. One purpose of the Mario C. family case history is to make a preliminary demonstration of the usefulness of cultural determinants and the nature of the extended family field, together with other determinants, for the description of processes in that family.

For this study, the categories relevant to the construction of a family case history were gathered according to a predetermined outline, reproduced as Appendix A. The data gathered have been reduced somewhat for presentation in Appendix B, but such reduction, the elimination of repetitions and the characteristic wordiness of some family members, has been undertaken carefully to avoid distortions of substance.

The controlling outline for gathering and recording data is, indeed, long and detailed and, some might say, unreasonably complete. The burdens on investigators and their investments of time in collecting the data may seem excessive. The argument in favor of completeness is that one cannot know in advance which details will prove theoretically or practically relevant. The goal of complete data organized in a systematic fashion is, therefore, important. The categories of data are analytically conceived so that, if the information they yield proves not to be useful at one point in time, it may later be useful, either to the original investigator or to someone else engaged in a comparative study.

The Family Case History Outline presented as Appendix A has emerged from the assessment of alternate modes of organizing family history data. It has proved to be satisfactory for a series of family histories prepared and reviewed by the members of the Committee on the Family and their consultants. It is presented both to facilitate reading of the case history in Appendix B and as a model for other family histories. Individual investigators working in various settings could, of course, make special additions and elaborations in accordance with their own interests. The explanatory statements provide the rationale for the material asked for and present detailed instructions about the exact content of any section. In gathering data, we have found it useful to use such symbols as $H = \text{husband}$, $W = \text{wife}$, $M = \text{mother}$, etc. Thus $HFB = \text{husband's father's brother}$ provides a more specific identification than "uncle."
SUMMARIZED CASE HISTORY
OF THE MARIO C. FAMILY

I. Description of Presenting Family Problems and Focus of Initial Contact

Data on the Mario C. family were collected during an intensive study from March 1962 to November 1963, followed by occasional contacts up until February 1965. Besides the nuclear family, various relatives were seen both in New York and in Puerto Rico.

The two interviewers tried to conduct a naturalistic observation of the family and did not undertake family therapy or individual psychotherapy with any family member. They were conducting research in order to document the family case history outline in preparation by the GAP Committee on the Family. The husband, who had periodic psychotic episodes, was treated under other auspices both before and during the period of investigation. Contact was first established just prior to his discharge from the hospital where he had been admitted with psychotic symptoms. The couple were told that the investigation was aimed toward gathering information about patterns of family life among Puerto Ricans, and they agreed to cooperate. It was apparent, however, that they viewed the interviews primarily as treatment for Mario's illness.

Mario had been brought to the hospital by his wife in January 1962 in an acutely anxious state, shouting, "I'm going to die, she is going to kill me." His wife indicated that he was typically prone to outbursts of verbal and physical violence; this time, however, he had been incoherent and out of control for six days, since hearing of his mother's unexpected death in Puerto Rico. He had gone to the funeral where he behaved wildly, trying to throw himself on his mother's grave, saying that he was with his mother, that she was "on top of him." He remained incoherent and excited after his return to New York, talked of dying, and began to confuse his wife with his mother. He had hallucinations that his mother was with him. After various evidences of bizarre behavior, he was admitted to the hospital.

To define the "presenting problem," the investigators consulted hospital admission notes about Mario. On admission, he had been restless and distracted and was apparently hallucinating. The admission diagnosis was "acute schizophrenic reaction." When he was discharged in March 1962, the gross psychotic symptoms had disappeared and he was coherent. The interviewers first met Mario and Rosa C. in the hospital office and began their investigation.

II. Composition and Characteristics of Focal Family (March 1962)

The Mario C. household consisted of the four members of the nuclear family: Mario, the husband; his wife, Rosa; a son, Mario Jr., born September 24, 1949; a daughter, Cara, born August 17, 1951. All four were born in Puerto Rico. The parents were married in March 1949, and the family moved to New York City in 1952 when Cara was nine months old. Mario was Protestant; Rosa and the children were practicing Catholics.

At the time the investigation began, Mario, who had eight grades of schooling, was the owner and operator of a neighborhood grocery store, purchased from his wife's brother-in-law two years previously. He had worked earlier for about seven years as a TV repairman. He kept his store open seven days a week, until 10 p.m. on all days but Sunday. The net income of the store was estimated by investigators to be between $5000 and $7500 a year. Rosa, who had ten grades of schooling, helped in the
store on weekdays from about noon till late afternoon, when she
returned home to prepare dinner for the children and spend the
evening with them. Before Mario purchased the store, she had
been a sewing-machine operator and had suffered severe arthri-
tis attacks that she attributed to her working conditions. The
family were bitter about having been denied compensation for
this condition.

The family lived in a seven-room apartment on the second
floor of a two-family house, their sixth residence since coming
to New York. Each change of address had represented some
move upward, although all their apartments had been in pre-
dominantly Puerto Rican neighborhoods. Their apartment was
neat, moderately clean, somewhat run-down, in a section of the
Bronx that had declined from its previous standards.

Mario C. was good-looking, rather more youthful in appear-
ance than his 35 years. Even when most relaxed, he appeared
tense and restless; he was a chain-smoker and a voluble talker.
He was quite articulate and obviously of at least normal intelli-
gence. Rosa was short and mildly obese, with a pretty face and
sweet smile. Although she dressed without regard to style, she
was very neat. She appeared placid and slow-moving, seem-
ingly agreeable and dependent. She spoke fluent English and
was very alert, more energetic than her first impression sug-
gested.

Mario Jr., 12, was small for his age, handsome, fidgety, and
thought by the family to be “nervous like the father.” He per-
formed well in school. He was brooding, touchy, and had trouble
controlling his anger. He had nightmares and was preoccupied
with fears about injury to his body. After some initial shyness,
he became friendly and verbal with the investigators. Cara, 10,
was plump and pretty and handled herself with poise. She had
been kept back a year at school and was in the fourth grade.
She appeared quite bright, and was open, friendly, and talkative
with the investigators.

Mario Sr. appeared to be the isolate in the family group. He
was rarely with his children except for Sunday evenings. His
contacts with his wife were limited to those times when they
were together in the store, the late evenings of weekdays, and
Sunday evenings when the whole family was together. He
made it clear that he was master of his household, but it seemed
that Rosa actually made most major decisions and regulated
the family’s life. Mario appeared to resent the fact that his chil-
dren, especially his son, had to work less hard than he did as a
boy. Rosa seemed to be allied with the children and more lenient
with them. The interviewers sensed that Mario would check with
his wife before making pronouncements about family matters;
once he had spoken, though, the others gave the appearance of
obeying. The children seemed to be close to each other. Their
father was frequently harsh with them, especially with Mario Jr.,
and father and son exhibited more strain between them than
did any other pair in the family.

The wife and children were markedly relaxed in referring to
the period when Mario Sr. was “crazy.” At the time of his father’s
hospitalization, Mario Jr. had been the most frightened of the
three, thinking his father was being taken away to be shot.

In the early stages of the investigation, the interviewers ad-
ministered those tests listed in Appendix B to Mario and Rosa.
Mario was overbearing, guarded, and grudgingly cooperative
during testing. He seemed a suspicious, negativistic individual
whose nonchalance, defiance, and superior pose masked deep
feelings of inadequacy and vulnerability. On the W-B.1, he
achieved a Verbal IQ at the upper end of the Dull-Normal range,
but various responses indicated a greater potential. He revealed
grandiose notions and themes suggestive of antisocial trends.
His Szondi profiles pointed to a passive, impulsively acting-out
individual with underlying depression and strong latent homo-
sexual tendencies.

Rosa was task-oriented and cooperative during testing. She
had only occasional difficulties with tasks and then made face-
tious comments or laughed nervously. Generally she strove to do
her best and answered questions promptly, neatly, to the point,
and, seemingly, with unwavering confidence. Her W-B.1 yielded
a Verbal IQ at the Average level, but analysis of her sub-test scores revealed superior ability for abstract thinking but a nearly mental defective level of function in Comprehensive performance. Some of her responses reflected naivete, niggardly tendencies, concern with aggressive urges, exhibitionistic impulses, touchiness, and self-contempt. She possibly viewed her husband’s psychotic behavior as abandonment, which resulted in the frustration of her dependency needs and a regressive shift to an adolescent type of homosexual liaison for gratification.

Interaction testing could not be completed, so no conclusive measure of their joint intellectual function and potential could be obtained. Those data that were gathered suggest that marital interaction brought pressure to bear on Mario, evident in his regression and bizarre behavior. Much of his disturbance seemed to be related to his need to be dominant. Rosa’s problem seemed to be to avoid conflicts with him, with the result that she sometimes gave in to his responses to close the issue, though occasionally writing her own answer on a piece of paper. Rosa unquestionably emerged as the dominant partner in the dominance pattern. It seems that Mario, although impulsive and aggressive in stance, was basically passive, whereas Rosa, though quiet and restrained, was characteristically aggressive.

III. Composition and Characteristics of Units in the Family Fields

Although the focal family consisted of only four members, both Mario and Rosa C. had originated in large and convoluted families. Collecting data about their history was, therefore, a complicated and time-consuming task. We suggest that the reader, in order to identify clearly the various relatives discussed in this section, refer frequently to Figure 2 in Appendix B. The schematic representation of the family networks will prove a useful adjunct to the written material.

Mario’s paternal grandfather, Pablo (H III A), was a farmer who owned land and also a retail bakery. He and his wife produced five children; the only one still alive at the time of the investigation was Mario’s father, Sandor. Mario had heard stories of his father’s brothers’ wildness, including the tale that two of them had killed each other in a fight. Sandor (HF) vehemently denied these stories. There had, however, undoubtedly been trouble in the family. Pablo had a brother who forced him off his land and paid only $100 for the property, which was worth much more. This occurred at the time when Sandor (HF) moved to Ponce, where he was to meet his future wife (HM).

Roberto Hass, Mario’s maternal grandfather (H III B), the son of a German immigrant to Puerto Rico, owned a liquor store in Ponce. He and his wife, the daughter of an emigrant from Holland, produced six children before her death in 1916. Of these, the third son was called Mario; he had not married and was widely known as a roué before his death from tuberculosis in 1918. Mario’s mother, Catalina (HM), was the fifth child, and the sixth was Mario’s Aunt Cara, for whom his daughter was named. After his wife’s death, Roberto lived with another woman and the two had a daughter, Amelia, living in Philadelphia at the time of the investigation and on good terms with the family. Roberto himself died in 1947.

Mario C.’s father (HF) was living in Ponce, Puerto Rico, where he was visited by one of the investigators. He had been a railroad worker and, for a long time, owned a grocery store in Ponce where he and his wife had raised their family. After selling the store in 1947, he bought and sold cattle for a time. In his retirement, he remained active, doing odd jobs on his own property. He was a Catholic. He was a short, wiry man, rather like Mario in his rapid speech and his aggressive manner and gestures.

Mario’s mother, Catalina, was born and raised in Ponce and lived across the street from the store where Sandor worked as a young man. She was in good health during their courtship. After their marriage, however, she had nervous attacks whenever they argued; she would cry, scream, and fall breathless. The couple’s arguments were mostly about their eight children: Maria, Lotta, Roberto, Mario (H), Alfonso, Johnny, Hector, and Juan. Sandor and Catalina never got along well. Mario
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blamed his father's temper but added, "You can't blame one in an argument." He indicated that his mother was the family disciplinarian. When Mario was first asked to describe his mother, he paused briefly and said, "She was all right as far as I was concerned. (Pause) I have a lot of problems with my wife—you know we separated once." Mario's sister Lotta told the interviewer that she could not remember a single occasion when her parents slept in the same room.

Several members of the family mentioned Sandor's jealousy of Catalina, sometimes accompanied by threats of violence. Every time Catalina left the house, Sandor would check up on her movements. He was even jealous of visiting male relatives. For the last 15 years of their marriage, Sandor and Catalina were separated, Catalina moving to the vicinity of San Juan with all the children except Maria, who had already married. Occasionally, Sandor would visit the family and stay in their house. On one such occasion, when Mario (H) was 17, he remembers Sandor waving a gun and threatening to shoot Catalina in the course of an argument; the others in the family were terrified, but Mario walked up to Sandor, said firmly, "Give me your gun," and took it away.

After Catalina's departure from Ponce, Sandor established a common-law marriage with Anna Porfirio, which produced two sons. The two separated, because of Sandor's temper, according to Mario's sister Lotta and his Aunt Cara, and now they have no contact except that Sandor provides money for the support of the children.

There is some mystery about changes in the family that occurred in 1947: the sale of the store, the separation of Sandor and Catalina, her move to Rio Piedras near San Juan. It seemed to investigators that Sandor had sold his store, at a time when business was booming all over Puerto Rico, to raise money for Catalina's house near San Juan, even though her move there was equivalent to her leaving him. The modern, prosperous-looking house in a quiet, well-to-do neighborhood was ultimately left by Catalina to her daughter Lotta, who was living there when the investigation reported here was begun.

Sandor seemed to the interviewer to be a tragic figure; he had apparently hoped to live with his family in the new house, but Catalina left him, taking the children and the house. Although he knew that Mario had invited him to come and live in New York, Sandor said he couldn't get away because of "unfinished business." In conversations, he ventured the opinion that men were paying a heavy price for progress in immorality, war, and the dissolution of family life. He spoke dramatically of arrangements in an ideal family where the man made all important decisions. When asked where he would turn for help in a crisis, he mentioned his children, particularly Lotta and Mario, and friends in the neighborhood.

Of Mario's seven siblings, three (Maria, Roberto, and Juan) were living in the United States, the other four in Puerto Rico. It is striking that, when the news of Catalina's last illness reached them, all those in this country were able to gather on short notice for the trip to Puerto Rico.

Mario and his brothers and sisters were very varied in respect to educational attainment, ranging from Juan, who completed only seven grades of school, to Hector, who received a B.S. degree from the University of Puerto Rico. Of the five who did not complete high school, four were living in the United States; all three who had at least completed high school remained in Puerto Rico. All were married except for Lotta, aged 40 at the time of the investigation, and Johnny, who was living with Lotta in the house left by Catalina.

Among the siblings, the investigators received most information from Lotta. She seemed nervous and frightened that Johnny would leave the house to get married; Hector had lived with her formerly but left when he took his degree at the university. She described her childhood as unhappy. She referred to a love affair that had embittered her life and seemed distrustful of men. Her mother had, apparently, tried to discourage all dating for her. Her attitude toward Sandor (HF) was ambivalent. She was sharp, cynical, and critical of everything he said, but
seemed to evince much tenderness and affection for him behind a facade of near hatred. She wore her mother's wedding ring on her own fourth finger. Once, when Sandor was not present, the interviewer commented that, despite her efforts to be hostile, she was obviously fond of her father. She replied that she didn't want to know the details of her parents' quarrel and separation and that, if she knew, she would end up hating her father.

The family's religious activities deserve special comment. Catalina was Presbyterian and Sandor, Catholic; they were married in the Catholic Church because Catalina had agreed that the children would be raised as Catholics. Maria, the first born, though, was baptized Presbyterian, though the later children were all baptized in the Catholic Church. Of all the children, only Maria considered herself Catholic at the time of the investigation. Some members of the family were obviously involved with spiritualism, including Mario (H), who ordered herbs from his sister Lotta to make prescriptions for friends in New York. Lotta thought that Rosa's influence had caused her brother to become interested. Lotta confessed to attending spiritualist services regularly, although, paradoxically, she also attended mass from time to time. Sandor (HF) felt that he was protected by "good guides" and threatened by evil spirits. Some conversation with Aunt Cara (HMS) indicated that she may have been a spiritualist medium at one time and had suffered seizures during seances.

Rosa's paternal grandparents were said by her mother to have been a wealthy couple but to have squandered their money on lavish living, leaving nothing to their children. Her maternal grandfather (W III B), Rafael Bernard, had come from France as a young man and lived on his inheritance from his parents. He married a widow with five children; they had two children together, one of whom was Isabella, Rosa's mother.

The investigators were able to interview Isabella (WM), then living in New York. She was small, wiry, very dark-skinned with marked Indian features. Her upper teeth were missing and she smoked cigars. She claimed to be 72, but looked older. She was a vigorous woman with a lively sense of humor. She reported that she had had a happy childhood, her mother's favorite and well-loved by her older half-sisters. The family lived on a farm with cattle and horses and had enough money and help to make life relatively easy for them. She went briefly to private school, but refused to continue. Her mother died when she was 13.

Isabella's husband (WF) had been Francisco Torres, the youngest of eight children in an economically comfortable family. He and Isabella had grown up in Arroyo together but did not marry until their mid-twenties. Francisco died in 1941. He was reported to have been very short (4'4"), white-skinned, black-haired, and handsome. He had had little schooling but, among all the siblings, was the only one who could read and write. He was a railroad worker. Isabella described him as a model husband. Rosa (W) reported that he gambled and drank, although he was well-liked and respected by all. The couple produced 12 children; 11 lived to become adults and nine were alive at the time of the investigation. The children were, in order: Felicia, Violetta, Ramon, Tiberio, Francisco, Paula, Francisco Garcia, Manuela, Fidelio, Rosa (W), Jaime, and Rodrigo.

Both Rosa (W) and Isabella (WM) agreed that Isabella had been the stricter parent. Francisco (WF) was affectionate and indulgent. Isabella appeared to be a strong figure in the family, still playing a prominent role in her children's lives. In 1950, after most of her children had migrated to New York, she followed them there; her apartment in a run-down Puerto Rican section of the Bronx became a center for family gatherings. At various times, one or another of her children had lived with her; at the time of the investigation, a grandchild, Rosita, was living there, apparently quite content with the arrangement.

Felicia, the oldest of the children born to Isabella and Francisco, had married a laborer in Puerto Rico and had died in childbirth in 1949. It was her daughter, Rosita, who was living with Isabella, although the father was eager for both Isabella and Rosita to come and live with him in Puerto Rico. Violetta, the second child, and her husband, Frederico, had owned the
The grocery store that Mario and Rosa owned at the time of the investigation. They sold it in order to move to Florida because of their son's rheumatic heart disease. The sixth child, Paula, had died in 1944 following a severe illness. Of the remaining children, except Rodrigo who died in infancy, those from whom information was forthcoming were living in New York; the youngest, Jaime, was with Isabella, following a separation from his wife.

IV. Relations of Focal Family with Other Family Units in the Contemporary Fields

Much of the focal family's social life centered around Isabella and the rest of Rosa's family in New York. Isabella appeared to be venerated by her children and grandchildren. She referred to Mario (H) as the "crazy one," but spoke of him affectionately, somewhat more so than of Rosa. She blamed Mario's family, whom she considered difficult and vindictive, for the focal family's troubles. Mario's side of the family had never been particularly fond of Rosa, but their attitude toward the whole focal family was not clear. Mario's contacts with his siblings had apparently diminished since their mother's death. Lotta in Puerto Rico seemed aggrieved that he had not written to her to acknowledge a gift. At the time of Catalina's funeral, Mario (H) and Roberto (HB) concluded a two-year period of not speaking to each other, and Mario mentioned his distress over Roberto's insulting comments about Sandor (HF) when they were in Puerto Rico.

V. Developmental Background of Husband and Wife

Little information could be collected about Mario's earliest years. He described himself as not too close with any of his siblings. He was most frequently with Roberto, with whom he fought. He also fought with Johnny because, Mario asserted, Johnny didn't show sufficient respect for their parents. Mario remarked that his own son, Mario Jr., was like Johnny. Mario claimed to have been his father's favorite, beaten less frequently than the others and trusted with more responsibilities. Sandor confirmed this and cited Mario as the most responsible and hard-working of the children. Sandor described Mario as a good child, active and "nervous," who got on well with his siblings. Mario's Aunt Cara (HMS) spoke of Mario's closeness to his mother, Catalina, and there were indications that Mario and Lotta had been very close when they were growing up. Mario's own early memories were a sequence of rather traumatic episodes, including several illnesses.

Mario quit school in the eighth grade to help in the family store. He described himself as not very bright, though Lotta and Sandor thought he had been quite bright but that a bad encounter with an eighth-grade teacher had precipitated his leaving school. Mario's adolescence was most dramatically marked by the separation of his parents when he was about 16. Since Maria had married and Roberto and Lotta were in the service, he was left the senior sibling. He did much of the household maintenance and helped his mother with chores. "If she was sick, I used to do the cooking—you know, I liked taking care of Mother when she was sick, and when she was well I would do anything she asked me to do." He wanted to join the service, but his mother insisted that he stay home. He had applied to trade school to become an auto mechanic but was not accepted; instead, he was given a place in an electrical school where he discovered, on the first day, that he was "afraid of electricity." (He later became a TV repairman.) He quit electrical school and returned home to help his mother. Lotta remarked that he was the closest of all the children to Catalina (HM). Mario confided everything to his mother. In his late teens, he held a series of jobs, finally working in a clothing store owned by Rosa's brother-in-law. Rosa, who lived in Guyama, occasionally stayed with her sister and would visit the store, where the two met.

Rosa was described as having been an easy, quiet, not very active baby and as a good, conforming, quiet child, loved by all her family. The one exception was, perhaps, Manuela, five years older; the two girls often fought. Rosa, during interviews, was
amused and giggly in describing Manuela's bad behavior, as she was in talking of anyone who was nonconforming, hostile, "crazy." Rosa's father preferred the girls, his favorites being Rosa and Violetta. Rosa said that her mother preferred the boys, particularly Francisco. Isabella confirmed this and also evidenced some preference for Violetta. Francisco García was the one child who angered their father because he was rough and active. Once he accidentally hit his mother on the head with a rock; his father then hit him with a broom handle. On another occasion, he accidentally caused Rosa to fall and break her clavicle.

Rosa's parents had not argued. Isabella was the stricter of the two and had preached to her children that the man of the house was always right. Rosa talked more affectionately of her father than of Isabella, but admired her mother for being friendly and calm and felt that she, Rosa, resembled the mother. Among her sisters, Rosa was especially close to Paula when they were children.

An event that Rosa remembered as especially traumatic, along with the broken clavicle, was having Fidelio accidentally crush the top of one of her fingers with a hammer when she was five years old. She felt pain for months. The nail grew in wrong and had to be pulled out. The nail continued to be deformed and Rosa expressed annoyance with its ugly appearance at the time of the investigation.

Rosa started school at 6, having already learned to read and write. She was considered bright, and she accelerated by combining the second and third grades in one year. Because there were so many children in the family, she had few household responsibilities. When she was 11, her mother started Manuela and her in cleaning, washing dishes, and caring for their own clothes, tasks that Rosa enjoyed. The family went to church regularly on Sundays. Rosa attended doctrine classes at the church daily from age 10 to 12, and later taught the class.

When Rosa was 10, her father died, and the family moved from Arroyo to Guyama, which changed Rosa's life considerably. In the former, more rural environment, Rosa had been able to play outdoors freely with many children, although she was permitted to play only with those boys who were members of the family. In Guyama, her social activities were confined to school and church and to visits to the houses of two girl friends, with whom she remained friendly until she left Puerto Rico. Her activities were restricted more as she began to mature.

When Rosa was 14, her sister Paula died; Rosa cried during the interview when recounting this event. About a year later, she quit school. She had done well until her second year in high school when, although good in other subjects, she expected to fail at bookkeeping. She felt so averse to bringing home a failing grade that she left, despite her mother's efforts to dissuade her. Rosa blamed the teacher, saying that he had intimidated all the students. She had liked math best of all her subjects and had hoped to become a bookkeeper. On leaving school, she went to Rio Piedras to live with her sister Felicia and her husband, who owned a clothing store and needed some help. Manuela had been there earlier but had been sent home for disobedience. Rosa took up a way of life that she was later to repeat with her husband. She would cook meals at home and take them to the store for Felicia to eat, then stay on to help. She enjoyed this period and the many outings on which she accompanied her sister and brother-in-law, a great change from her restricted life at home.

Rosa did not go out with boys until she began to date Mario secretly when she was 16. He worked at the store and the two met there. When it was discovered that she was in love with Mario, their meetings were chaperoned and she was finally sent home to her mother. The two managed to have intercourse once, which resulted in Rosa's pregnancy and their marriage when she was 19.

VI. Courtship

Mario was in love with Rosa before the two met, having seen her when she visited Felicia before coming to live in Rio Pie-
Once she moved to her sister's house, they saw each other frequently at the store, but Rosa did not like Mario because he had "bad manners" and used obscene language. He began to improve his manners and his language and to pursue her for a date. She refused because she was not allowed to go out with boys. Often she teased him by agreeing to meet him and was amused when he waited in vain. Finally, Felicia permitted Mario to take Rosa to a show. He tried to make love to her, but Rosa held him off out of respect for her sister and brother-in-law; but, in Rosa's words, "He kept on until he got me."

The two dated secretly for about a year. When Felicia discovered this, she objected because of Mario's family. It was believed that his mother had treated a daughter-in-law badly. Rosa refused to give up Mario, and Felicia returned her to their mother. Isabella (WM) declined to interfere, and Mario was received as a regular visitor in their home. Mario and Rosa became engaged, and he visited her on Sundays for the next year. The couple planned to marry when Mario got a better job.

When Mario's visits became less frequent, Rosa heard through his sister, Lotta, that he was seeing another girl. She wanted to break the engagement, but Mario persuaded her that Lotta was lying and threatened to kill Lotta. Relations between the two families seemed otherwise amicable.

At their wedding, Rosa was, unknown to either family, four months pregnant. She expressed great shame at having been married in a white veil and reported that she was too worried to enjoy her wedding. Isabella thought that Rosa looked very pretty and that Mario's family had fussed over her with great pleasure. Interviews in Puerto Rico, however, indicated that only Mario's Aunt Cara saw anything good in Rosa at the time of the wedding. Lotta repeatedly referred to Rosa as "two-faced" and grimaced whenever her name was mentioned.

VII. Marriage and Course of Focal Family

During the early months of their marriage, Mario was a taxi driver. The couple had money difficulties and practically no social life. They ate their evening meals at the home of Mario's mother, and Mario paid for this. Friction developed between Catalina (HM) and Rosa, and the dining arrangement ceased. Isabella (WM) said that Catalina wanted to dominate the young couple and that "Rosa is nobody's fool." Rosa was nauseated and ill during her pregnancy, anxious lest her family discover her condition, and relieved when they found out and were only "a little mad." When Rosa was seven months pregnant, her sister Felicia died in childbirth and Rosa became alarmed that she too would die. All the family were stunned by Felicia's death. Rosa eventually had an easy delivery, and there were few problems with the baby, Mario Jr., until just before his second birthday when a gland burst in his groin. He was "leaking for two years," during which time he got penicillin shots every day, administered at a drugstore; he feared the store and screamed whenever he saw it.

During their three years in Rio Piedras, Rosa and Mario lived in three different residences, each move leading to improved housing. Mario continued driving a cab for one year; then his mother bought him a liquor and food store. Rosa and Catalina (HM) became increasingly hostile to each other. Rosa opposed the move to the liquor store, but helped in the store. The couple began to argue frequently, mostly about Catalina's interference.

During her pregnancy with Cara, Rosa was ill with phlebitis. She was in labor three or four days. The day after the birth, Rosa had her tubes tied. Mario and Rosa were glad for a girl, and Mario Jr. was "crazy about her." Family arguments continued, however. A crisis arose in 1952 when Rosa sent $25 to her brother Fidelio in New York. Catalina said that Rosa was taking money from the store to support her relatives and to force Mario to sell the store to his brother. Rosa reported that Catalina asked Mario to leave her, and they separated for two weeks. By that time, Isabella (WM) and most of Rosa's siblings had gone to New York, so Rosa made plans to follow with the children. Mario begged for a reconciliation, and the whole focal family moved to New York.
The interviewers discussed with relatives in Puerto Rico the circumstances of Mario's selling the store. One reason offered was that Mario had failed in business through trusting his customers too much. (This was one of several reasons advanced to explain Sandor's selling his store some years earlier.) Another reason was that Rosa was "stealing" money to send to her "lazy brother in New York." It emerged that, just before the sale, a man with whom Mario had once fought was killed in a fight outside the bar. Just after this episode, Alfonso "got" the business from Mario. Both Sandor (HF) and Lotta (HS) denied that Mario was suspected of being involved in the killing.

The focal family spent their first three months in New York with Isabella (WM). Then Mario got a job in a TV repair shop, and they moved to a small apartment. For five years, they got on well. Troubles appear to have begun when Rosa took a job as a sewing-machine operator; Mario objected to her working and wanted all her money. In 1957, Rosa's brother Ramon migrated from Puerto Rico and, with his wife and six of their eight children, moved in with Mario and Rosa. Mario said they could stay for six months. Rosa found this intolerable and threatened to leave with her children unless Mario evicted Ramon by Christmas. He did not, and Rosa moved out with Mario Jr. and Cara. Mario argued with Ramon, then went briefly to Puerto Rico to stay with his mother. He returned to Rosa and a new apartment.

In 1959, Mario wanted to use $500 banked in Rosa's name to buy a new car. Rosa insisted that the money was for an emergency and that they didn't need the car. Mario appeared at the factory where she worked and shouted at her until she left. At home, he hit her, kicked her, and threatened to "kill her like a dog." She left with the children and took him to court for assault. After two weeks, he begged her to return to him, which she did. Mario admitted that he had really wanted to send the money to his father.

A more serious rupture occurred in 1960. According to Rosa, Mario had decided to return to Puerto Rico and was trying to sell their furniture. Rosa, in the presence of a friend, said to him, "You found me on the street and can leave me on the street." This enraged Mario. He punched her so hard that her face "was black and blue for five months." He went to Puerto Rico, stayed two weeks with his mother, then returned to New York. Meanwhile, Rosa had gone back to work and had found a new apartment in Yonkers. They were apart for six months, meeting at Isabella's, where she brought the children to see Mario each week and he was to bring her support money. He threatened not to provide money unless she revealed her address. An emergency appendectomy for little Cara eventually brought them together again. Rosa reported that Mario did not hit her after that; she told him that, if he ever hit her, she would "cut his arm through." Four or five months after their reunion, they bought their grocery store and took up the pattern of life they were leading at the time of the intensive interviews.

Mario Jr. had several visits away from his immediate family during his childhood. During Rosa's second pregnancy, he stayed in Guyama with his uncle Francisco Garcia. When Mario and Rosa separated just before their move to New York, Mario's family "took" little Mario for a few weeks, threatening not to give him back to Rosa. When he was five, he visited Catalina's stepsister, Amelia, for five months; Rosa liked Amelia and trusted the child with her. She also wanted him to have a visit with Catalina (HM) before he began school; Rosa reported that he complained that Catalina mistreated him. Mario Jr. also made two-week visits to other relatives in Puerto Rico in 1958 and 1960.

The boy did well in school and sports and made friends easily. He visited his grandmother Isabella daily and was said to adore her, saving his allowance to buy her presents of cigars. Mario Sr. usually talked to his son in screaming tones and often threatened him. Mario Jr. had begun having nightmares three years before the interviews began.

Little Cara was treated gently by both parents. She had done poorly in school because, according to Rosa, she missed many
sessions with colds and had changed schools four times. She was left back in the third grade while her parents were separated and Rosa moved to Yonkers. The school guidance counselor told the interviewer that Cara did not get on well with other children because she was a “tattler” and that she was able to do her school work but was quite lazy. She played with her friends and cousins but was not active in sports.

VIII. Family Relations Prevailing at Time of Referral or First Contact

This information has been incorporated into preceding sections.

IX. Initial Diagnostic Formulation

See Chapter 4.

X. Changes in Family During Period of Study or Treatment

After Mario’s psychotic episode, the couple seemed for a time to get along better. Mario was described as “listening” more to Rosa. In the autumn of 1962, however, Mario became increasingly intense, agitated, and grandiose. He also became increasingly attached to one of the investigators, Dr. Z., to whom he spoke passionately about his family, indicating that he was against them all. Rosa began to spend all day in the store, presumably because Mario’s rudeness to customers was likely to discourage business.

In November, Mario had to be hospitalized again, an event that occurred while both observers were away at a meeting. The hospitalization was precipitated by what Rosa described as a harrowing episode. Mario crawled around the floor, demanding that she leave. She went to get the police and returned to find that he had killed a pigeon and eaten its heart. He was very bloody and told the police that the pigeon was Rosa. He fought the police and had to be tied up in the hospital emergency room, “like an animal,” according to Rosa. Rosa was angry that he had had to cope with this alone while the interviewers were out of town and seemed preoccupied with the thought that all of Mario’s relatives had abandoned him.

Mario remained in the hospital three weeks. When he began to calm down, Rosa refused to believe that the psychotic episode was over. She was furious when Dr. Z. approved passes for Mario to visit at home and especially furious when her husband was discharged.

During December, Mario appeared depressed, defeated, and worried about business. He was taking Thorazine and was sleepy and quiet at the store, where Rosa more and more took over the management. Throughout the next three months, she showed a tendency to demonstrate Mario’s incompetence and to maintain an image of him as seriously sick, even to the point of deceiving the investigators about his behavior. Mario complained that Rosa had put him in a position of no authority both at home and in the store. Business was desperately bad. He wrote to his sister Lotta for money, but she said she didn’t have any. After an impulsive announcement that he would emigrate to Venezuela, Mario decided to sell the store and return to Puerto Rico. Rosa refused to comply. In mid-January, Mario admitted himself to Bellevue Hospital; he was kept overnight then discharged, described as “not psychotic or out of control.” He seemed to want hospitalization as an alternative to pursuing his announced plan of returning to Puerto Rico.

On January 18, 1963, Mario was interviewed at the store. He was dressed and packed, ready to leave for Puerto Rico. He seemed calm but depressed. In an argument with Rosa, she had told him she wanted him out of the house. Rosa reported that she had written to Lotta, who had refused to help Mario. Rosa complained to the female interviewer of Mario’s sexual incompatibility: “He gets me all stirred up and then comes too fast.” She was reserved but unrelenting in rejecting Mario.

After Mario’s departure, Rosa said that she was planning to sell the store and follow her husband to Puerto Rico “if he wants me.” At the same time, she expressed relief at his ab-
sence and a continued rejection of him. On March 14, the interviewers discovered the store closed and in bankruptcy. Rosa had disappeared. Isabella (WM) claimed she did not know where Rosa was and that Rosa had moved because she was afraid of Mario.

In June 1963, the observers were able to locate Rosa. She was living, with her children, in a common-law relationship with a Mr. B. Mario had obtained a divorce in Puerto Rico. Although Rosa would not agree to an interview, the investigators dropped in one evening. After some initial stiffness, the couple were relaxed and friendly. Mr. B. had come to New York from Puerto Rico in 1948 and considered it his home; he had never returned to Puerto Rico for a visit. He was tall, heavily built, calm, and thoughtful, a striking contrast to Mario. He had worked himself up from porter to shipping clerk, and expressed his faith in education, preparing for the future, and personal determination. His mother and three sisters were living in the Bronx. He said he did not live too near them because families should live more on their own. He and Rosa regularly visited their mothers and Mr. B.'s three children by a previous marriage. Although it is doubtful that Mr. B. and Rosa were legally married at the time of the interview, they appeared firmly established as a family.

An interviewer in Puerto Rico followed Mario closely after his arrival there in January 1963. For the first four or five months, he was unemployed, living briefly with Alfonso before moving in with Lotta. He was totally dependent on Lotta, who treated him like an irresponsible burden. Mario did household work while Lotta worked. During this period, he asked his Aunt Cara to pierce his car so that he could wear an ornament "like a pirate's earring." He drank a lot and was often intensely excited. Lotta argued with him frequently. The family blamed Mario's outbursts on alcohol rather than mental illness, but they considered Lotta crazy.

After a few months, Mario got a job as a tourist guide and began sending part of his salary to Rosa. He dated a secretary who lived next door to Alfonso. His family described the girl as better educated, lighter skinned, and prettier than Rosa. The interviewers in New York had never realized how much Mario's family considered his marriage to Rosa as a marriage beneath him. Mario attributed his new calm to his return to Puerto Rico, adding that, in New York, he would have had to be hospitalized again because of his debts and Rosa's demands and arguments. The interviewer sensed that Mario had renewed his ties with his family and had reasserted his male position. He was the oldest male of the family living in Puerto Rico. When he spoke of New York, he became excited in recalling how afraid of him his customers were; he said that he had had to show them he was boss; he talked of not being afraid of anyone, of being a man.

A serious struggle developed within the family over the house inherited from Catalina. She had been recognized as owner, even though the house was in Lotta's name. Lotta began to claim the house as her own. She sold it for $32,000 and persuaded each of her brothers to accept $1500 as a "donation" with the stipulation that they sign "donation papers." They all consented to this but were furious. All the family said she was like Sandor, with lots of houses and money. At the same time, their anger at her financial manipulation was tempered with concern about her mental state.

In November 1963, Dr. Z. saw Mario in Puerto Rico. He had been promoted in his job but had broken with his girl friend, or, probably, she with him. He appeared to be in a better state of mind than ever before in his contacts with Dr. Z. In a later visit to Puerto Rico in February 1965, Dr. Z. found that Mario had been promoted again and was now a special guide for VIP tours. He was married to a woman strikingly different from Rosa in appearance and disposition. She was thoroughly naive, even-tempered, plain-looking, as characteristically Puerto Rican in speech and manner as Rosa's Mr. B. was a New Yorker. She seemed to worship Mario.

The observers found it significant that little Cara had become a behavior problem in New York and that Rosa had written to
ask whether Mario could have her to live with him and his new wife. The pattern of solving behavior problems by sending children back to Puerto Rico is not unfamiliar; what was striking in this instance was Rosa's implicit assumption that Mario was well and able to care for his daughter.

XI. Final Evaluation and Prediction of Future Trends

See Chapter 4.

XII. Changes and Developments Subsequent to Period of Study or Treatment

No information.

The process manifesting itself in the psychotic behavior of Mario C. may be viewed from several perspectives. A traditional psychiatric approach would begin with a clinical diagnosis, that is, a label attempting to sum up the most salient phenomena of the illness, and would then proceed to formulate the intrapsychic dynamics, that is, the forces and counterforces, conscious and unconscious, determining his cognitive and emotional behavior. Among a large number of psychiatrists, despite a wide area of consensus about the intrapsychic determinants of Mario's character structure and of the manifest psychopathology, there would probably be some disagreement about the clinical diagnosis, about the ordering in importance of the psychodynamic sequences identified, perhaps even about the presence or the relevance of a particular sequence. Thus, "acute undifferentiated schizophrenic reaction," "chronic schizophrenia, paranoid type," and "homosexual panic in a passive-aggressive character disorder" were three diagnoses conferred upon Mario C. at different times in the course of his illness. The presenting symptoms can be described essentially as regressive, marked by lack of control, excitement, confusion, with few restitutive or reparative symptoms. The prepsychotic personality picture was of a pseudo-masculine, hyperaggressive, impulsive behavior style. Character structure was of a mixed neurotic type, with
emphasis placed by different supervisors of Mario’s therapy upon his intense dependent needs, his marked castration anxiety, or his deep yearnings for a passive-feminine adaptive mode.

Genetic determinants can be cited to support each of these formulations: the incapability of Mario’s mother, particularly with the many siblings born in rapid succession after him, to provide an adequate nurturing experience in infancy; the harsh, poorly controlled physical punishment meted out to offenders by both parents; the combination of seductive behavior of the mother and the father’s near-paranoid jealousy. The mother’s death, which precipitated Mario’s psychotic episode, may be seen as representing, at one level, the loss of Mario’s unconscious dependency object (“I’m a part of Mother and therefore I too will die”). At the same time, and in the presence of an access of rage at the abandonment, it also represented the loss of a powerful source of external control. Finally, it represented the loss of Mario’s oedipal object in a setting already marked by heightened passive-feminine longings and exaggerated defensive pseudo-masculine needs. The treatment program, including choice of drugs, the type and frequency of psychotherapeutic contact, and the nature and extent of family or community resources to be utilized would depend on which formulation seemed most valid to the therapist.

Whatever the seeming differences in dynamic formulations, clinical diagnoses, and treatment programs, they are indeed more alike than different. Most fundamentally, they share at least one feature: they all limit themselves to a basic view of Mario’s illness as residing within himself. Though the histories obtained on the occasions of his hospitalization did refer to his family of orientation and even to his family of procreation, the references were limited to two-person units within these families and, furthermore, merely alluded to the influence of the important “other” upon the patient.

An alternative is, of course, family diagnosis, and Chapter 2 has already presented suggestions for a fully diagnostic approach. Such an approach involves a system of cross-references among the cultural, interpersonal, psychological, and biological determinants of family function, all in the context of the structure of the family field. The Mario C. case history, reconstructed in accordance with the case history outline, can be used as a test case for the feasibility of this procedure. The elements of this diagnostic program were presented in a previous report formulated by the Committee on the Family.* There it was proposed that family systems are integrated on the basis of social roles patterned in accordance with a set of value orientations characteristic of a particular culture or subculture. In this view, the husband-wife roles (and other kinship roles) are designed within cultures to maintain reciprocal and harmonious patterns of behavior; this means that the actions of husband and wife in a particular culture are relatively predictable and complementary. The details of this process, in the case of both integration and conflict, have been tested by members of this Committee and its consultants on family histories gathered in their own work with families.

The cultural sector in the diagnostic program requires that we specify the profile of values characteristic of a particular culture. In the Mario C. case, we can best begin by comparing Puerto Rican working-class and American middle-class values, these being the two sets with relevance for that family. The contrast between these two patterns is presented in Table I in accordance with the categories and theory of variation proposed by Florence Kluckhohn.† Even a casual glance at the items in the table reveals the amount of “cultural distance” migrating Puerto Rican families may have to traverse in order to accommodate to the culture of American cities.

Kluckhohn’s theory of variation in value orientations is based on a set of assumptions that should be briefly reviewed. She has proposed that “Value orientations are complex but

---

definitely patterned (rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements—which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of 'common human' problems." The complex patterning is correlated with the assumption that all value choices in all dimensions are present in all societies. What varies between cultures or subcultures is the rank ordering of preferences. With respect to the interplay of evaluative components, it can be assumed that the cognitive element refers to a relation between the value pattern and the belief systems of the individual. For the person who holds them, values confer a normative structure on the world, a strong belief in the pertinence of some over other possible interpretations of the nature of existence. The affective or emotional component in internalized values refers to the strength with which beliefs are held. It is assumed that the value pattern has been imbedded in the personality by unconscious processing during childhood and has become attached both to intense instinctual drives and to conflicts between drives. Consequently, the adult changes his pattern of values slowly, if at all. Finally, the directive component is considered to be a biological predisposition to impose order on the world, to give stability to the process of choosing between alternatives in decision-making and action. Since directionality is a process always undergoing change in some degree, the specification of a given pattern of value choices is time-bound—a slice through the present of what is undergoing gradual change within the cultural community.

The bases of classification of the value orientation dimensions are some "common human" problems that all societies confront. The five of these isolated by Kluckhohn are by no means exhaustive, but are the ones that have so far been studied in the context of American middle-class, American working-class, Japanese, Spanish-American, Irish-American, Italian-American, Greek-American, and Puerto Rican settings. In Table I, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puerto Rican Working-Class</th>
<th>American Working-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony with Evil</td>
<td>Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Middle-Class</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Working-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing</td>
<td>Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>Being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Harmony with Evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Evil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
five problems are listed in the left-hand column. For each problem are listed three solutions in order of preference. The symbol \( > \) indicates that the left-hand solution is preferred over the right-hand solution; the symbol \( = \) indicates that there is no clear preference between right-hand and left-hand solutions, a situation usually associated with a state of flux within a culture. Table I is divided in half vertically, one half showing Puerto Rican working-class rank order patterns, the other half showing patterns for American middle-class urban society. Naturally, the contrasting patterns are not thought to describe all Puerto Rican working-class or American middle-class families, since families and individuals in both settings have variant values; the patterns describe, however, the dominant trend within each setting. The American middle-class rather than working-class pattern has been selected because it is the pattern toward which immigrant families usually aspire.

Every society must order its relationships within Time, and the usual ordering distinguishes between Past, Present, and Future. In Puerto Rican families, the traditional preference has been for the Present Time orientation, a preference characteristic of most peasant societies. In such societies, the past is not well-differentiated from the present or future, and life is perceived as a vast, self-repeating cycle of events. Time boundaries are demarcated by seasons (rainy vs. dry), celebrations (fiestas), holidays, anniversaries, and other recurring occasions. There is little point in hurry because no future is conceived of as pressing down with inexorable demands. There is little expectation of change in the course of life, and no positive appreciation of novelty for its own sake. In the Present Time preference, change is regarded as something accidental.

American middle-class culture places a heavy emphasis on the Future. Americans plan ceaselessly for a future pictured in terms of a vastly extended perspective. Parents plan the children's education before they are born, and plan for their own old age over a period of years. American middle-class persons watch their clocks and calendars to make sure they will not be late when the future arrives. They look forward to what novelties the future will bring, confident, for the most part, that they have "planned change" to their own betterment. They value their children as representing the future just as they neglect their elderly who have little future remaining. The second-order position of Present Time means that it is the preference for a crisis. In stressful situations, everyone stops worrying about the future and attends to the immediate problem. In some other circumstances too, particularly in recreation, Present Time considerations prevail; in a party or game, it is thought important to have fun and to forget the future with its compulsive concerns. Past Time is given little importance, as shown in the American hostility to tradition. What few traditions Americans preserve are being constantly reinterpreted in the light of new circumstances.

The Relational dimension concerns the ordering of relations within social groups and is, therefore, of the greatest importance to family life. Collateral relations accent the horizontal, group-wide structuring of positions, especially in decision-making; in a Collateral ordering, decisions are made optimally by consensus. The Lineal solution is one in which there is hierarchical stratification; decisions are made by top authorities and passed down the chain of command. In the Individualistic solution, decisions are optimally made by each person, his connection with the group being much freer and involving more independence than in either of the other systems.

Collaterality is the principle that holds the Puerto Rican family in a web of horizontally extended relationships. The preference is for a high birth rate, large family systems, and close, intensely consuming relationships. The child is trained for independence on the family network and for obedience. Loyalty is demanded, in exchange for which the individual family member is offered reliable caretaking throughout his life. Whoever sticks with the system will be protected by it against a potentially evil outside world. Whoever leaves the system takes grave risks. Separation is cause for grief, preferably dramatically expressed;
greeting after absence is reason for elaborate displays of tearful happiness. Within such a warm and controlling family, the individual scarcely exists; in the outside world, he is a representative and bears responsibility for the entire family's honor and reputation. With Collaterality firmly established, the second-order Lineal principle is brought into play for important decisions. The male is the dominant authority, both as husband and as father. This area gives rise to one of the principal strains in Puerto Rican family life: the disparity between the presumed dominance of the male and the actual facts of the situation, a gap that brings about exaggerated masculine pride and sensitivity.

The American middle-class pattern of preference emphasizes Individualism to a degree almost unknown anywhere else in the world. Children are expected to stand on their own two feet, make their own decisions, and learn self-control from an early age. They are trained to experience separation (e.g., being sent to summer camp) as a normal event, one that tests their ability to manage by themselves. In contrast to the large Puerto Rican family, where it is quite proper for any of several relatives to discipline a misbehaving child, the American child is responsible only to himself and his immediate family. Nuclear families of parents and children are themselves expected to be relatively independent of extended kin. Collaterality, the second-position preference, is regarded as necessary for restricted occasions. In recreation, e.g., games and sports, one should forget about himself for the good of the team or to be a good loser. In emergencies and crises, there is a closing of the ranks within families, communities, or even within the nation as a whole. The Lineal principle is avoided whenever possible. Generally, Americans do not like bosses, and do not like being boss; they fulfill such roles, somewhat apologetically, only when a job situation requires it. Within the nuclear family too, husbands and wives usually avoid the Lineal principle, sharing responsibilities and reaching decisions by mutual agreement.

The Activity dimension involves those aspects of the personality in action which are most valued; it is not concerned with the distinction between activity and passivity. The Being solution is a preference for spontaneity and expressiveness, its aim to be oneself whatever one's mood. Doing stresses the achievement motive at the expense of inner feelings. The Doing solution is characterized by externally judged performance, merit granted on the grounds of success, seeing oneself as having made the grade in the eyes of others. Being-in-Becoming (abbreviated BiB in the table) accents the rounded development of the whole personality over time. The goal is neither the external success of the Doing solution nor the expression of the inner man in the Being solution; rather it requires time to bring all parts of the personality and a variety of interests to fulfillment for the sake of inner harmony.

Puerto Rican society emphasizes Being. The individual is expressive, and feelings are aired, usually with considerable dramatic flair. Tempers fly, laughter rings out, tears flow. One knows where one stands in the feelings of others. Children are freely scolded and punished; they are also freely and effusively loved. No one is expected to control his feelings except before strangers. As for actions, they are controlled by the group in accordance with the Collateral principle. Since it is not expected that the individual is able to control himself, violence may break out that needs calming or control by the collateral group. In the second-order position, probably because of recent economic progress and initiative within the Commonwealth, is Doing. Energy employed toward achievement and success is appreciated, but this is still secondary to the expressive needs of the individual. Work may be called off if tensions grow, if there is a ceremonial occasion, or if there is illness in the family. The Being-in-Becoming solution in Puerto Rico is important mainly for the wealthier classes with the leisure to develop their interests in a variety of directions.

The preference for Doing in American life is obvious. Initiative and striving for success are expected of everyone. Parents watch themselves and their children for evidence of progress; competition is the spice of life. Education is viewed as the main path to success, and the higher rungs of education depend on
achievement at lower levels. So work and study come before play. Being, however, is encouraged in recreation, when the compulsive attention to success is temporarily relaxed. If one is freed from watching one's step in order to get ahead, as at a game or party, then expressiveness can be trotted out; one can, in modest doses, even make a fool of oneself. Being-in-Becoming in the United States is of importance only to variant groups—to artists, musicians, and some intellectuals. To most others, it has the flavor of dilettantism or self-indulgence.

The Man-Nature dimension refers to the ordering of the relationship between man and nature or supernature. The Dominant-Over-Nature position assumes that mankind can control his natural environment, solving most of his problems by planning, hard work, and the application of scientific principles. The Subjugated-to-Nature position sees nature—or most often a deity or deities—as stronger than man; man must appeal to it for the solution to his problems. In the Harmony-with-Nature solution, man and supernature are not pitted against each other; rather, man is expected to fit himself into the ways of nature and to keep all the complicated forces within and without himself in proper balance. It is obvious that the ordering of preferences for this dimension would vary greatly according to the religious and philosophical system.

At the present time, Puerto Rican society demonstrates a lack of ordering within the Man-Nature dimension. The reasons why there is no clear preference are not really clear. Eighty-five percent of the population of the Commonwealth is nominally Roman Catholic, and the Church's position is clearly that the individual human is subjugated to the Deity, needing constant help to overcome the sinfulness toward which his human nature leads him. But ecclesiastical organization on the island is not strong; the number of Spanish-speaking priests is rather small; anticlerical feeling tends to run high; religious observances are deemed as interesting mainly to women. The situation is complicated by remnants of belief and custom inherited from the native Indian population or transferred from Africa at the time of the slave trade. These have crystallized into a strong belief in “spiritualism,” a movement with its own institutional forms and practices, largely of a Harmony-with-Nature cast. Finally, recent economic and industrial development, backed by science and technology, has dramatically increased confidence in the Dominant-Over-Nature position. No one of the three solutions can claim precedence. Individuals and family groups move around among the three positions with remarkable ease: they may call on the Church and clergy for weddings and baptisms, look for cures for illness or assurances of good luck from spiritualist practitioners, then seek out physicians or other technical specialists for the same problems.

Americans clearly prefer the Dominant-Over-Nature solution, most conspicuously symbolized by the satellite program and the flights of the astronauts. It is considered that man, with the help of computers, can engineer most large problems toward a successful outcome. For small problems, there are professionals and experts listed in the Yellow Pages. There is, to be sure, a disjunctive turning through religious ceremony to the second-order Subjugated-to-Nature solution for problems where science and technology do not work, such as chronic illness and death. Even there, however, the Dominant-Over-Nature solution is so strongly preferred, that death tends to be regarded as a mistake, a failure of science and medical research to reach their goals. It ought not to have happened, and one often responds emotionally as though it had not happened. There is no room for lamentation over unhappy events brought about by forces beyond our control. This is in marked contrast to Puerto Rican custom where the Subjugated-to-Nature position is still strong enough to produce an outpouring of expressions of grief at the death of a family member.

In respect to the Basic Human Nature dimension, the first-order preference among Puerto Ricans is that man is born in a state of sin and has a large, almost ineradicable component of Evil in his nature. Since this is so, one must watch out carefully for the intentions of others. One can try to be good through the
help of the Church, the saints, and the Deity, or one can be influenced for good (or bad) by local “spirits.” Nevertheless one needs to be always on guard. It is particularly important to keep one's fences mended within the collateral group, for this group is the main guarantee of protection against outside (outgroup) hostile forces.

Middle-class Americans tend to see man as either a mixture of Good and Evil or as Neutral. The latter concept is becoming more and more prevalent, probably because of the gradual education of the public by psychiatrists and of the teaching in colleges of the behavioral science point of view on child development. Children are to be looked at as neither good nor evil, but as products of their early experiences and of the environment in their homes. This, of course, shifts the burden to the parents, who feel responsible for providing an environment in which the child can blossom into an achieving, independent, future-oriented, self-controlled, middle-class citizen. In spite of the growth of preference for a Neutral view of man's nature, there is still a strong second-order preference for man as Evil but perfectible. This often makes parents vacillate, one moment feeling they ought to punish a misbehaving child to show him that there are rules he must obey, the next moment feeling guilty for not having offered a sufficiently appropriate model so that he would learn without punishment. The possibility that man is innately Good but corruptible exists only in the third-order least-preferred position, supported by a few nostalgic idealists who believe that man could be Good if it were not for the corrupting influences of urban life and modern times.

No culture is perfectly integrated, and strain can arise from any of several sources. The various dominant or first-order value choices may not fit well together. Or, because of rapid cultural change resulting from internal or external forces, the first-order preferences may cease to fit the actual circumstances of social life. Or, when large numbers migrate, the values of the newly arrived may clash with those prevailing in the country of adoption. When there is malintegration both within the original value profile of the migrating group and within the value pattern of the adopted country, the strain is doubled or tripled. Of several sources of strain in Puerto Rican life, two will be selected for discussion. These two are interrelated, and they will be presented as they affect generalized masculine-feminine sex-role patterning and, more specifically, the structuring of husband-wife and parent-child roles.

The first strain arises from the fragility of collaterally structured groups. The Puerto Rican family, with its laterally extended chains of relatives, is easily fractured by internal tension. The break most often occurs between the husband's relatives and the wife's relatives, placing a terrible strain on the husband-wife bond. The break may also come between siblings or between a parent and a child. Wherever it occurs, the rupture produces great anxiety in the family members most closely affected because of their training for dependency on the family and the multiply-reinforced need to preserve collateral relations at all costs. The fragility of the laterally extended family results from its great size and from the absence of a stable pattern of authority in the male line.

Problems of male authority are associated with a long-standing history of weak support for legal marriage in Puerto Rico. The origin of acceptance for alternate male-female household units is obscure. At any rate, the norms of the culture support both consensual (common-law) marriage, unblessed by either religious or legal sanction, and the maintenance by the male of a mistress with whom he does not live but by whom he may have children. In some cases, a man may be supporting a legal wife, a consensual wife, and a mistress, all of whom have borne him children.

This pattern of polygamy is costly to the structure of the collateral groupings. It is also costly in purely economic terms, since the man is expected (and usually tries) to support his wives and their children. And although he usually accepts the responsibility of fatherhood toward his children, both legitimate and illegitimate, he is able to be a father, in the sense of provid-
ing an adequate role model, toward only some of them. He would be unable to spend the amount of time in the various households where his children live to function adequately as a parent in all of them. Thus, a son may not often be exposed to his father, while living in close proximity to his mother.

Under these circumstances, the son’s identification with his mother is apt to be strong, and one might expect that his character structure would unconsciously be patterned in large part along feminine lines. Conscious, however, he usually has a strong identification with the absent father, an identification encouraged by whatever collateral male relationships the son can maintain and by the “machismo” image so important within the culture. Machismo refers to a pattern of belligerent masculinity and sexual dominance that the Puerto Rican male is expected to display under any possible situation of challenge. Though its overcompensatory quality is apparent to those outside the native culture, to those within a failure to display machismo in appropriate circumstances may result in social disgrace and ostracism.

The degree of male dominance thought to be suitable for a husband to maintain would fit better with first-order Lineal and Past Time value choices. Lineal values support authority lines more firmly than do Collateral values. Lineality endorses ordered positional succession over time, an oldest son replacing an infirm or dying father from the Crown Prince down to the lowliest subject. Past Time values provide the sanction of tradition for such inheritance of authority and responsibility in the male line. In a Present Time, Collateral system, there is no sanction for the transmission of authority to any particular son; all the sons, therefore, are likely to compete for dominance. Given a son’s generic problem with masculine identification, the problem of settling the question of dominance in the collateral system, and the difficulty of managing two or more households of wives and children, it is not surprising that the male asserts himself through a hypertrophied, self-reassuring masculinity when faced with a challenge to his authority or to his sexual competence.

What is the source of such challenge? Quite often it is the wives, who are the first to sense the intrinsic weakness of the male’s position. Since wives are required to be submissive, the challenging must be subtle. Frequently it is expressed through sexual coldness. Or it can be expressed through a wife’s managing to take care of household affairs without consulting her husband. The husband-wife roles feature much segregation of tasks and responsibilities, with the husband the nominal authority for major decisions. The husband’s frequent absences from home make the splitting up of tasks a practical arrangement. But they also provide the opportunity for the wife to make decisions and to carry out plans without consulting her husband. This is facilitated by her own collateral relatives, especially the women, who are usually around to help. Gradually, then, authority and responsibility shift to the wife and her female relatives, and a masked matriarchy is established. The husband either settles into this matriarchal system, comfortable so long as his authority is not overtly challenged, or he rebels and seeks solace with a consensual wife or a mistress.

Just as every social system has its strains, it also has compensatory mechanisms. The balance may be uneasy, but it is at least a working equilibrium. In Puerto Rico, the system of checks and balances within the family works. The collateral family network may cause hardship to one or another of its members; but, just as often, it provides him with its own special kind of support and protection.

The system works haltingly, however, for Puerto Ricans arriving in cities on the mainland, and the pressure to change over to the American family style is constant. A collateral network of relatives cannot easily be maintained in the cut-up, overcrowded tenements of metropolitan slums, designed for the small, nuclear, independent families preferred as the dominant American value. Isolation is the price of this independence, and
the loneliness of isolation is one of the strains of American life. This strain can be compensated for by rewards accruing to those who master the uprooted, wandering, but achieving path toward upward mobility and financial success; for new immigrants, though, there may be a long interval before there is even the faintest foretaste of this compensatory success. There may be special strains if only one side of the family network comes along on the migration. If it is the wife's family, the matriarchal pattern may attain unusual force; if it is the husband's, his dominance over his wife may become unbearable to her.

The situation is often exacerbated by problems of employment. The job market for unskilled and semi-skilled labor, the primary attraction for Puerto Ricans arriving on the mainland, is variable, sometimes glutted; the Puerto Rican male may find himself recurrently unemployed. If the collateral family system has arrived intact in the new environment, a small business like a grocery store, the family "bodega," may be set up and managed with all the relatives pitching in. Sometimes the husband finds employment in a service or manufacturing job, earning higher wages than were possible back home. Even these more successful ventures, however, often fail to result in a comfortable living standard, since higher costs of living quickly consume earnings.

The high birth rate required by the collateral family system in Puerto Rico is usually maintained after migration. A family of many children is, of course, difficult to support and particularly difficult to house in a crowded city. The decrepit brownstone tenements of New York's West Side absorb and expel these burgeoning families before they can establish any stable relations with neighbors, any sense of belonging, or any network of those community controls that regulate internal impulses within the native culture. Wandering in and out of the job market, moving his family frequently in a frustrating search for housing, the Puerto Rican husband may easily find his fragile sense of masculinity further weakened.

In Puerto Rico, the male was known to everyone in the community and in turn knew everyone. In the streets of an American city, he is largely unknown and hardly knows anyone. He may end up hardly recognizing himself. Self-recognition is also impaired by the change in his wife. In Puerto Rico, unmarried girls are vigilantly watched by their parents, who protect their virginity against the wicked natural tendency of males, married or unmarried, to seduce them. Girls are kept at home and carefully supervised. They marry at an early age to escape this surveillance and immediately begin having their own families. From then on, with the assistance of numerous female relatives, they keep busy with child-rearing and domestic tasks, while the husbands are off somewhere working or displaying masculinity in the company of others.

In the United States, however, the wife may not have collateral relatives near her to help with the child-rearing. She keenly feels the burden of many children and may deeply resent her husband's absence and his propensity for manly displays outside the home. She soon discovers, however, that, if her husband is not able to maintain the family's income, to manage its affairs effectively, or to give her the help she needs, the city's welfare agencies will come to her aid. She is not so dependent on her husband as in Puerto Rico and, therefore, under less obligation to fulfill his demands for passive, compliant behavior. The American pattern of feminine equality and relative independence is soon borne in upon her. As she finds the means to assert herself and her rights, she further reduces her husband's concept of himself as a self-respecting male. The strain on the marital bond sometimes becomes disruptive.

New conditions on the mainland also affect relations between parents and children. Shrinkage of the collateral network makes it impossible constantly to supervise children outside the home. Since self-control is not expected and since children are not assumed to be individuals capable of getting along by themselves, the world of the city streets seems especially evil and threatening, as, indeed, it often is.

The situation is most critical with respect to adolescent
It is impossible to supervise them strictly at all times. Furthermore, the centrifugal impact upon families of American schools and the firmly established, highly valued dating patterns are usually able to pry a girl away from the watchful eyes of her parents. Parental anxiety over the possibility of seduction and premarital pregnancy is enormously magnified, resulting either in attempts to increase supervision and control or in the abandonment of vigilance in the face of the American system, however immoral it seems. In either event, the anxiety is often transmitted to the daughter, who becomes strongly tempted to act out her parents' expectations of what will happen during her contacts with boys.

The control of sons is also difficult. The absent or careless father and the idea of compulsive masculinity have a damaging effect upon the growing boy's sense of male identity. The situation is magnified in the United States where there may be no other male relatives available as role models. Masculinity, then, becomes represented by the peer group and the street gang. The gang satisfies the need for impulse expression and an exhibitionistic display of male power, perhaps involving violence, to overcome internal uncertainties and weakness. The gang also channels the need for mastery away from the school situation. With or without a gang's influence, school performance is seriously jeopardized by the value patterns of Puerto Rican youths. Present Time, Being, and Collateral values are not conducive to the planning and hoarding of energies needed for application in intellectual areas. In addition, language difficulties and the middle-class expectations of American school teachers militate against the success of Puerto Rican students. Their drop-out rate, like that for all minority groups, is high. The gang, with its imaginative names, its projects, legal or illegal, and its team spirit, supplies an alternate climate for achievement. In a pale and corrupt way, the aims of the gang imitate the success motif of American society, while simultaneously satisfying the need for feelings of territoriality and community and for knowing who is who in one's neighborhood. Peer groups and gangs are sources of anxiety for Puerto Rican parents. Sometimes they try to tighten controls, but that strategy usually fails. Resenting the domineering father and the overprotective mother, a boy may stay away from home as much as possible, eventually ending up in the domineering and overprotective hands of the police and court authorities.

In one sense, this examination of the potential areas of stress confronting the newly-arrived, working-class Puerto Rican family has been pessimistic. There is no doubt that many families arrive in this country with a background of education and a set of values more concordant with American middle-class patterns. Such families suffer fewer strains. There is no doubt, furthermore, that second-generation parents and their children make the cultural transition to middle-class roles with less difficulty than the first generation to arrive in this country. On the other hand, some areas of strain have not been covered by this description. No reference, for example, has been made to skin color and the problems of race relations that Puerto Ricans experience.

The inspection of cultural sources of strain in family process is appropriate to many currents of contemporary life. The family is the crossroad—the nexus—at which social and personality factors intermingle in the formation of character structure. To understand a person, one must understand his family. To appreciate the form and function of the family, one must have in mind its cultural determinants. These are of utmost importance in assessing integration and conflict within a family and the psychic health and illness of its individual members.
CONTRASTS IN VALUES WITHIN THE NUCLEAR FAMILY OF MARIO C.

The last chapter delineated the difference in dominant value preferences between a working-class Puerto Rican culture and a middle-class American structure, in addition to pointing up some strains intrinsic to the set of Puerto Rican value preferences. It will be necessary now to look again at the situation prevailing within the family of Mario C. and Rosa C. at the time of the study and to notice the effects of these cultural determinants on their family process.

The core of the problem in the Mario C. family may be located in the husband-wife roles, which exhibited many of the strains typical of working-class Puerto Rican family life. Mario C. was influenced by the usual "machismo" patterning of the male role. It was extremely important to him to be regarded as a "macho," an assertive, competent, sexually aggressive male, and to see himself in that light. During the early years of their marriage while they were living in Puerto Rico, Rosa and her family tended to undermine his views of his own competence. The means for such undermining were present in the typical collateral fragility of the extended family system. While they were in Puerto Rico, the point of rupture between the two collateral families, with concomitant divisive effects on their marriage, was mainly provided by the mutual antagonism between Rosa and Catalina (HM). Rosa complained that Catalina interfered in their lives; Catalina complained that Rosa stole money for her "lazy" brother in New York. As tension mounted, Catalina put pressure on Mario to leave his wife, and their first separation occurred. Behind this overt fracture of the husband-wife bond lay the usual competition of the implicit matriarchal system. To whom was Mario to attach himself, his mother or his wife? To his own family or his wife's family?

The issue was resolved on that occasion by Mario's return to Rosa and their subsequent migration to New York to live with Rosa's mother. It is probable that various factors operated to determine Mario's choice. Rosa's family represented a tightly knit, harmonious clan, in contrast to the fragmented units available to him in his own family. It was equally important that, whereas Rosa was unacceptable to Mario's family, Mario was relatively acceptable to Rosa's family. It may be that Rosa was unacceptable because Mario's role as male head-of-the-house was of such urgent importance to his mother and sister that they could not tolerate his wife; nor could they have permitted him the culturally acceptable solution of leaving Rosa and simultaneously escaping from his mother by forming a relationship with a mistress or a common-law wife. At the intrapsychic dynamic level, Mario's choice was between Rosa as an uncertain dependency object who was sexually acceptable and his mother as a reliable dependency object who was sexually prohibited.

In New York, Mario settled down in the bosom of Rosa's family. With his mother far off in Puerto Rico, he was initially relieved of the strain of the competing collateral systems. In fact, Mario was happier with his wife's relatives than Rosa herself; for example, it was Rosa who objected to her brother and his family moving in with them and who insisted that Mario eject them. Mario's inclination to accept collaterality in the household in the form of overcrowded hospitality was opposed by Rosa not only because of the discomfort and inconvenience but also because her values were slowly, hesitantly moving toward a more middle-class orientation. Because of this change, Rosa did not want to have as frequent or as close contact with
her mother and siblings as Mario did. Her swing toward American middle-class orientation also made her decide to seek employment in an occupation outside the home. This decision precipitated intense quarreling between Mario and Rosa and signaled a further major step toward crisis in their family.

In the maternal environment of Rosa's family, Mario could maintain the "machismo" pattern outside the home without too much strain, but Rosa's steady drift toward independence from his domination constituted an increasing challenge to his masculine role at home. Mario's violent response to Rosa's working and her increasing control of family finances was, culturally speaking, merely an exaggeration of the customary reaction. As Mario's violence increased, Rosa's tendency to question his competence as a wage earner and husband also increased, producing a vicious circle of interaction.

When it became evident to Mario that his culturally legitimate masculine right to stormy and violent behavior would not bring about the expected submissiveness of his wife, he left her and returned to Puerto Rico to stay with his own family. Rosa, to emphasize her independence and her determination to assert her new-found rights, refused to let Mario have her address or to communicate with him. Expecting, however, that Mario would eventually ask to be taken back, she let it be known that he could return if he promised to refrain from further violence. The maneuver was, in effect, a manifesto demanding that Mario sanction her right not to live with him if he insisted on the Puerto Rican pattern of domestic abuse to obtain dominance. At the same time, undoubtedly anticipating the need for his cooperation in the purchase of her brother's store, she facilitated his return by appealing to him on the basis of the family's need for him. Because of Cara's illness, Mario gave in.

Following his return, Mario bought the grocery store, Rosa gave up her job to help him with the store, and their relations were again temporarily stabilized in a compromise pattern. Running a family business gave Mario some area for expressing his masculine assertiveness and gave Rosa some hope that the store would provide enough income for them to make adjustments to the American success pattern. Underneath the compromise, however, lay the strain of Rosa's chronic doubt that Mario could perform successfully and with restraint in the American pattern and her tendency to depreciate him because of that doubt.

This was the setting at the time of the death of Catalina (HM) and the sudden eruption of Mario's psychosis. In losing his mother, Mario lost the mainstay of his collateral support system. His siblings could not be depended upon to take him in and buoy him up when he had trouble with his wife and family. Furthermore, Catalina (HM) had endorsed and often prompted Mario's expression of masculinity through abusive demands for submissiveness from Rosa. Even though he was no longer able to enforce these violently because of Rosa's ultimatum, he still wished to do so, and Catalina's death removed a principal validation for his definition of his own masculinity.

With all this concern for his masculinity, it must be remembered that Mario himself had grown up within a typical masked matriarchy in which the mother represented control and restraint. Ordinarily, the release of such restraints is described in terms of the "secondary gain" of illness. In this instance, however, even more was involved. Mario's culture actively subscribes to the proposition that "spirits" may gain access to the person and influence his behavior in ways for which he is not responsible. This is an intrinsic feature of "spiritualism" and is akin to the "voodoo" culture of Haiti and other Caribbean societies. From the cultural point of view, what is significant is that the person possessed by spirits is not ill, but merely possessed, and that a religious phenomenon must be dealt with differently from an illness and differently from deliberately bizarre behavior. In becoming psychotic, Mario was, in part, acting out a culturally prescribed role for which there were many precedents in his family. Both his mother and aunt were known for their susceptibility to seizures. He was unwittingly taking full advantage of his cultural prerogative; his psychosis represented
a last desperate attempt to force his wife and her family to accept his male dominance.

This definition of the "sick role" was quite clearly perceived by Rosa and the children. His "craziness" was described to the observers with amusement and understanding. It was the use of his psychosis to get his own way, to control his family by threats and by physical attacks that in the end could not be tolerated.

The hidden, unverbalized contest over who and what was to determine role definitions in the family also governed the relations between the observers and the spouses. As long as Rosa could believe that the observers would "cure" Mario's belligerent domineering as a part of his psychosis, she was able to cooperate. When she discovered that they would not take sides in the dispute and would not persuade Mario to conform to her wishes and values, she became actively resentful of their presence. For her, there was no middle ground; the observers were either for her or against her. Eventually she came to regard the observers' nonintervention as an active sanction of Mario's domineering behavior. At that point, her long struggle for her right to live with Mario on her terms was concluded. She gave up. Subsequently, all her efforts were directed to undermining Mario in order to establish that he was not a man with whom she could live. In the end, her effort to separate fully and finally from her husband was successful.

Rosa's effort to separate was facilitated not only by her collateral relatives but also by her having found a man whose value orientations and aspirations were more in line with her tentative steps toward an American middle-class value system. The Puerto Rican values were still evident in her willingness to live in consensual marriage with him. But, so far as the observers could determine, the relationship was characterized by the determination of Rosa and her new "husband" to establish a small, independent, nuclear family with shared responsibility, educational aspirations for the children, and freedom from their collateral families.

For his part, when his psychosis failed to scare his wife into submission, Mario became depressed. His illness not only had failed to strengthen his position, but had further and fatally weakened it. Now, even when he was symptom-free, Rosa was able to deflate his image of himself as a "macho" by implying that any behavior of which she disapproved was a sign of imminent relapse and need for hospitalization. The emptiness of their marriage and the lack of hope for any viable compromise between Mario's and Rosa's values became brutally clear. The grocery store, the symbol and means of their earlier compromise, was in a state of ruin, with Mario in the position of its incompetent owner. Financially and emotionally bankrupt, he had no choice but to accept the separation he had so long been postponing and to retreat to Puerto Rico and his collateral relatives there.

In Puerto Rico, the restorative process that had eluded him in New York eventually began to operate. At first, the reaction to the loss of mother, wife, and children precipitated fresh regression. Slowly, however, with some help from his siblings, he was able to face these losses and to reconstruct his life in accordance with traditional Puerto Rican values. No longer undervalued by Rosa's expectations for a male role whose terms he did not understand and could not meet, the internal integrative process sealed over the memory of failure. He then became able to explore relations with women who were able to accept and appreciate that kind of male role he knew how to act. He was again respected, a "macho," able to master his everyday circumstances and to perform creditably.

To say that Mario's psychosis was caused by his marriage and cured by its dissolution is an oversimplification. It has been shown that considerable light can be thrown on his psychosis exclusively in terms of strains caused by discordant value orientations between him and his milieu as well as between him and Rosa within the nuclear family. In any case, the description of cultural and family strains is only the beginning of the diagnostic process. It approaches the background of the problems in the
family, delineating normative expectations and departures from them on the basis of which health or pathology in interpersonal relations is perceived. Interpersonal, intrapsychic, and biological levels of integration must all be explored for a full elucidation of any state of illness.

Even without an effort to collect data required for detailed analysis at these levels, however, the family case history as presented provides glimpses of the kinds of family interactions characteristic of Mario, Rosa, and their children. The history supplies a picture of the interaction of Mario and Rosa when Mario's psychosis was at its height during the time of psychological testing. Mario's provoking, overassertive, and illogical behavior was evident in his relationship to both Rosa and the tester; equally evident was Rosa's way of evading a direct challenge to Mario while subtly correcting him by revealing his errors. The subtle and not-so-subtle unmasking of Mario in the home by Rosa and the children is illustrated somewhat later in the case history along with the coalition of Rosa and the children and Mario's consequent isolation from the nuclear family. The history gives evidence of the see-saw struggle between Mario and Rosa: he attempting to maintain face by lord it over his family; she, with the children, resisting through humor, mocking behavior, or pretenses to follow orders while actually disobeying. As the history progresses, Mario's violence is described as increasing periodically, such increases correlated with Rosa's efforts to distort the meaning of his behavior in her ever more vigorous attempt to undermine his position as the center of authority in the home. Interactions of this sort were a vicious circle from which husband and wife were unable to extricate themselves. The more Rosa distorted, the more Mario defied and threatened her. The more he threatened her, the more she distorted. This process, as recounted in the history, led to fresh outbreaks of Mario's overt psychosis and to the ultimate collapse of his position in the extended family and in the community. With the final disintegration of his position as a person entitled to respect in the community, especially among his customers at the store, Mario became withdrawn and depressed. His interactions with Rosa and the children then became wholly concerned with disposing of the store and separating from his family.

It seems evident to us that these kinds of communications and interactions achieve their significance only within the framework of the cultural and extended family process already described. Why was it necessary for Rosa to distort and for Mario to threaten? Were they both innately evil? Or merely ignorant and stupid? Or so basically anxious and immature that they could not behave otherwise? Such explanations have been advanced in the past and have found acceptance. That they cannot be wholly accurate is indicated by the change in Mario and Rosa under other circumstances. Rosa turned out to be a non-manipulative person when she found a husband whose values corresponded to her own; Mario became calm and non-threatening when, in the context of his extended family in Puerto Rico, he found a woman who accepted him as a "macho." Nevertheless, there is a measure of truth in the imperfect explanations. The evil that is in men—that is, their hostile destructiveness—was maximally stimulated by the conflict in values between the spouses. They were ignorant of better ways to cope with the conflict, even of the nature of the conflict dividing them. And they both displayed various defenses against anxiety that obscured the real nature of their problem and gave rise to remarkably maladaptive behavior. Over and above all these causes of their difficulties in interpersonal relations, however, were the cultural process and changing patterns in values and domestic roles in Puerto Rico, and the gulf between these values and middle-class values in the United States. Mario and Rosa were caught up in these contrasts, and they responded in increasingly divergent ways.

Similar considerations apply to the psychodynamic formulations. Here the reference is directed more to the norms for expected behavior, overtly interpersonal or in fantasy, for children within a particular culture. For example, the judgment that
Mario exhibited intense dependent needs as an adult and that as a child he was unusually close to his mother is based upon an implicit assessment of the norms for dependency in adulthood and for affiliation of a son with a mother during childhood. That such norms vary with different cultures may not ordinarily be treated in a systematic fashion, but some slight attention to this matter is almost always given in the course of a clinical-diagnostic conference. Again, the differences are not basic but, rather, a matter of emphasis and systemization.

If it is conceded that the family case history and diagnosis do systematize, conceptually and procedurally, the cultural and interpersonal factors traditionally used to make an individual diagnosis, then the scheduling of items in the reconstructed family case history, called for by the outline presented in Appendix A, falls into perspective. In order to develop the cultural and interpersonal story as it occurred over the generations, information must be programmed in a definite order. From the picture derived in this systematic fashion emerge the clinical and psychodynamic phenomena used in the assessment of psychopathology within the individual. Without such an assessment, the family case history is incomplete. By the same token, without a reconstruction of the family case history, the assessment of individual psychopathology is incomplete. Each is complementary to the other.

In the last chapter, we looked at the multiple causes of the maladaptive behavior between Mario and Rosa primarily as a phenomenon of the nuclear family. Influences on the behavior emanating from the extended family chains were mentioned, but only as background material, as the soil, so to speak, in which the difficulties of the spouses were rooted.

It is now time to regard these extended families as systems in their own right. This requires a shift in focus. The problems of Mario and Rosa will now appear as reverberations of the strains in each of the two family systems. The Mario C. family, the focal family on the chart of extended family fields, will now become only one of the several foci of strain and conflict in the extended families. Admittedly, it is the trouble spot most clearly in view because information-gathering procedures spent most time on the focal family. The outline for the acquisition and assembly of the data on family processes, however, resulted in bringing to light other trouble spots sufficiently obvious to invite our scrutiny.

To look at the extended family chains as systems *sui generis* follows a strategy of family diagnosis discussed in Chapter 2. Integration and conflict in any one nuclear family do not appear clearly, cannot be conceptualized with accuracy, except as reflecting integration and strain in the larger system. To introduce a disease analogy, we would not be able to identify typhoid fever in an isolated patient except as a manifestation of
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a complex process involving definable systems of bacteria, food, typhoid carriers, feces, flies, and dwelling places.

Even a cursory reading of the family case history reveals clear differences in the life styles of Mario's and Rosa's clans. As a group, Mario's family members tend to show violence, dramatic overstatement, quarrelsome and suspicious behavior, and ambition. For the most part, they are hard-working, they value education, and they strive to improve their economic and occupational positions. But they are often outrageously manipulative in their relations with each other and with outsiders; at other times, they permit themselves to be manipulated unnecessarily. Rosa's family, in contrast, are characterized by a slow, somewhat genteel, downward social mobility. The family members stick together, giving each other much support. They seldom get angry or disappointed with each other; they accept life as it comes. Little or no emphasis is given to education or occupational achievement. The hysterical outbursts of spiritualistic possession and the appearance of animistic or “folk” medical practices of Mario's family are unknown in Rosa's family system.

These differences are associated with relevant variations in the manifestations of integration and conflict in both groups. Mario's family are, for the most part, willing to help each other financially or in other ways whenever the help is associated with an improvement in life circumstances. This sort of aid is likely to be proffered even when it causes other serious strains. For example, Sandor (HF) used a large part of his life savings to buy a house for Catalina (HM) and the children, even though he knew that she was in the process of permanently separating from him. Catalina (HM) bought a liquor and food store for Mario despite her disapproval of his marriage and over the opposition of his wife. Mario tried to get $500 from Rosa (under false pretenses) to send to his father, even though father and son had had little to do with each other recently. The most spectacular of these family savings-and-loan operations was the siblings' permitting their sister Lotta to acquire Catalina's house by buying them off with a token compensation; because she was lonely and disturbed, they put up with her financial manipulation.

As a result of such help and prompting, several of Mario's generation of his family have managed to improve their status. Three finished high school (Lotta, Alfonso, and Hector), and Hector graduated from the University of Puerto Rico. Three others had some high school education (Maria, Roberto, and Johnny), while two failed to complete the primary grades (Mario and Juan). Four managed to attain middle-class status in occupational and residential terms (Maria, Lotta, Alfonso, and Hector), in contrast to the other four, including Mario, who remained at the working-class level. It is interesting that, among the four siblings who migrated to the mainland (Maria, Lotta, Alfonso, and Hector), in contrast to the other four, including Mario, only Maria achieved middle-class status, whereas, of the four remaining in Puerto Rico, all but Johnny rose to the middle class. Apparently, the promised land failed to live up to its image for most of the migrating siblings, at least in the migrants' own generation.

Another sign of the integrative potential of Mario's family is the stability—Mario excepted—of the children's marriages. There were no divorces or separations, and we have seen how steadfastly Mario himself struggled to maintain his marriage. His sister Lotta never married, but she seems to have been a special case. (In large family systems, it often happens that one child, usually a daughter, is selected to stay close to the parents and to be the caretaker for their old age. This child tends to be discouraged from marrying by parental disapproval of every known suitor; sometimes she is forbidden to marry. The record shows that Catalina (HM) not only actively opposed a suitor but frowned on any dating for Lotta.) The degree of marital stability shown by the other siblings is not only atypical for Puerto Rican culture but is also in marked contrast to the marital instability of their parents, Sandor and Catalina.

In contrast to these positive aspects of the family system are negative features that weaken the fabric of their life style. Often
the support and closeness that one family member offers another is conditional upon a slavish dependency and submissiveness enforced by punitive measures. The violent parental conflict to which Mario was exposed during his childhood was a prolonged struggle for dominance. Sandor tried to master his rebellious wife by terrorizing, brutal behavior. Both Sandor and Catalina beat their children severely for challenges to their authority. The use of harassment to establish authority and quash rebellion resulted in a kind of clinging, masochistic dependence among the children, alternating with a defiant, domineering behavior. This oscillation seems clearest in Lotta and Mario. Mario was known for his closeness to both parents and his desire to serve them; once he beat his brother Johnny for not showing them enough respect. Yet it was Mario who defied his drunken father and took away the gun with which Sandor was threatening Catalina. In his youth, Mario was submissively close to Lotta while Lotta was submissive to their mother; when Mario became engaged, Lotta did her best to break up the relationship so as to retain control over Mario and told Rosa that Mario was dating another girl. When Mario learned of this, he reacted characteristically with a threat to kill Lotta. Much later, Lotta responded with bitterness to Hector's and Johnny's desire to leave her home to get married. Finally, when Mario returned to Puerto Rico after the terminal separation from Rosa and made his home with Lotta, she treated him like a personal servant, as though his illness reinforced her desire to display her family's typical tyrannical control over a younger, weaker member.

The seams and cracks in the family structure—and the cement as well—are now clearly visible. It is a system that demands and fosters achievement at the price of dependence—a paradoxical combination. To maximize achievement requires a diminution of dependence; but the attempt to resist dependence is interpreted in this family as rebellion and countered with open punishment or behind-the-scenes manipulation. Some of the family members were able to juggle these contradictory directives, holding them in a kind of equilibrium that permitted them to preserve their balance between the family and the outside world. We do not have enough information to know how they did this. As usual, the successful adaptations among members of a large family attract little attention; and the observational resources available for this study were unequal to the task of gathering all the information needed for a full understanding of how the family system operated. Accordingly, we do not know what sort of personal and family relations were characteristic of Maria, Roberto, Alfonso, Hector, and Juan. We only know that they experienced no difficulties reported by our chief informants.

What kinds of values can be associated with the paradoxical behavior features exhibited by Mario's family? If one assesses the probable value orientation profiles in the first three of the five categories previously discussed—Time, Activity, and Relational orientations—then a most interesting pattern emerges. (See Table 2.)

**Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalized C. Family Value Orientation Profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several interesting aspects of this profile. First, the equal preference for Being and Doing and the preference for Lineal over Collateral Relations diverge somewhat from the typical working-class pattern in Puerto Rico. Of more importance, however, is the awkward combination provided by the family's first-order choices. Time problems tend to be settled on the basis of the Present; thus there is a lack of ordered perception of change over time. There is no clear-cut preference for Being or Doing; in other words, both achievement and dramatic
expressiveness are equally valued. Or, to put the issue differently, both are regarded as equally valid solutions for situations of tension or frustration. Group decision and control proceed on the basis of Lineal hierarchy; tension generated by this system of dictatorial command can be dissipated either through the creation of stormy emotional scenes followed by reconciliation, or through a maximum effort to achieve and thereby to win some freedom from the stringent demands of the control system. But the path to educational and occupational achievement is made difficult by the lack of a primary orientation toward the Future. This obstacle puts a premium on the attempt to achieve success through manipulating and victimizing rivals, a feature of many success-hungry, Present-Time oriented, Lineally-organized groups, such as gamblers and gangsters.

The pathological consequences of this configuration of values show up most conspicuously in Sandor, Catalina, Aunt Cara, Lotta, Roberto, and Mario. Sandor (HF) and Catalina (HM) spent most of their married life fighting until they separated; Sandor did not get along any better with his new common-law wife, Anna Porfirio, who also left him. Catalina and Cara (HMS) were both subject to wild, hysterical seizures that the family considered episodes of demonic possession. Lotta (HS) quarreled with, clung to, and manipulated her brothers and was defiant and disrespectful toward her father. Roberto (HB) and Mario fought continuously and refused to speak to each other for two years. Catalina constantly urged Mario to separate from Rosa and made her daughter-in-law's life as unpleasant as she could. When Mario tried to throw himself into his mother's grave, shouting, "Esta encima de mi," he meant to convey the feeling that he was possessed by his dead mother's spirit. But his literal translation, "My mother is on top of me," conveys in the clearest fashion the dysfunctional properties of the lineal, hierarchical, and domineering system of relations existing in the family.

As we have noted earlier, the first choice of the Lineal solution is not characteristic of the dominant Puerto Rican value system. Our information is insufficient to explain how Mario's extended family developed such a strong Lineal orientation. Perhaps it is significant that Catalina's paternal grandfather emigrated from Germany and her paternal grandmother was born in Holland; both of these countries are characterized by a dominantly Lineal relational orientation. All we know about the inheritance of Sandor (HF) is that a struggle for dominance flourished among his siblings and that two of his brothers probably killed each other in a fight. In the preceding generation, there was a similar struggle among siblings; Sandor's father (HFF) was forced off his land by an older brother and given $100 for property worth much more. Thus it seems that intensely stratified interpersonal relations and the use of force to maintain dominance descend from both sides of Mario's family field.

In contrast to the variant preferences of Mario's family, Rosa's family are fairly well in line with the main directions of Puerto Rican life in the first quarter of this century. With the exception of the downward mobility on both sides of Rosa's family field, the family's life style before migration was not distinguishable from that of many rural island families living on slowly decaying farms. And even the descent into poverty may not have been as dramatic as it is portrayed in retrospect. The story that Francisco's parents (WFF and WFM) were rich enough to "put gold coins out to dry" has the overblown, romantic sound of a family myth. That Francisco's father (WFF) dissipated the family resources by living lavishly and not working probably approximates the truth. Either because of lack of interest or lack of knowledge, he failed to run the farm profitably.

Somewhat the same fate seems to have overtaken the parents of Isabella, Rosa's mother. Rafael Bernard (WMF) came to Puerto Rico with an inheritance that he dissipated after purchasing a farm. He is described as well educated and well mannered, but "lazy." Isabella's mother (WMM) is similarly described as a delicate, refined lady of a good family. By the time of the marriage between Francisco and Isabella nothing
was left of either family's fortune except the run-down farm on which they lived while Francisco supported his family as a railroad worker.

Marital relations between Isabella and Francisco were tranquil. He was amiable and hard-working but unambitious, and he liked to drink and gamble with his male friends on weekends; Isabella did not object. In the customary Puerto Rican fashion, she supported him as the ideal head-of-family while herself making all important decisions and carrying out most family responsibilities. The integration of the family rested on the implicit matriarchy, an efficient mechanism for the easy-going, extended family networks of the Puerto Rican farms and villages.

This easy, warm atmosphere prevailed in relations between siblings and parents. Rosa's father hated to discipline the children and left most of this to the mother. School work and occupational training were not emphasized. The children played with their cousins under the supervision of older relatives in a rural setting. A similar life style continued when, after the death of Francisco (WF), the family left the farm and moved to a village. Later, Isabella and all her children and their nuclear families little by little migrated to New York so that the collateral extended family system remained intact and efficient in the new environment.

That system fosters security while discouraging change. All the children who moved to New York remained in working-class occupations, and, with the exception of Rosa's moderate shift toward middle-class aspirations, were reasonably content. Even in Rosa's case, the impetus toward change did not come from within her family system, but came about because the family system was not working well for her; in her restructuring of values, the pull of the American value system made itself felt.

The transfer of Puerto Rican rural family patterns to the New York scene has included, for Rosa's family, the preservation of some traditional marital instability. Francisco Garcia separated from his wife. Manuela divorced an alcoholic husband and remarried. Fidelio married a divorcée who deceived him about the number of children she had borne her previous husband. Jimmy separated from his wife and was living with his mother at the time of the investigation. Rosa's separation and subsequent divorce from Mario were, therefore, wholly in accord with her family's custom.

Long-standing family customs, along with their supporting values, confer a peculiar sense of propriety upon the self-image of family members. To the C.'s (Mario excepted), the casual, easy-going acceptance of lower-class status and marital instability shown by Rosa's family looked like unpardonable shiftlessness. They thought that Mario had married beneath himself, and they worked to extricate him from this error. To Rosa's family, the C.'s seemed excitable, quarrelsome, and pushy to the point of madness. They thought of Mario's relatives as a bunch of "crazy people." Though they tolerated Mario's "craziness," as they accepted many other mixtures of the good and the bad, they were not in the least impressed with his or his family's social standards. The lack of meshing between the two family self-images and the projective qualities of each guaranteed an extended family conflict of nearly irreconcilable proportions. Mario's family members were unable to see the defects that Rosa's relatives saw in them, and vice versa. Nor could either family appreciate the strengths of the other. Therefore, contact between the two family systems tended to maximize the most disruptive features within each of them.

This point is of great importance to the micro-sociology of conflict in extended family systems. When two incompatible systems are required to establish transactions, each makes the other look worse than it actually is—that is, more irrational, more disruptive, more damaging to its constituent members. The apparent unreasonableness of interactions between the two families, their lack of effective ways of reducing conflict, cast an aura of bad faith and evil motivations on both camps. The resulting gloom and doom and the tendency to blame the other side give rise to a spiral of hopelessness and impatience that can
be terminated only by violence, exhaustion, or total disengagement.

It seems apparent that the dynamics of such conflicts can be detected in larger-than-family systems, for example, in the interplay of political organizations and in the relations between nations. It is tempting to elaborate the parallels and to think of exploring the general features of integration and conflict between extended systems of all sorts. In this report, however, our aim is more restricted: to demonstrate the relevance of the history of the extended family systems to the dynamic interactions within the nuclear family and, thus, to the mental health and illness of its individual members.

Appendix A

FAMILY CASE HISTORY OUTLINE

I. Description of Presenting Family Problems and Focus of Initial Contact

There are two main considerations here that must be distinguished because they cross-cut each other in complex interrelations. One concerns the purposes or aims held by the investigators; we may call this consideration the "objectives" of the contact or referral. The second concerns the definition of the problem held by the family; this consideration can be called the "presenting problem." Each of these areas of concern should be broken down into its component parts.

A. Context

State whether the description is being made after only a few diagnostic interviews with family members or from the perspective of an intensive and prolonged study of the family. Specify whether the interviews have been structured or unstructured; where they have taken place (i.e., in the office, in the hospital, in the home, or elsewhere); who has conducted the interviews and whether the interviews have occurred individually or in a group. Include an estimate of frequency of interviews and average length of the interview.

B. The "Objectives" of the Investigators

C. The "Presenting Problem" as Defined by Family Members

This should include discrepancies and agreements about its definition.

D. The "Presenting Problem" as Defined by Investigators

This should include clinical descriptions of symptomatic behavior in family members. Since divergences in impressions between family members and professional personnel are influenced, to some extent, by differences in
the ethnic origin, social class background, and professional training of the investigators, information about these matters should be stated explicitly, as under item II E below.

II. Composition and Characteristics of Focal Family

A. Composition of Household
   1. Names, ages, dates and places of birth and death, and kinship roles of all members of the focal family.
   2. Names, sex, ages, dates and places of birth, dates of death, and kinship roles of all other members of household unit.
   3. Date and place of marriage of parents in the focal family.

B. Social Characteristics
   1. Ethnicity, religion, occupation, and estimate of class position of members of focal family and household unit.
   2. Description of dwelling and neighborhood.
   3. Previous residences of focal family.

These items should all be filled out in sufficient detail to give them specific content. For example, if the family is of Italian descent, it is well to state whether from northern or southern, rural or urban Italy, plus the names of the city or village if known. State generation of emigration to this country if possible. If the family is of mixed origins, they should be described. If the family has been geographically mobile in this country, give some indication of the movements. Include language spoken in the home. For religion, specify denomination and subdivision within denomination (such as “high” or “low,” “orthodox” or “conservative”) if this is important. Husband’s and wife’s occupations should be described in sufficient detail to provide a picture of the duties and responsibilities of the job, training required, and position within an organizational structure. If the socio-economic class status has been assessed in accordance with a formal system, such as that of Warner or Hollingshead, this should be stated. Otherwise, state the items on the basis of which class status is assessed and describe them. They should include, in addition to occupation, the amount and sources of income, the education of husband and wife, schools attended by the children, the characteristics of the neighborhood and community, and the dwelling in which the family lives.

C. Behavioral Characteristics: Appearance and General Modes of Behavior and of Interaction of Family Members of the Focal.

This section requires a physical description of each family member and a brief characterization of the way that person behaves with the observer or interviewer. Because there will inevitably be a subjective bias in the way any one observer sees that person, the observer responsible for the description should be identified. The description should be behavioral and phenomenological rather than couched in the words of a particular professional language or deduced in accordance with a particular theory of behavior, psychoanalytic or otherwise. We have found that it is often difficult to get agreement among a number of observers as to the simplest matters of physical description, such as whether a person is tall, short, of medium build or chubby, blonde or brunette, plain or beautiful. Even in plain language, it is often difficult to get agreement about behavior; professional language often seems to be used to evade this problem. Observers should discuss their findings with each other so that some degree of consensus is reached.

D. Summary of Psychological Test Data
   1. For individual family members.
   2. For family as a group.

E. Social Characteristics of Therapists, Observers, Raters, or Recorders in Contact with Members of Focal Family

The items should include age, sex, occupational status, religion, ethnic or national affiliation, and socio-class status of each professional, semi-professional, or non-professional in contact with family members.

III. Composition and Characteristics of Units in the Family Fields

A. Husband's Field
   1. H IV-A
   2. H IV-B
   3. H IV-C
IV. Relations of Focal Family with Other Family Units
   in the Contemporary Fields

Specify collateral or extended family units to whom focal family is close, or with whom focal family is in conflict, or about whom there is conflict in the focal family, as well as those units who have no importance to focal family members, or with whom there is no effective relationship, including reasons therefore.

V. Developmental Background of Husband and Wife

The listing of items for husband and wife is meant to be exhaustive. It will often be unrealistic to expect to obtain all the information asked for in each category. Even so, the list of items will serve as a check for assessing what relevant information was or was not obtained.

A. Husband

1. Chief facts of childhood, from birth to 12 years of age.
   a. Body management patterns: mode and chronology of feeding, weaning, sleeping, sitting, walking, talking, toilet training, sexual behavior, time-space-object coordination, energy level, tempo, and frustration tolerance.
   b. Relations with parents, siblings, significant members of the extended family, and other adults. Effects of significant changes in household composition.
2. Chief facts of adolescence, from 12 to 18 years of age.
   a. Sexual maturation patterns; parents' mode of handling age and sex roles.
   b. Relations with parents, siblings, significant members of extended family, and other adults. Effects of significant changes in household composition.
   c. Dating patterns and sexual experiences.
   d. Associations with peers.
   e. School life.
   f. Illnesses and symptomatic behavior.
   g. Traumas and unusual experiences.
   h. Participation in family routines and division of labor.
   i. Patterns of class and neighborhood, and ethnic identifications and associations.
   j. Extra-familial associations, both institutionalized and non-institutionalized.
3. Chief facts of adult life up to courtship period.
   a. Place of residence as an adult.
   b. Dating and premarital sexual patterns.
   c. Relations with parents, siblings, significant members of extended family, and other adults. Effects of significant changes in household composition.
   d. Occupational sequences.
   e. Experience in military service.

B. Wife

1. (Repeat items under V-A.1.)
2. Chief facts of adolescence, from 12 to 18 years of age.
   a. Sexual maturation patterns; parents' mode of handling age and sex roles.
   b. Relations with parents, siblings, significant members of extended family, and other adults. Effects of significant changes in household composition.
   c. Dating patterns and sexual experiences.
   d. Associations with peers.
   e. School life.
   f. Illnesses and symptomatic behavior.
   g. Traumas and unusual experiences.
   h. Participation in family routines and division of labor.
   i. Patterns of class and neighborhood, and ethnic identifications and associations.
   j. Extra-familial associations, both institutionalized and non-institutionalized.
a. Sexual maturation patterns; parents' mode of handling age and sex roles. Date of menarche and memory of the circumstances.
b. (Repeat items V-A.2, b through k.)
3. (Repeat items under V-A.3.)

VI. Courtship
A. Initial relationship
1. Circumstances of meeting or introduction.
2. Dating patterns.
3. Length and vicissitudes of courtship.
4. Attitudes of husband's and wife's parents and relatives toward dating and courtship.
B. Marriage proposal
C. Engagement period
D. Wedding and honeymoon

VII. Marriage and Course of Focal Family
A. Initial Adjustment until Birth of First Child
1. Residence: neighborhood, dwelling, proximity to in-laws.
2. Composition of household.
3. Occupation of husband and wife.
4. Income and outgo.
5. Family routines and rituals; division of labor, responsibility, and decision-making.
   a. Housekeeping and fixing.
   b. Social activities.
6. Interaction with families in extended network.
7. Recreational patterns, interests and hobbies.
8. Patterns of class and neighborhood, and ethnic associations and identifications.
10. Sexual adjustment.
11. Attitudes toward each other.
12. Attitudes toward self.
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B. Birth of First Child
1. Planning procedures for pregnancy or for contraception.
2. Attitudes of husband, wife, and relatives toward pregnancy.
3. Events of prenatal period, labor, delivery.
4. Significant events of postpartum period.
C. Adjustment of Husband and Wife after Birth of First Child
1. Any changes in VII-A.
2. Attitudes of husband and wife toward child.
D. Developmental History of First Child up to Birth of Second Child (Repeat V-A, insofar as it is applicable.)
E. Birth of Second Child
1. (Repeat VII-B.)
2. Impact of second child on first child.
F. Adjustments in Family after Birth of Second Child
1. (Repeat VII-C.)
2. (Continue developmental history of first child.)
G. Developmental History of Second Child up to Birth of Third Child (Repeat V-A, insofar as it is applicable.)
H. Birth of Third and Subsequent Children (Repeat VII-B through VII-G.)
I. Adjustments in Family after Birth of Last or Latest Child

VIII. Family Relations Prevailing at Time of Referral or First Contact

IX. Initial Diagnostic Formulation
A. Chief Areas of Integration; Modes of Problem Solving
B. Chief Areas of Conflict; Modes of Avoidance of Intensification

X. Changes in Family During Period of Study or Treatment

XI. Final Evaluation and Prediction of Future Trends

XII. Changes and Developments Subsequent to Period of Study or Treatment
Figure 11 The Corso-Torres Family Fields

Direct lines of ascent
Indirect lines of descent
Appendix B

CASE HISTORY OF THE MARIO C. FAMILY *

I. Description of Presenting Family Problems and Focus of Initial Contact

A. Context

The interviews that yielded the following information were conducted during an intensive study of the family from March 1962 to November 1963, followed by less frequent contacts until February 1965. During the time of the intensive phase, the family was seen irregularly but frequently at the hospital, at their home, and at their store, in varying combinations, by two interviewers, both singly and together. In addition, the husband’s father, sister, and aunt were interviewed in Puerto Rico, and there were fleeting contacts with other members of the extended family. In the last stages of the study, the wife was seen in New York and the husband in Puerto Rico. The interviewers were a psychiatrist and a social worker.

B. The “Objectives” of the Investigators

The interviewers did not undertake “family therapy” or individual psychotherapy with family members, but made every effort to conduct a naturalistic observation of the family in order to describe the character of the husband’s illness as a part of the ongoing behavior of the family as a whole. The husband, who had periodic psychotic episodes, was treated by hospitalization and supportive therapy, including drug therapy, by staff members of the Bronx Municipal Hospital Center. The interviewers were engaged on a research project, studying a Puerto Rican family with a psychotic member in order to develop and document the family case history outline in preparation by the GAP Committee on the Family. The couple were contacted just prior to the husband’s discharge from the hospital, to which he had been admitted with psychotic symptoms. They were told that the hospital staff was dissatisfied with the results of treatment of most Puerto Rican patients and felt this might be because they lacked knowledge about the patterns of family life among Puerto Ricans. Mario C. and his wife, Rosa, agreed to a series of interviews. It was apparent from the start, however, that the family viewed the interviews primarily as treatment in connection with Mario’s breakdown.

C. The “Presenting Problem” as Defined by Family Members

Mario C. had been brought by his wife to the psychiatric service of the Bronx Municipal Hospital Center (the teaching hospital of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University) in January 1962, two months prior to the beginning of the investigation. His admission record indicates that Mario C. was in an acutely anxious state, shouting, “I’m going to die, she is going to kill me.” His wife stated that he had been nervous for many years and prone to outbursts of verbal and physical violence, though heretofore coherent and not out of control for any great length of time. She had brought him to the hospital because of an illness that began suddenly and dramatically six days before, when Mario was notified that his mother had died unexpectedly in Puerto Rico. He became upset. Within a matter of hours, he was on a plane and headed for the funeral in Puerto Rico. Other family members had told Rosa that he behaved wildly at the funeral, trying to throw himself on his mother’s grave, saying that he was with his mother, that she was on top of him.* Four days later, according to Rosa, he returned to New York, grossly incoherent and extremely excited. He talked of his going to die and began to confuse his wife with his mother.

*Names and places have been changed to preserve the anonymity of family members.

The phrase “She was on top of me” appeared in the initial intake for Mr. C. and was translated literally by him from the Spanish idiom “esta encima de mi,” which really means “being possessed by someone” and is used to express the feeling that somebody is “with me” or “on my back.”
He had hallucinations that his mother was with him. The day before admission to the hospital, Mario had tried to pull the coat off a woman in the church where he was attending service with his family. He lit a fire and began burning his hands. He started punching his wife's brother. That evening, at his request, he was taken to his mother-in-law's house for a family gathering. He proceeded to drag the women into the bedroom with him, seeking to have relations with them. His wife became agitated when he began to pull his goddaughter, a girl of 12, into the bedroom. The family brought him to the emergency room at the hospital, where he was seen by the admitting psychiatrist and given high dosages of Thorazine to be taken at home. Even with the medication, he remained agitated and restless. He was brought back the following night and was then admitted to the hospital.

D. The "Presenting Problem" as Defined by Investigators

The investigators had access to hospital admission notes to describe Mario's condition on admission. At that time, according to the records, Mario C. paced the room, appeared distracted, and was apparently hallucinating throughout the interview. He tried several times to make physical contact with the admissions interviewer (a woman), kissing, touching her shoulders, shaking her hand. He manifested gross thought disorder with loosening of association. ("I'm going to be killed. I will not die. I have to shit, please let me go and shit.") He appeared to be trying to control aggressive behavior. He had auditory hallucinations in the form of commands. ("Don't do this, don't do that, or you will be killed.") He had visual hallucinations involving his wife and mother. He didn't know the date exactly; he was off by two days. He was oriented, though, to place and person. He was able to do serial sevens. His general information was poor. He showed a strong tendency toward concretization of thought (e.g., when he calculated down to 72, he said, "72, that's my postal district"). He was unable to interpret proverbs, but the admissions interviewer believed that a language barrier was operating as well as his inability to concentrate. Mario C.'s admission diagnosis was "acute schizophrenic reaction." When he was discharged in March 1962, the gross psychotic symptoms had disappeared; panic and assaultive behavior had subsided; there was no evidence of hallucination; he was coherent. It was at this stage that the family history interviewers first met Mario and Rosa C. in the hospital office of the director of the service on which Mario had been hospitalized.

II. Composition and Characteristics of Focal Family
(March 10, 1962)

A. Composition of Household

1. The father, Mario, was born on October 15, 1928; his wife, Rosa, on December 30, 1929. Their son, Mario Jr., was born on September 24, 1949; their daughter, Cara, named for an aunt of Mr. C., on August 17, 1951. All were born in Puerto Rico: the father in Ponce, the mother in Arroyo, the children in San Juan.

2. There are no other members of the household.

3. Mario and Rosa C. were married in March 1949, in Puerto Rico.

B. Social Characteristics

1. The family emigrated from Puerto Rico to New York City in 1952 when Cara was nine months old. Mario is Protestant; Rosa and the children, Catholic. She and the children attend church regularly. Mario owns a neighborhood grocery store, purchased from his brother-in-law about two years ago. Prior to this, he worked as a TV repairman for about seven years. He keeps the store open from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and from 10 a.m. until about 6 p.m. on Sundays. Net income from the store is not known; the interviewers estimate it at between $5000 and $7500 a year. Rosa worked as a sewing machine operator until about two years ago. At the time Mario bought the store, she was having severe arthritic attacks. The C. family sued for compensation for this condition, but they were denied an award on the grounds that the illness was not related to Rosa's work. The family
seemed bitter about this, convinced that the dampness and cold of the shop where Rosa worked had obviously been responsible. Since ceasing that employment, Rosa has helped her husband in the store. After seeing the children off to school, she does her household chores, joining her husband at the store from about noon to late afternoon, when the children return from school. She then goes home to prepare dinner for the children and to spend the evening at home with them. Mario has had eight grades of school; Rosa, ten grades. At the time the interviews began, Mario Jr. was in the seventh grade at the local junior high. Cara was in the fourth grade at elementary school.

2. The family has lived, for the past six months, in a rented seven-room apartment in the upper story of a two-family house. They are friendly with the family that rents the lower story. Their monthly rental is about $100. The apartment is neat, moderately clean, somewhat run-down. One room has a separate entrance and is used sometimes as a children’s playroom, occasionally as a guest room. The remaining rooms are arranged around a central hallway. The parents’ bedroom, at the front, is the largest room and has the newest, most complete furniture. Cara’s small room is connected to her parents’ room without a door; she has just a few pieces of shabby furniture, and her dolls are prominently displayed. Mario Jr.’s room is farther down the hall, larger, also shabbily furnished, but containing a desk. Across the hall from him is a small room used as an altar room with a clutter of religious objects and pictures. The living room, next to Mario Jr.’s room, is dominated by a TV set. There is a phonograph. The few pieces of furniture are fairly new and inexpensive. There is no rug on the floor. The only decorations are a few items of bric-a-brac. Some of the children’s toys are scattered around the living room. Nothing belonging to Mario Sr. is visible. The kitchen has a modern refrigerator and stove and a table and chairs for dining. The C. apartment is in a section of the Bronx that only recently has had a large infiltration of Puerto Ricans. Previously, the neighborhood had a heavy concentration of Jews, and, some years earlier, it was considered a middle-income area. The neighborhood is now run-down, but retains a semblance of previous standards.

3. In the nine years since coming to New York, the C. family lived in six different apartments. There has been a steady movement upwards in respect to neighborhood standard, but all their apartments have been in heavily Puerto Rican neighborhoods. Their present apartment is the best they have had.

C. Behavioral Characteristics

Mario C. is 35, but looks younger. He is of average height and muscular build, wears glasses, and has a thin mustache. He is good-looking with a boyish appearance that is accentuated when he grins in an infectious and charming manner. Even when most relaxed, he is tense and in constant motion; he taps his foot or fingers, and chain-smokes cigarettes. He talks volubly and intensely. Despite his limited schooling and his arrival in the continental United States only nine years ago, he is quite articulate; he is obviously of at least normal intelligence. With the interviewer, Mario was at times deferential, at other times rather “mutual” in his approach. His reporting, therefore, varied from the traditional patient-to-doctor communication to the kind of interchange one might expect from a casual acquaintance.

Rosa is 32, about 5’1”, mildly obese. She has a round, pretty face, and a sweet, winning smile. Her straight, black hair is pulled back in no particular style. She also dresses without regard for style, but is very neat. She appears placid, rather slow-moving. Her dress, figure, and heavy-footedness make her seem somewhat older than her age. When one first meets her, she seems a sweet, agreeable, dependent woman. With the male observer, she was somewhat teasing and flirtatious, though more reserved with the female interviewer. Rosa speaks fluent English and is very alert. She is more energetic than one at first assumes.
Mario Jr., 12, is somewhat small for his age. He is a handsome boy, very fidgety and restless, and has, within the family, the reputation of being “nervous like the father.” He tends to be brooding and touchy and has trouble controlling his anger. He does well in school. He has nightmares and tends to be preoccupied with thoughts about injuries to his body. At first, he posed in exaggerated attitudes of shyness and shame with the interviewer, apparently his usual response to strangers. This quickly disappeared, however; he then became eager, friendly, and verbal.

Cara is 10, quite pretty and plump, and handles herself with exceptional poise. She is now in the fourth grade, having been kept back in the third. She appears quite bright. With the observers, she was open, friendly, and talkative, and, especially with the female interviewer, she was affectionate.

Mario Sr. appears to be the isolate in the family group. He is rarely with the children except for Sunday evenings and the occasional visits they make to the store. His contacts with his wife are limited to the hours when they are together at the store, the late evening, and Sunday evenings when the family is all together. Although Mario pretends to be master of the household, one gathers that Rosa actually makes all major decisions and regulates the life of the family unit.

Mario Sr. states that he has the unquestioned respect and obedience of all members of his family; at the same time, it is evident that the children are not really obedient. Within a two-minute period, Mario would make reference to the respect he commands and to his own bewilderment that young Mario is not enthusiastic about performing chores at the store. Mario is prone to contrast the behavior of his children, especially his son, with his own early development; he began to be responsible for earning money much younger than the present age of Mario Jr. Rosa protects the children from her husband’s demands that they work hard as he did when young. The children overhear their arguments about this. Rosa appears to ally herself with the children against Mario Sr. She will allow them to sit up and watch TV against his wishes; then, when they hear him coming, they all pretend the children have been asleep. There is, however, no open defiance of Mario Sr. The interviewers sensed that he would check his wife before announcing some decision about family routine, but that, once he announced it, the family responded as though absolute obedience were necessary.

There is more strain evident between Mario Sr. and Mario Jr. than between any other family pair. Various family members have mentioned the father’s harshness and his frequently hitting both children; they agree that he shows more affection for Cara. The two children play together often and seem very close. Cara often sleeps with her brother because he needs her comfort at night when he is frightened. They also fight, and Mario Jr. sometimes hits Cara; but he seems to rely on her heavily.

Rosa and the children were unusually relaxed in their references to the period when Mario Sr. was “crazy.” Cara, in speaking of this on one occasion, made the traditional rotary gesture with her index finger outside her right temple. Mario Jr. was the most frightened family member at the time of his father’s hospitalization, thinking that he was being taken away to be shot.

D. Summary of Psychological Test Data
Tests administered: Wechsler-Bellevue Form I and II (Comprehension and Similarities Subtests); Szondi Profiles; Human Figure Drawing (Spouse); Object Relations Technique (Cards A2, B2, C2).

1. Husband. Mario C. was overbearing, guarded, and grudgingly cooperative during testing. His resistive attitude was evident in his adamant refusal to do figure drawings and in his consistent negativistic denial of
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similarities. In this subtest, he was often helped to re-focus his thinking and come up with a good answer through the tester's acknowledging that he was "right in a certain way" (i.e., agreeing that the items were different) followed by a repetition of the instructions calling for sameness. Generally, Mario asserted that the answer to an item was obvious, that the examiner was foolish to ask such a question. Yet he frequently sought support and approval for his responses, many of which he offered in a tentative voice. He seemed a suspicious, negativistic individual whose nonchalance, defiance, and superior pose masked deep feelings of inadequacy and vulnerability. On the W-B.I, Mario achieved a pro-rated Verbal IQ of 88—the upper end of the Dull-Normal range. Appreciable intratest scatter, the result of his failing easy items and passing difficult ones, suggests a greater potential. Although there is no basic disorganization or breakdown of communicative ability, his thinking seemed occasionally forced and concrete. His intellectual inefficiency was magnified by the intrusion of grandiose notions and themes suggestive of antisocial trends. His Szondi profiles pointed to a very passive, impulsively acting-out individual with underlying depression and strong latent homosexual tendencies. One of his stories reflected a fear of sex related to the fusion of sexual excitement and aggression projected onto the woman; he then had the compelling need to run away. In another narrative, he saw the woman, presumably his wife, as making sexual demands on him.

Wife. Rosa was entirely task-oriented and cooperated fully in all phases of testing. She experienced much anxiety during the figure-drawing productions, which elicited self-disparaging remarks ("stupido"), uncertainty, and expressions of embarrassment. She rarely, however, encountered difficulty with other tasks; when she did, she made some facetious comment or laughed nervously. Generally, she strove to do her best and answered questions promptly, neatly, to the point, and, seemingly, with unwavering confidence. Her W-B.I yielded a pro-rated Verbal IQ of 98—at the Average level. This obtained IQ does not appear to represent her intellectual endowment; there was an unusually marked discrepancy between her subtest measures. An analysis of her scores revealed superior ability for abstract thinking, but her Comprehension performance dipped to a mental defective level of functioning. Items on the latter subtest, which measures social judgment, elicited responses reflecting naiveté, niggardly tendencies, and concern with aggressive urges. The projective tests underscored her great tension-producing concern with the handling of aggressive and exhibitionistic impulses, her touchiness, and her self-contempt. The Szondi profile suggested a poorly differentiated ego, emotionally infantile, and living on a level of instinctive prompting. Her stories contained depression themes associated with separation and "loss" of a significant figure. She probably sees her husband's psychotic behavior as abandonment, which results in the frustration of her great dependency needs and a regressive shift to an adolescent type of homosexual liaison for gratification.

2. A measure of their joint intellectual function and potential is not possible because interaction testing* could not be completed. The following comments and description of their joint endeavor, based on behavioral observations and partial test results, are offered tentatively.

Marital interaction seems to bring intolerable pressure to bear on Mario, evident in his regression and his bizarre behavior. He gave way to outbursts and introduced irrelevant issues. His responses showed qualitative changes; for example, in the individual session, he offered a one-point response, "both grow," to the

item asking how a fly and a tree are alike; in the interaction, he created a near-crisis by shouting that anyone who believed in God would have to give this answer: "that the fly and the tree are alike because both will move in a hurricane." Much of his disturbance seems related to his need to be dominant. Rosa's problem is the avoiding of conflicts with him, the giving in to his version of reality. At times, she was able to exercise a corrective influence, and he accepted her answer. At other times, he was so vehemently insistent on his answer that she reluctantly accepted it to close the issue. In another way of circumventing conflict, she sometimes wrote her own answer after having agreed verbally to accept his answer.

Of the 22 items in the two subtests, the couple answered 15. The dominance pattern unquestionably points to Rosa as the dominant partner. Her answers prevailed in six out of seven Selection responses, and only in one was her answer inappropriate. In the one item where Mario's answer prevailed, he was appropriately dominant. These findings suggest that Mario's efforts at dominance are a pretense, an illusion probably fostered by Rosa, who, in her quiet and "devious" manner, is able to deal with his temper and pathology and to emerge as the more forceful and effective member. Mario is impulsive and acts out his aggression; Rosa experiences acute conflict in this area, fearing loss of control over her aggressive impulses. Although he has outbursts of rage, Mario is basically passive, while Rosa is characteristically aggressive. She has strong needs for passive-dependency gratification and sex. He also has inordinate passive strivings, but is afraid of sex and runs away from it.

E. Social Characteristics of Observers

The observations reported in this history were made by a psychiatrist, Dr. Z., and a psychiatric social worker, Mrs. G. Both are of middle-class, Jewish background. Dr. Z., 44, is Director of the Division of Social and Community Psychiatry that operates the hospital service on which Mario had been hospitalized during his acute psychotic episode.

Dr. Z. grew up in New York City and is quite familiar with the area where the Mario C. family now lives. He is married and has two children. It may be significant that Dr. Z. has visited Puerto Rico six times and has many acquaintances there. This connection with Puerto Rico is known to the C. family.

Mrs. G. is Chief Social Worker of the Division of Social and Community Psychiatry. She is 35, divorced, with no children. She grew up in a small town in Massachusetts, spent most of her adult life in California, and moved to New York City a year ago. She had virtually no contact with Puerto Ricans before meeting the C. family.

III. Composition and Characteristics of Units in the Family Fields (See Figure 2, pp. 330-331).

A. Husband's Field

1. H IV A. No information.
2. H IV B. No information.
3. H IV C. Carl Hass (HMFF) came to Puerto Rico from Germany as a young adult and married shortly after he arrived. Carl's wife, name unknown, had migrated to Puerto Rico from Holland as a young girl.
5. H III A. Husband's father's father (HFF) was Pablo and his wife (HFM) was Anna Morales Sanander. Pablo was a farmer; he owned land and also a retail bakery. There were five children, two girls and three boys; all are now dead except for Sandor, the father of Mario C. Mario said he had heard stories of several brothers of his father, all wild, two of whom killed each other in a fight. Sandor (HF) denied that there was ever any discord among the brothers; asked about the "fatal" fight, he stood up with a most dramatic gesture and stated, "They lived like saints and died..."
of natural deaths." There was apparently some trouble in the family; Pablo had a brother who forced him off his land and paid only $100 for the property, which was worth much more. This occurred at the time when Sandor came to Ponce.

6. H III B. Mario's maternal grandfather (HMF) was Roberto Hass, who owned a liquor store in Ponce. He married Lotta del Gatto, and there were six children born before Lotta's death in 1916. Of the children, the third, a son called Mario, died of tuberculosis in 1918. He had never married and was widely known as a roué who "loved fiesta mucho." He had worked with his father at the liquor store. The fifth child was Catalina, Mario's mother (HM); the sixth, Cara, his aunt. After Lotta's death, Roberto took up with another woman. (It was delicately suggested that they had lived together but did not actually marry.) With this woman, name unknown, he had a daughter called Amelia, who now lives in Philadelphia. She is close to the family. Roberto died in 1947. As described by his daughter Cara, he was tall and good-looking, not a nervous man.


8. H II. Mario C.'s father (HF), Sandor, is well and lives in Ponce, Puerto Rico. His mother, Catalina (HM), died in January 1962, as reported earlier. Mario is the fourth of eight children, all born in Ponce. They are, in order of birth: Maria, Lotta, Roberto, Mario (H), Alfonso, Johnny, Hector, and Juan. Sandor looks older than the age he claims. As evidence of his age, he has his marriage certificate and the birth certificate of his late wife, in place of his own birth certificate. He also has a statement that he was born in 1896 from an apparently knowledgeable resident of Ponce. Sandor was born in Dorado in the environs of San Juan. He attended four grades of school and can read and write. In 1913, he left Dorado and has since lived in Ponce. He was once a railroad worker and, for a long time, owned a grocery store in Ponce, where he raised his family. After selling the store in 1947, he bought and sold cattle for a time, but stopped because he did not have adequate space for housing cattle and storing feed. He is now retired, but does odd jobs (carpentry, plastering, electric repairs) on his own property. Sandor is Catholic; he goes to church about three times a year and attends Catholic funerals. He is short and wiry, rather like Mario (H) in his rapid speech and the aggressiveness of his manner and gestures.

Catalina (HM) was born in Ponce and lived across the street from the store where Sandor worked as a young man. Sandor described her coming into the store and flirting with him until they became acquainted. Catalina's mother approved the courtship. According to Sandor, Catalina was in good health until their marriage, but, thereafter, whenever they had an argument, she got a nervous attack; she would cry, scream, and fall breathless. Sandor took care of her with a kind of witch hazel. Their arguments were usually about the children. Mario C.'s older sister Lotta dramatically imitated one of her mother's attacks for the interviewers, clutching her throat with one hand, holding her chest with the other, tottering as though about to fall, and gurgling deep inside her throat. Catalina's children used to brush her chest with a hair brush and give her water with salt and sugar in it to stop an attack.

Sandor and Catalina never got along. Mario C. describes his father's temper as the source of their arguments, but adds, "You can't blame one in an argument." According to Mario, his mother was the family disciplinarian; the beatings Sandor administered to his children were more severe, but Catalina's were more frequent. When Mario was first asked to describe his mother, he paused briefly and said, "She was all right as far as I was concerned. (Pause) I have a lot
of problems with my wife—you know we separated once.” Mario’s descriptions of his family of origin leave little doubt that Catalina was the autocratic ruler and that the family arguments were severe. Because of Mario’s marked sensitivity to discussing his mother, the interviewers asked him only a few questions about her.

Mario’s sister Lotta insisted, through several rounds of questioning by the interviewer, that she could not remember a single occasion when her parents slept in the same room. Several attempts to get her to describe the family’s sleeping arrangements failed. Apparently, Sandor slept with the older boys and the mother with the younger boys, while Lotta and Maria had a room to themselves.

Sandor was very jealous of Catalina. Sandor, his daughter Lotta, and Cara, his sister-in-law, all told different versions of one illustrative situation. This involved a cousin of Sandor’s, Silvestro, orphaned at 10 and taken into the house with Sandor and Catalina. Sandor became jealous of any attention Catalina paid Silvestro, even though he got on well with the boy. Lotta gave a humorous description of how Sandor would play dominoes with Silvestro, then turn on Catalina and accuse her of every sort of infidelity with the boy. Aunt Cara corroborated these stories about Sandor’s temper. She said he used to storm in, throw his knife on the table, and threaten to kill everyone in the house. Cara thought Sandor’s jealousy unjustified by Catalina’s behavior; every time she left the house, Sandor would check up on her movements all around the town. Cara said that Sandor was even jealous of Catalina’s relationship with Cara’s own husband, Antonio. Once when Cara and Antonio were overnight guests at her sister’s house, Antonio got up to get a drink of water. After he returned to bed, they heard Sandor loudly questioning Catalina about him and accusing her of having relations with him.

For the last 15 years of their marriage, Catalina and Sandor were separated, Catalina moving to the vicinity of San Juan with all the children except Maria, who was already married. Occasionally Sandor would visit the family and stay in their house. On one such occasion, when Mario C. was 17, he remembers Sandor and Catalina arguing. Sandor whipped out a gun and threatened to shoot his wife. The others in the family were terrified, but Mario walked up to Sandor, said firmly, “Give me your gun,” and took it away.

After Catalina’s departure, Sandor established a common-law marriage with Anna Porfirio; they had two sons, Francisco Antonio, now 12, and Marco Achille, now 6, both of whom carry Sandor’s last name. Mario’s sister Lotta and his Aunt Cara both like Anna Porfirio. Shortly after Marco’s birth, Anna found Sandor’s temper too difficult and left him; they now have no contact except that he provides money for the support of the children. There is some mystery about Sandor’s sale of his store, his separation from Catalina, and her moving, all in 1947. Various circumstances contributed to these events. Maria’s husband had been sent to Japan, and Catalina wanted to move where she could be near her oldest daughter. Sandor also mentions that they had agreed the schools in Rio Piedras were superior to those in Ponce. When Catalina left, there was no other woman in Sandor’s life; then he began to feel that she cared more for the children than for him and began to live with Anna Porfirio. He sold his store at a time when retail business was booming all over Puerto Rico. He told the interviewer that people owed him money and that he was unable to refuse anyone in need. It is probable, however, that he wanted to raise money for a house in Rio Piedras for his wife, even though her move was equivalent to her leaving him. Sandor seemed to the interviewer a tragic figure; he had, apparently, hoped to live with his family in the new house, but Catalina abruptly left.
him, taking the children. Only Sandor himself affirmed that he had contributed money for the family property. The modern house, in a quiet, well-to-do neighborhood, was in effect Catalina’s. She left it to her daughter Lotta who now lives there. Lotta claims the house is valued at $31,000.

Asked during the interviews whether he knew that his son Mario had invited him to come and live in New York, Sandor said he knew this but couldn’t get away because of “unfinished business.” Lotta interjected that he would always have “unfinished business,” that he was really afraid that Mario would put him to work in the store. Sandor said he was not afraid of anything, illustrating this with a story of his breaking up a fight between two men with knives. He was not certain whether he would trust an airplane, but finally concluded that he would not be afraid. Sandor said he was all for progress, but thought people were paying a very heavy price in immorality, war, and the dissolution of family life so that children were now disobedient to their parents. He spoke dramatically of arrangements in an ideal family in which the man made all important decisions. He said man was a mixture of good and evil and had to work to maintain the good. He had no concept of what man would be like in a hundred years because that was something “above nature—only God knows.”

When asked about planning for the future, Sandor said this was important in business; his only plans were to continue making himself useful with odd jobs as long as he could before he died, and to leave his affairs so that his children would benefit. When asked a question that documents could answer, he dashed off and returned on a bicycle with a suitcase in which all important papers were kept, as though he were ready to move at a moment’s notice. Asked where he would turn for help in a crisis, he mentioned his children, particularly Lotta and Mario. He also claimed to be a person of prestige in the town and was certain his friends would help him.

9. Collateral Descendant Families at II Generational Level. Cara (HMS), Mario’s maternal aunt, was born in 1900 and married twice. In 1917, she married José Lopez. They had a son, Arturo, now 44, who lives in Río Piedras and has never married. José Lopez was 18 years older than Cara and, after three years, she divorced him. Asked the reason, she laughed and said, “Oh my, he was much too old for me.” In 1932 she married Antonio Accardo, an accountant and bank manager, who died in 1949 of a coronary. They had no children. After his death, Cara moved to New York and worked there 11 years. Arturo stayed in Puerto Rico with his father.

10. Collateral Descendant Families at FF Generational Level.
   a. Maria, now 42. Completed one year of high school. Married to Felipe and living in Washington, D.C. Felipe is an auditor for the U.S. Government and is much respected by all the family. One eight-year-old daughter.
   b. Lotta, now 40. Graduated from high school. Never married. Works in Puerto Rico as a secretary for a government agency. Mario C. (H) regards Lotta as a person of importance. At the time of his mother’s death one of his recurrent worries was about who would take care of Lotta. Asked why a woman of Lotta’s age needed care, Mario answered that she was still unmarried.

Lotta has been interviewed several times in Puerto Rico. Her house, left her by Catalina, contains four bedrooms, two bathrooms, two patios, and a carport that accommodates two automobiles. Her brother Johnny lives with her. Lotta is angry and frightened about his possibly getting married and leaving her alone; Hector, a younger brother, married right after graduating from college. Having discovered
that Johnny had a girlfriend, Lotta visited the girl and found that the couple were making concrete plans for their marriage. She and Johnny have little actual contact because their working hours do not coincide and they seem to avoid each other on weekends. They communicate by leaving notes.

Catalina had malaria when she was pregnant with Lotta. After Lotta was born, she was cared for by an elderly neighbor woman who would pick her up in the mornings and bring her back to her family only for certain feedings. The woman died when Lotta was seven, and Lotta returned to her family. Her childhood was rather unhappy. Lotta left Ponce to attend high school in Rio Piedras, living with her Aunt Cara. Toward the end of that year, she began to "feel upset," although she said nothing of it to Cara. When Cara took a vacation to New York that summer, Lotta went home to Ponce. There she became increasingly "sick" and missed a year of school.

Lotta stated that she could not trust men and doesn't date. She made reference to a love affair, possibly in 1953, but said her mother did not approve of the man. Apparently Catalina had disapproved of any dating for Lotta. Lotta mumbled that this man had "embittered my life."

One striking aspect of the interviews was Lotta's attitude toward her father. She was sharp, cynical, and critical of everything he said. She would frequently contradict him in a provocative way. At the same time, there seemed to be much tenderness and affection in her attitude toward him, kept behind a facade of near-hatred. The interviewer noticed that she was wearing her mother's wedding ring on the correct finger. Questioned about this, she said her mother had wanted her to have it. When the interviewer pointed out that she wore this as though it were her own wedding ring, she merely shrugged. She spoke of how her father had made her mother suffer and how much she resented this. Once, when Sandor was not there, the interviewer commented that, despite all her efforts to be hostile, she obviously was fond of her father. Lotta said she didn't want to know the details of her parents' quarrels and separation; that, if she knew, she would end up hating her father.

In that interview when Sandor mentioned turning to his friends for help in time of trouble, Lotta said bitterly that there was nobody one could really trust. She cited the occasion when she first met Roberto's wife, who later told Lotta that she was very nice, that none of the terrible things she had been told seemed true. Lotta pointed out that only her own family could have told of "terrible things"; later she identified Rosa C. (W) as the probable culprit. In the course of listening to her father's discussion about the impersonal attitude of government, Lotta commented that the government cared nothing for a person except to collect his taxes.

c. Roberto, less than two years older than Mario C. Finished three years of high school. A factory worker in New Jersey. Married. One son, age 6. One daughter, age 4.

d. Mario C. (H) is the next child in sequence.


f. Johnny, 27, unmarried. Completed two years of high school. Works in Puerto Rico as a bowling alley attendant. He was living with his mother at the time of her death, and now lives with his older sister Lotta.

g. Hector, now 25. B.S. degree from the University
of Puerto Rico. Works in San Juan as a chemist for an industrial firm. Married with one five-month-old daughter.

h. Juan, 23. Married a girl from Ecuador. Completed seven grades of school. Works in Washington, D.C., as a government painter. He is very close to his sister Maria and sees her often.

It is striking that Maria, Roberto, Mario, and Juan all gathered together on short notice the day that Mario received the call from Puerto Rico about his mother’s critical illness. They all flew to Puerto Rico together.

The family’s religious activities deserve some digression from the foregoing. In respect to formal religion, the picture is confused. Catalina (HM) was Presbyterian and Sandor (HF) was Catholic. They were married in the Catholic Church because Catalina agreed to having the children raised as Catholics. Maria, the first born, however, was promptly baptized in the Presbyterian Church. All the others were baptized Catholics. Lotta described her baptism at age 14, mentioning that the priest who baptized her was drowned two days later, along with another priest who had refused to baptize her because she did not know the Creed. Lotta said she considered herself a Protestant.

When this point was pursued by the interviewers, it emerged that, on all formal papers, including her job application, she lists herself as Protestant. Asked how she could be a Presbyterian if baptized Catholic, she merely shrugged. She claimed to go to church occasionally; since her mother’s death, on the average of once or twice a week. These visits are to the Catholic Church, because, as she remarked, she likes the way they pray. Of Mario C. and all his siblings, only Maria, the one baptized Presbyterian, now considers herself a Catholic.

Some members of the family are obviously involved in spiritualism. Mario occasionally gave orders for herbs to his sister Lotta; these he compounded into prescriptions for his acquaintances. Lotta insisted, however, that he never used these personally. While he was in Puerto Rico, Mario was not involved with spiritualists; Lotta thinks that Rosa’s influence, once they moved to New York, caused him to begin to visit spiritualists. Lotta confessed that she once went to spiritualists every Thursday; though she had skipped some sessions recently, she planned to resume. On the day following the last interview in Puerto Rico, she was planning to attend a “Sanity Service.” This was run by a spiritualist whose staff included an M.D. The doctor’s role was to examine all applicants for the church; if no medical illness was discovered, it was presumed that illness was in the spirit and curable by the spiritualist.

Sandor (HF) mentioned moments of confusion and upset caused by “spiritual things.” He treated these symptoms successfully by relaxing in a warm bath. He felt that he was protected somewhat by “good guides” (apparently defenses against evil supernatural forces). His spiritualist had told him that others wanted him dead and were trying to get him killed; he assumed this was attempted with evil spirits, but he had also had fights with men armed with knives. He attributed his survival to his strong faith in God. During these revelations, Lotta whispered to the interviewer that she had never before heard her father talk about spiritualism.

An interview with Aunt Cara and Lotta reflected their ambivalence about spiritualism. Aunt Cara is calm and placid, and always spoke with deliberation. When Lotta talked of her own visits to spiritualists, Cara kept interjecting that she, of course, did not believe in all this. Finally, Lotta turned on her aunt, claiming that Cara had herself been a medium and only stopped when one of her “attacks” had been very severe. Lotta described severe attacks caused by a spirit’s entering Cara and making her wild so that sometimes her second husband had to sit on her to hold her down. Cara maintained her calmness and followed Lotta’s reports with the placid comment, “Maybe I was dizzy.”

B. Wife’s Field

1. W IV A. Known by the townspeople of Arroyo to be so wealthy that “they put gold coins out to dry in the sun.”
2. W IV B. No information.
4. W IV D. Both born in Arroyo.
5. W III A. Isabella (WM) reported that these were a “wealthy” couple. They were both dead by the time
she was grown, but she had heard that the husband had never worked to dirty his hands. He had many servants and, if he wished to ride, a horse was brought to the door. He lived on an inheritance which he squandered in lavish living, leaving nothing to his children.

6. W III B. Rafael Bernard (WMF) with two older brothers came to Puerto Rico from France when quite young. Their parents died. Each of the boys took his share of the inheritance and went his own way, keeping somewhat in touch by letter. Rafael did not work, but lived on his inheritance. His daughter Isabella (WM) stated, “Let me tell you something—he was lazy.” Isabella remembers him only as an old man. He married her mother after she had been left a widow with five children. He was tall, dark, well-educated, and spoke several languages, though he spoke Spanish with difficulty. He was sociable and always well-dressed, very particular about his clothing. He was not, apparently, affectionate. He died in about 1929 “just before the San Felippo storm.” His wife, Carla Severio (WMM), had been born in a small village near Guaymas of a good family. She was short, fair, and slender, so delicate and refined that everyone wanted to be her “compadre.” Unlike her husband, she did not like parties. She was not sent to school and never learned to read and write. She died in about 1900 “after the San Cerrito storm.”


8. W II. Isabella (WM) is small, wiry, very dark-skinned, with white hair and marked Indian features. Her upper teeth are missing. She smokes cigars and looks like a hillbilly. She appears older than the 72 years to which she admits. She is vigorous and lively with a sense of humor. She enjoyed the interviews, particularly those about III and IV Generational Level, but was more reticent about II Generational Level. Isabella was the older of two children born to her parents, but her mother had five other children from a previous marriage. Her childhood was happy. She was her mother’s favorite and was also favored by her older half-sisters. Her parents got along well, and they were in a good economic position for those times. They had a farm with cattle and horses and enough hired help to preclude the children’s doing chores. Isabella went to private school for a brief time, then refused to continue. When she was 15, her mother became fatally ill. She called Isabella (her “compadre”) to her and said she regretted leaving Isabella, fearing that the father, being unaffectionate, would not care for her well.

Francisco Torres (WF) was born in Arroyo, the youngest of eight children in an economically comfortable family. Although the date of his birth is not known, he was about two years older than Isabella. They grew up in Arroyo together, but did not marry until they were 27 and 25. Francisco died in 1941. He had suffered since youth from abdominal pains that were diagnosed as due to chronic appendicitis two years before his death. He had surgery, followed by recurrent “fevers”; these caused his death, according to Isabella.

Isabella and Francisco had 12 children; 11 survived to adulthood, and nine are still living. In order of birth, they are: Felicia, Violetta, Ramon, Tiberio, Francisco, Paula, Francisco Garcia, Manuela, Fidelio, Rosa C. (W), Jaime, Rodrigo. Francisco (WF) was 4’4” tall, white-skinned, black-haired and handsome. Although he was small and thin, he was strong. He had little schooling, but could read and write. He was a railroad worker. Isabella described him as a model husband, comparing him with her daughter Violetta’s husband, whom she “adores” and considers to be like a “holy man.” Rosa C., however, reported that her father gambled and drank; her mother disapproved but paid no attention, possibly because she couldn’t have
stopped him, for he was stubborn. Rosa said he would
get drunk on weekends only, then go quietly to bed.
He was serious and quiet, but happy, a man well-
liked and respected by all.

Both Rosa and Isabella (WM) agreed that Isabella
was the stricter parent; Francisco (WF) was affection-
ate and indulgent. Until his death, the family lived on
the large, comfortable farm Isabella inherited from
her father. Just before his death, however, Francisco
advised his wife to move to the city; a bad clement
was moving into Arroyo and Fidelio was already in
some kind of trouble. Isabella sold the farm and, with
the proceeds, bought a house in Guyama.

Rosa described her mother as honest, strong-willed,
friendly, and calm. She appears to be a strong figure
in the family, still playing a prominent part in most, if
not all, of her children's lives. In 1950, after most of
her children had migrated to New York, she followed.
Her apartment, in a run-down Puerto Rican section of
the Bronx, is the center for family gatherings. At vari­
sous times, one or another of her children has lived
with her. She is now raising a grandchild, Rosita
(Felicia's daughter), an attractive, outgoing 12-year­
old girl who seems quite content to be living with her
aged grandmother.

9. Collateral Descendant Families at II Generational
Level. Isabella's full brother, Alejandro, lives on Long
Island, is retired, and is supported by his eight chil­
dren. He came to New York five years ago; all but
one of his children had been here for several years.
Alejandro was the only one of Isabella's siblings to
attend public school. Unable to get beyond the fourth
grade, he repeated it year after year until he grew up
to become the fourth-grade teacher. His later occupa­
tion had been as overseer on a sugar plantation.
Of her five half-siblings, four sisters and a brother,
only one sister is still alive. She is 10 years older than

Isabella and lives in Puerto Rico. The half-brother had
been a businessman; the half-sisters, all domestics.
Of Francisco's seven siblings, only one brother and
one sister are alive. His older sister married well, but
died "of an insect bite." His other sister married a
laborer. All five brothers were tenant farmers. Only
Francisco learned to read and write.

10. Collateral Descendant Families at FF Generational
Level.

a. Felicia. Married to a laborer in Puerto Rico. Died
in childbirth in 1949, age 38. She had one son
who died at birth. Her daughter, Rosita, at whose
birth she died, is now living with Isabella in New
York. Tommaso, her widowed husband, lives in
Ponce. Recently he asked Isabella and Rosita to
come live with him, yearning to be with his daugh­
ter. Years before, Isabella had leaned on Tommaso
as the family adviser and had considered him and
Felicia the serious, stable, mature ones in the
family.

b. Violetta, 46. She and her husband, Frederico, once
owned the grocery store that Mario and Rosa now
own. They sold it to move to Florida two years ago
because of their son's rheumatic heart disease.
Frederico's present occupation is unknown. He has
two daughters from a previous marriage who live
with him and Violetta and their 12-year-old son.
Isabella described this couple as "living like sweet­
hearts."

c. Ramon. Lives in the Bronx. Married. Eight sons,
ranging from 6 to 16. Superintendent of the large
apartment house where he has his apartment.

d. Tiberio. No information.

e. Francisco. A welder. Having been injured on the
job, he lived with his mother for some months; his
wife was in Puerto Rico with their three-year-old
boy. While waiting for his lawsuit for injury to be
brought so that he could join his wife, he occasion­
ally helped Mario and Rosa in the store.
f. Paula, died in 1944 following severe illness, just before her 20th birthday. She had a sequence of hospitalizations that used up much money. Rosa cited tracheal tuberculosis as the final diagnosis; Isabella called it tuberculosis of the stomach. Had business training. Worked briefly as a secretary at a naval installation in Puerto Rico before her illness.

g. Francisco Garcia. Married, childless, separated from his wife for six years. Completed a bookkeeping course in Puerto Rico, but now drives a cab in New York City.

h. Manuela. In 1949, married a hotel worker who drank heavily; divorced in 1955, after having two boys and two girls, ages 7 to 12. Recently married an auto mechanic and is described, by Rosa, as very happy in her new marriage. Recently gave birth to a son.

i. Fidelio. Lives in the Bronx. A utility operator in a plastics factory. Married to a divorcee with five children, oldest of whom, a 13-year-old girl, lives with them now. The other four are in Puerto Rico with Fidelio's mother-in-law. Isabella is bitter about this marriage, claiming that Fidelio's wife fooled him about the other four children and that he complains about this.

j. Rosa C. (W) is the next child in sequence.

k. Jaime, called “Jimmy” in the family, two years Rosa's junior. A taxi driver. Married, childless. Recently separated from his wife and lives with his mother; his estranged wife visits the house.

l. Rodrigo, born when Rosa was four, died in infancy.

IV. Relations of Focal Family with Other Family Units in the Contemporary Fields

Much of the focal family's social life centers around Isabella and the rest of Rosa's family in New York. The cousins are quite close and frequently play together, but there is sometimes trouble because Rosita is Isabella's favorite grandchild. According to Isabella, Rosa is not as close as she could be with some of her siblings, particularly Jaime, because Mario insults and offends them. Isabella calls Mario the “crazy one,” but speaks of him affectionately, somewhat more warmly than of Rosa. She blames Mario's family for the troubles Mario and Rosa have experienced, and considers them strange people who are difficult and vindictive. She worries that Mario might do harm to Rosa or the children and says this “would make me crazy.”

Mario's side of the family has never been particularly fond of Rosa, but their attitude toward the whole focal family is not known. Mario's contacts with his family have apparently diminished since his mother's death. He, Lotta, and Maria each bet two dollars a week on the loteria in Puerto Rico, and Lotta told the interviewer she was annoyed that Mario was six to eight weeks behind in his payments. When the interviewer was in Puerto Rico, he offered Mario's address to Lotta; she refused it, feeling that Mario should write to her, especially to acknowledge a bottle of rum she had sent via Amelia. Mario and Roberto appear to be antagonistic. Recently, possibly at the time of their mother's funeral, they concluded a two-year period of not speaking to each other. Mario has mentioned that he was distressed by Roberto's insulting comments about Sandor when they were all in Puerto Rico.

V. Developmental Background of Husband and Wife

A. Husband *

1. Chief facts of childhood, from birth to 12 years of age Mario grew up in a four-bedroom house in Ponce. Nothing is known of his feeding, weaning, or toilet-training experience, nor of the times when he started to sit, walk, or talk. Mario describes himself as not too close with any siblings. He was most frequently with Roberto, with whom he fought. He also fought with his brother Johnny because Johnny didn't show proper respect for their parents. (Mario now says his own son is like Johnny.) Mario says he was his father's favorite

*Less information is available for Mario C. than for Rosa C. For the former, therefore, the third set of subdivisions is not used, though it is used for Rosa. This demonstrates a degree of flexibility in reporting that the outline permits.
and was beaten less frequently than the others. Mario was entrusted by Sandor with money and responsibility in the grocery store and in caring for the family cows and goats. Sandor says he chose Mario because he was the most responsible and hard-working of the children. Sandor said that people admired Mario and predicted that he would be a fine man "like his father." According to Sandor, Mario was a good child, active and "nervous," who got on well with his siblings.

His Aunt Cara talked of Mario's closeness to his mother. When he was given money for the movies, he always reserved some for a present for Catalina, some fruit or candy. There are indications that Lotta and Mario were close when growing up. Lotta referred to occasions when she needed money for school supplies that her father declined to provide; she would wait until Mario was in charge of the store and he would slip her small sums of money for these purchases. Lotta said that, any time she left the house, Mario would go along with her. If she asked him where he was going, he always answered, "With you, anywhere you go."

Mario's early memories are a sequence of rather traumatic episodes. He recalls being ill much of the time with fever and stomach aches, suffering two sieges of pneumonia, and being taken to a local hospital for shots for some illnesses he cannot describe. Lotta remembers Mario's pneumonia vividly. Sandor said that Mario was thin but, once past his early bouts with pneumonia, in good health.

2. Chief facts of adolescence, from 12 to 18 years of age

According to Mario, he was not a particularly good student in school and didn't enjoy it. He quit after the eighth grade to help full-time in the store. Lotta and Sandor, though, described him as quite bright. When asked why he had quit school, they provided a number of reasons. Both said he preferred working to attending school. Lotta mentioned that Mario had never gotten along well with teachers and had had a particularly bad encounter with the eighth-grade teacher. Sandor agreed that the teacher had been critical and unappreciative and had discouraged Mario. Mario's adolescence was most dramatically marked by the separation of his parents when he was about 16. His older sister Maria had married, and both Lotta and Roberto were in the service. This left him the senior sibling, and he assumed the role of male head of the house. He painted and fixed the house and helped his mother with all chores. "If she was sick, I used to do the cooking—you know, I liked taking care of Mother when she was sick, and when she was well I would do anything she asked me to do." He would have joined the service, but his mother insisted he stay home. He had hoped to be an auto mechanic and applied to trade school during this period; he was not accepted, but was given a place in an electrical school nearby. There he discovered on his first day that he was "afraid of electricity" (although he was later to become a TV repairman); he quit and came home to help his mother. His sister Lotta suggested that Mario had become sick when his mother died because he was by far the closest to her of all her children. She recalled his coming home from school when his mother was sick, cooking lunch for everybody, cleaning up, hunting for the medicine the doctor had prescribed, then returning to school.

3. Chief facts of adult life up to courtship period

Mario always told his mother everything about himself. After returning from a date, he would relate details of the date to his mother. In his late teens he held a series of jobs, finally working in a clothing store owned by his future wife's brother-in-law. Rosa, who lived in Guyama, occasionally stayed with her sister and would visit the store. There the two met.

B. Wife

1. Chief facts of childhood, from birth to 12 years of age

a. As all the children in her family, Rosa was breast-fed and had to be weaned before two, at which time the next child was conceived. Isabella must have been
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At least 45 when Rosa was born. No information about other early developmental history. Rosa was described as an easy, quiet, not very active baby. Isabella says she was "a fatty" and very pretty.

b. Rosa was good, conforming, and quiet, and was apparently loved by all her family. The one exception was, perhaps, Manuela, five years older, who was the "bad one" and strong-willed. Manuela was jealous of Rosa and fought her; Isabella confirmed this, but said Rosa went out of her way to provoke Manuela. Rosa, during interviews, was amused and giggly in describing Manuela's bad behavior, as she was in talking of anyone who was nonconforming, hostile, "crazy." Rosa's father preferred the girls, and his favorites were the quiet ones, Rosa and Violetta. Isabella thought it was not right that he always took Rosa's part. Rosa said her mother preferred the boys, Francisco being her favorite. This was confirmed in interviews with Isabella, but she seemed also to favor Violetta. Of Francisco, Isabella said, "I could never remember scolding him and having him look up at me in reproach. He was always happy." Francisco Garcia was the one child who angered the father because he played roughly, teased, and was very active. Once he accidentally hit his mother in the head with a rock; his father then hit him with a broom handle. On another occasion, he accidentally caused Rosa to fall and break her clavicle.

Rosa talks more warmly of her father than of her mother. The mother, the stricter parent, preached that the man was always right. There were no arguments between the parents and all the children were close. Rosa admired her mother for being friendly and calm and felt she was like her. Among her sisters, Rosa was especially close to Paula, nine years older, who taught her to read and write, combed her hair, and helped her to dress.

c. While living in Arroyo until age 10, Rosa played with many children, mostly siblings and cousins. She was allowed to play with boys only if they were in the family. Once the family moved to Guayama after the father's death, her activities became more restricted. She could no longer play freely. Her social activities were confined to school and visits to the houses of two girl friends. She remained friendly with these girls until she left Puerto Rico.

d. Rosa started school at 6, having already learned to read and write. In her second year, she went to second grade in the morning and third grade in the afternoon, thereby skipping a year. She did well and was considered bright.

e. When less than 4, Rosa had double pneumonia followed by malaria. She does not recall this. At 5, she was hospitalized briefly to have a growth surgically removed from the top of one eyelid. (Her father was hospitalized at the same time.) She broke her clavicle at six.

f. An event that Rosa remembers as especially traumatic was having Fidelio accidentally crush the top of one of her fingers with a hammer when she was 5. She felt pain for months. The nail grew in wrong and had to be pulled out. The nail is still deformed, and Rosa is bothered by its ugly appearance. Her second most traumatic memory is of the broken clavicle.

g. Because of her having so many older siblings, Rosa had no home duties until age 11. Then the mother started Manuela and Rosa together in cleaning, washing dishes, and caring for their own clothes. Rosa enjoyed this. Although the older ones had earlier worked to help support the family, Rosa never had to do so.

h. In Arroyo, Rosa had much outdoor activity—going to the river, fishing, cooking in the backyard; she had free run of the neighborhood. Rosa best liked to play with dolls, to sew, and to cook outdoors. She
often made dolls' clothes that were exact copies of clothes her sister Felicia, a seamstress, made.

i. Arroyo, the community in which Rosa first lived, was rural. The family occupied the same house during these years. When she was 10, they moved to Guayama. Family social life revolved around visiting the large extended family.

j. The family attended church regularly on Sundays. Rosa attended doctrine classes at church daily from age 10 to 12, and later taught the class.

2. Chief facts of adolescence, from 12 to 18 years of age

a. Rosa began menstruating when she was almost 12 years old. She had been prepared for this by Paula and Manuela, and met the change calmly. There was no discussion of sex at home; what she learned came from girls at school. Her mother and older brothers restricted her more when she began to mature.

b. When Rosa was 14, her sister Paula died. Rosa cried when recounting this. About a year later she quit school and her mother sent her to live in Rio Piedras with her sister Felicia. Felicia and her husband owned a clothing store and needed some help. Manuela had been there earlier, but was sent home for disobedience. Rosa began a way of life now being repeated with her husband. She would cook meals at home and take them to the store for Felicia to eat, then stay on to help. Rosa enjoyed this period. She accompanied Felicia and her husband on many outings (to the beach, to the movies, to visit friends), a great change from her restricted life at home. The couple had no children and her brother-in-law treated Rosa like a daughter. Every Sunday, all three drove to Guayama to visit Isabella. Rosa stayed at Felicia's for two years. When it was discovered that she was in love with Mario, who worked at the store, she was sent home to her mother. Rosa says that, during this period, her family acted as guardians of her chastity.

c. Rosa did not go out with boys until she began to date Mario secretly at 16. Earlier, she had attended parties, but was allowed to dance only with her brother-in-law or his friends. After it was discovered that she was in love with Mario, a chaperone was provided for all their meetings. They did, however, manage to have intercourse once before their marriage when she was 19.

d. While in Guyama, Rosa belonged to a club organized by the police department. The activities included trips to beaches, parks, and other places of interest. Through this group, she took trumpet lessons for a year. Her mother thought the club safe, but would not permit her to join the Girl Scouts. Rosa's social life was more active when she was living with Felicia. She had a girl friend there whose family was also restrictive about boys, but the two girls were allowed to go about together.

e. Rosa did well until her second year of high school, when, though good in other subjects, she expected to fail at bookkeeping. She felt so averse to bringing home a failing grade that she quit school. Her family never knew the reason, and her mother tried to dissuade Rosa from leaving school. Rosa blames the teacher, saying that he intimidated all the students. She liked math best and had hoped to become a bookkeeper.

3. Chief facts of adult life up to courtship period (Because of Rosa's early marriage, adolescence and courtship merge and are both covered in Section 2 above.)

VI. Courtship

A. Initial Relationship

1. Mario was in love with Rosa before she met him. The year before she came to live with Felicia, Rosa visited the store. Mario, working there, saw her. Although he was quite taken with her, he did not initiate anything because she was the boss's sister-in-law. After Rosa came there to live, she saw Mario in the store frequently.
He spoke with her often. She did not like him at first because he had “bad manners” with his friends and “talked lousy” (used obscene language).

2. Mario began to improve his language and manners to please her and pursued her for a date. She turned him down because she was not allowed to date. Often, she teased him by agreeing to meet him after church or the movies, and was amused when he waited for her in vain. Some months later, Felicia had two tickets for a show, offered one to Mario, and allowed him to take Rosa.

He tried to make love to her; she held him off awhile out of respect for her sister and brother-in-law, but, in Rosa’s words, “He kept on until he got me.”

3. They dated in secret for about a year, sneaking off together when Rosa was supposed to be with her girl friend. She seems to have enjoyed this period. Felicia discovered the romance when she realized that Rosa had not been using any of her spending money for a long time.

4. Felicia objected to Mario because of his family. It was believed that his mother had treated another daughter-in-law badly, had hit her and turned her into the street. Rosa refused to give up Mario, and Felicia returned her to their mother. The mother declined to interfere and accepted Mario as a regular visitor in their home.

B. **Marriage Proposal**

No information.

C. **Engagement Period**

They became engaged after Rosa returned to live with her mother. Mario visited on Sundays for the next year. At that time, Rosa and her mother were living alone in the house, and Rosa worked in a drugstore. The couple planned to marry as soon as Mario got a better job. Rosa admits to having had some concern about this. A crisis arose when he began visiting only every other week; Rosa heard through his sister Lotta that he was seeing another girl. She wanted to break the engagement, but he persuaded her that his sister lied and threatened to kill Lotta.

D. **Wedding and Honeymoon**

Mario and Rosa were married when she was, unknown to either family, in the fourth month of her pregnancy. The wedding was in church, with both families attending. Rosa feels great shame at having been married in a white veil. She was too worried to enjoy her wedding. Isabella says that Rosa looked pretty and that Mario’s mother and the rest of his family fusses over her with great pleasure. Interviews in Puerto Rico, however, indicated that only Mario’s Aunt Cara saw anything good in Rosa at the time of the wedding. Lotta repeatedly referred to Rosa as “two-faced” and grimaced whenever her name was mentioned. Both Cara and Lotta described Rosa as skinny at the time of her marriage.

VII. **Marriage and Course of Focal Family**

A. **Initial Adjustment Until Birth of First Child**

During the early months of their marriage, Mario was a taxi driver. He worked nights and the couple had practically no social life. They also had money difficulties. For the first few months, they ate their evening meal at the home of Mario’s mother; Mario paid for this. Friction developed between Catalina (HM) and Rosa. Finally, Catalina gave Mario some pans and told him to tell his wife to cook; Rosa preferred this. Relations between Rosa and Catalina were persistently antagonistic and jealous. Isabella says Catalina wanted to dominate the young couple, and “Rosa is nobody’s fool.” Rosa was nauseated and ill for the first seven months of her pregnancy and could not eat well. She was anxious lest her family discover her pregnancy, and relieved when they finally did and were only “a little mad.” When Rosa had been pregnant for seven months and married for three,
her sister Felicia died in childbirth. Rosa was alarmed that she too would die in childbirth. All her family were stunned by the death. Francisco Garcia wanted to die himself. Isabella became absorbed in Felicia's daughter and husband and cannot recall Rosa's state of mind at the time.

B. Birth of First Child
Rosa had an easy delivery. She and Mario were both happy with the baby. There were no problems except that he cried at night.

C. Adjustments of Husband and Wife after Birth of First Child
During the three years in Rio Piedras before they moved to New York, Rosa and Mario lived in three different residences, each move leading to improved housing. Rosa did not work. Mario continued driving a cab for one year; then his mother bought him a liquor and food store. Rosa and Catalina became increasingly hostile to each other. Rosa opposed the move to the liquor store. She worked in the store, however. After this move, the two began to argue a lot, especially about the mother's interference in their lives.

D. Developmental History of First Child up to Birth of Second Child
Mario Jr.'s birth was normal. He was breast-fed for two months, but he was "too hungry," and the doctor advised a formula. He did not give up the bottle until he was four years old. He slept and ate well, and was quite active. He sat at 4 months, walked at 8 months, began talking at 15 months. He was toilet-trained by 2, but continued to wet the bed at night until 5. As a baby he was easy to handle.

E. Birth of Second Child
Rosa was very ill with phlebitis during her pregnancy with Cara, being hospitalized on and off for the last few months. She was in labor three or four days. The day after the birth, Rosa had her tubes tied. Mario and Rosa were glad to have a girl, and Mario Jr. was "crazy about her."

F. Adjustments in Family after Birth of Second Child
Family arguments continued, particularly in respect to Catalina's interference in their lives. A crisis arose in 1952 when Rosa sent $25 to her brother Fidelio in New York. Catalina said Rosa was taking money from the liquor store to support her relatives and to force Mario to sell the store to his brother. Rosa says Catalina asked Mario to leave her, and they separated for the first time. During their two weeks apart, Rosa made arrangements to go to her relatives in New York, taking both children. By then, her mother had gone to New York and all but one of her siblings had left Puerto Rico. Mario begged her to take him back, and they all moved to New York.

The interviewers discussed with relatives in Puerto Rico the circumstances of Mario's selling his store before the move. One reason offered was that Mario had failed in business because he had trusted his customers too much (the same reason given for Sandor's (HF) selling his grocery store). Another reason was that Rosa was "stealing" money to send to her "lazy brother in New York." In the course of discussion, it emerged that, just before the sale, a man with whom Mario had once had a fight was killed in a fight outside the bar. It was just after the man was found dead that Alfonso "got" the business from Mario. Both Sandor and Lotta spontaneously denied that Mario was suspected of being involved in the killing.

After moving to New York, the family spent the first three months with Isabella. Then Mario got a job in a TV repair shop, and the family moved to a small apartment. For the first five years, Mario and Rosa got on well. After that, Rosa went to work as a sewing machine operator, and troubles appear to have begun then. Mario objected to her working and wanted all her money. A crisis developed in 1957 when Rosa's brother Ramon migrated from Puerto Rico and, with his wife and six of their eight children, moved in with Mario and Rosa. Mario said they could stay for six months. Ramon's active children caused damage in the house. Rosa found it intolerable that they picked on her own two children. Rosa gave Mario an ultimatum
that she would move unless he evicted Ramon and his family by Christmas. They were still in residence at Christmas, so Rosa moved out with Mario Jr. and Cara. Mario and Ramon argued. During this brief separation from Rosa, Mario spent some time in Puerto Rico with his mother. He returned to Rosa and a new apartment. A few months later, a second crisis was occasioned by a boarder in the household. Every Sunday, Rosa would take the children to her mother’s; the boarder would wait in the living room with Mario till she was gone. Then the men would go out and return late at night, drunk and marked with lipstick. Although Mario went to sleep unconcernedly, Rosa would argue with him. This continued for three or four months. One Sunday, she and the children dressed, but, instead of leaving, waited in the living room. When Mario and the boarder asked where they were going, she answered, “Wherever you go.” The boarder stopped waiting around after that. At the time, they had a “smart dog,” who, according to Rosa, ripped apart the boarder’s bedroom. The boarder accused Rosa of doing it, and, in the course of the ensuing argument, he decided to move out.

In 1959, Mario wanted to use $500 banked in Rosa’s name to buy a new car. Rosa insisted the money was for an emergency, that they didn’t need a new car. Mario came to the factory where she worked and shouted profanities at her until she left in embarrassment. At home, Mario continued to press for the money, and when she refused, he hit her, kicked her, and threatened to “kill her like a dog.” She left with the children to stay with a friend and took Mario to court for assault. After two weeks, he begged her to come back; she did. Mario confessed that he had really wanted to send the money to his father. Although he had frequently slapped Rosa before, this was the first beating. A more serious rupture occurred in 1960. The circumstances surrounding it are cloudy. According to Rosa, Mario had decided to return to Puerto Rico alone and was trying to sell the furniture. Rosa, in the presence of a friend, said to him, “You found me on the street and can leave me on the street.” This enraged Mario. He punched her so hard that her face “was black and blue for five months.” He left for Puerto Rico, where he stayed with his mother for two weeks, then came back to New York. Rosa returned to work and found a new apartment in Yonkers. They were apart for six months. Rosa kept her address secret from Mario for a time. They would meet at her mother’s, where she brought the children to see him each week and he was to bring her support money. Most of the time, he held back the checks, threatening not to give her money until she revealed her address. He begged her to return to him. Cara’s emergency appendectomy finally brought them together again. Rosa says he never hit her after that; she had told him that, if he ever hit her, she would “cut his arm through.” Four or five months after they were reunited, they bought their grocery store and began the routine that characterized their lives at the time of the intensive interviews.

Just before his second birthday, Mario Jr. had a gland burst in his groin. He was “leaking for two years,” during which time he got penicillin shots every day. These were administered at a drugstore, and he would begin to scream as soon as he saw the store. The drugstore man tried to win him over with toys, but without success. Mario Jr. had whooping cough, measles, and chicken pox. While Rosa was ill during her second pregnancy, Mario Jr. stayed in Guayama with his uncle Francisco Garcia. When Mario and Rosa separated just before the move to New York, Mario’s family “took” little Mario for a few weeks, threatening not to give him back to Rosa. When he was five, Rosa allowed little Mario to visit Catalina’s stepsister Amelia for five months. Rosa liked Amelia and trusted Mario Jr. with her. She also wanted him to have a long visit with Catalina before he began school. Rosa said that the boy complained that Catalina hit him and would
not let him in the living room. Mario Jr. made two-week visits to other relatives in Puerto Rico in 1958 and 1960.

Mario Jr. always learned quickly and did well in school. He made friends easily and liked sports, especially baseball, which he played on the streets near the store. He visited his grandmother Isabella daily, and he was said to adore her. He saved his allowance to buy her cigars for presents. Usually his mother sent him away from the store on Saturdays so that his father wouldn't make him work. Mario Sr. usually talked to his son in a screaming voice, often threatened him. Mario Jr. would respond with sullen silence. He began having nightmares three years before the interviews began.

G. Developmental History of Second Child

Because of her mother's illness, Cara could not be breastfed, but started out on a bottle. She was so constantly hungry that the doctor advised solid food when she was 40 days old. She always ate somewhat gluttonously and especially liked sweets. Until five, she woke up a few times a night and called for a bottle. Finally Rosa took the bottle away, telling Cara that a bad witch came in the night and removed it. Cara still likes to fill her doll bottles with water and drink from them.

Cara has been treated gently by both parents. Rosa is indulgent and Mario softer and more affectionate with Cara than with her brother. Cara has done poorly in school because, according to Rosa, she missed many sessions with frequent colds and changed schools four times. Her being left back in third grade occurred while her parents were separated and Rosa had moved to Yonkers. At the time of the interviews, the school guidance counselor reported that Cara did not get on well with the other children because she was a "tattler." She was able to do the work, but was quite lazy. Cara was expected to do very little at home or in the store. She would play with her friends and cousins, jump rope, play games, but was not active in sports.

VIII. Family Relations Prevailing at Time of Referral or First Contact

This information has been incorporated into preceding sections.

IX. Initial Diagnostic Formulation

See Chapter IV.

X. Changes in Family During Period of Study or Treatment

Shortly after contact with the Mario C. family began, an opportunity arose to observe their reactions to medical illness. In May 1962, Cara had a severe bout of acute rheumatic fever and was hospitalized for five weeks. Rosa was initially fearful that Cara might die, but soon became casual about the illness to a degree that impressed the ward staff. Rosa visited Cara every day; the two behaved like little girls allied against the big people at the hospital. Simultaneously, Rosa criticized Mario Sr. for not believing Cara was sick.

After Mario's psychotic episode, the couple seemed to get on better. Mario was described as "listening" more to Rosa. In mid-September, Mario became increasingly "high," more intense, agitated, and grandiose; he awoke at three in the morning to write poetry. In October, they moved to a new apartment after the landlord of their previous apartment had, at Mario's invitation, moved in with his wife, mother-in-law, four children, and a dog. Mario complained that he couldn't stand the dog.

Marlo became increasingly attached to Dr. Z. Dr. Z's report of a home visit on October 21, 1962, stated:

"Mario is higher than at any time I have seen him. Over the two-and-a-half hours he had 10 shots of Barrellito Rum. He made speeches full of fire and passion about his family (in essence he is now against all of them), about life, the future, how he no longer gets excited, contradicting and recon contradicting himself. He was touching me as often as opportunity permitted—hand on my arm and on my shoulder, arm about me, hand against my chest, etc. He insisted on
calling me ‘Mister’ Z. because ‘Doctor’ would obscure the fact that the reason for my being there was as his friend, not his doctor.”

Rosa began to spend all day in the store, presumably because Mario’s rudeness to customers was likely to discourage business. In November, Mario was hospitalized while both observers were away at a meeting. Before departing, Dr. Z. had seen Mario along with Rosa, a friend, and the children in the emergency room at the hospital. Mario’s agitation had increased during the previous week. Dr. Z. approved his being given Thorazine and sent home. Rosa described a harrowing occurrence of the following day. Mario crawled around the floor, telling her to get out. She went to get the police and returned to find that he had killed a pigeon and eaten its heart. He was very bloody and told the police that the pigeon was Rosa. He fought the police and had to be tied up in the hospital emergency room, as Rosa said, “like an animal.” Rosa was angry that Mario had been returned home in the first place and felt neglected by everyone. She said it made her “sick” to think of all the phoning she had done to get help from the interviewers and from Mario’s relatives and friends. She said Dr. Z. should have had Mario hospitalized and should have asked Mario’s opinion. She seemed preoccupied with the thought that all Mario’s relatives had abandoned him.

During the first 10 days in the hospital, Mario was agitated, regressed, and impulsive. When he began to calm down, Rosa refused to regard his psychotic episode as over. She was furious with Dr. Z. whenever he approved passes for Mario to go home and especially when he approved Mario’s discharge three weeks after admission.

During December, Mario appeared depressed, beaten-down, worried about business. He was taking Thorazine and was sleepy and quiet at the store. Rosa would send him home to be with the children in the evenings while she remained in the store. Her behavior during the next three months showed a constant effort to demonstrate Mario’s incompetence and to maintain, through indirection, the image of Mario as seriously sick. On one occasion, she had a customer call Dr. Z. from an outside phone to report that Mario was in the store terrifying Rosa and some customers with a knife. When Dr. Z. phoned the store, Mario had to be called to the phone from the back of the store where he had been chatting with his brother Roberto all evening; Roberto confirmed this. Rosa had almost completely taken over the store. She kept reporting her fear that Mario would poison her or do something violent. She hinted at his association with drug addicts and “pushers.” Mario’s depression increased. He complained that Rosa had put him in a position of no authority, both at home and in the store. Business had dropped to a desperate low. Mario began appealing to Dr. Z. for medication, fearful that he was “getting sick again,” although there were no signs of psychosis. He had written to his sister Lotta for money, but she said she didn’t have it. Next, Mario angrily announced that he was going to Venezuela, apparently because he was receiving no help from his family. This idea was dropped in favor of a return to Puerto Rico. He wanted to sell the business, but Rosa refused. Although he stormed against her for this, he was himself reluctant to “sell the business for nothing.” In mid-January 1963, he admitted himself to Bellevue Hospital; he was kept overnight in the emergency room and then discharged, described as “not psychotic or out of control.” He seemed to want hospitalization as an alternative to pursuing his announced plan of returning to Puerto Rico. The problem was exquisitely anguishing for him, and was expressed entirely in terms of the store: Was it his or Rosa’s? Should he keep it or sell it?

On January 18, 1963, a very somber interview was conducted at the store. Mario was dressed and packed, ready to stay with his brother in New Jersey before leaving for Puerto Rico. He was calm but depressed, and became tearful when describing his goodbyes to the children. There had been another bitter argument at home, and Rosa told him she wanted him out of the house. Rosa at first avoided the interviewers by busying herself behind the counter. She then reported that she had written to Lotta, who had refused to keep
Mario. Rosa complained to the female interviewer of Mario's sexual incompatibility: "He gets me all stirred up and then comes too fast." She was reserved but unrelenting in rejecting Mario.

In the six weeks following Mario's departure, Rosa was quite cool to the interviewers. She continued to report that she didn't want Mario back in New York, that she was planning to sell the store and join him in Puerto Rico "if he wants me." At the same time, she reported her relief that he was gone and continued to express rejection of him. It was apparent that she was being secretive about her own future plans. Rosa was quite well and appeared to be socially successful in the neighborhood. Various men friends were helping her with the store, which had a run-down appearance. Business continued to be bad. On March 14, the interviewers were surprised to find the store closed and in bankruptcy. Rosa had disappeared. No one answered the door at her apartment; her phone was disconnected; she would not answer a letter. Her mother claimed she did not know where Rosa was, that Rosa had moved because she was afraid of Mario.

In June 1963, the observers were able to locate Rosa through the Office of Puerto Rico. She was living in a common-law relationship with a Mr. B. and had the children with them. Mario had obtained a divorce in Puerto Rico. Mr. B. had known Mario and was friendly with Rosa while the two were still married. Rosa would not agree to an interview, so the interviewers finally just dropped in one evening. Mr. B answered the door and, after learning who they were, invited them in. At first, Rosa was cool and Mr. B. wary. Rosa immediately challenged Dr. Z., saying he was not interested in her for "study" purposes or for helping Puerto Rican people, but simply interested in Mario. Dr. Z. again explained his research interest, and she relaxed and accepted this. Mr. B. listened quietly, then said, "You know they are divorced?" Once having established the legitimacy of his relationship with Rosa, he participated freely in the conversation. The atmosphere was friendly, and Mr. B. suggested that Rosa serve coffee.

Mr. B. is tall, heavily built, calm, and thoughtful, a striking contrast to Mario. He came to New York in 1948 and considers it his home. He has never returned to Puerto Rico. All his family are in New York. Mr. B. is employed as a shipping clerk and likes his job, having worked his way up from porter. He stressed his faith in education, preparing for the future, and personal determination: "If anyone tries to push you down, just get up." His mother and three sisters are living near each other in the Bronx. He said he did not live too near them because families should live more on their own. He and Rosa said they visited their mothers once a month and, on alternate Sundays, visited Mr. B.'s three children by a previous marriage. Mr. B. seems extremely solid and successful in making the transition from Puerto Rico to New York. Although it is doubtful that he and Rosa were legally married at the time of the interview, they appeared firmly established as a family.

An interviewer in Puerto Rico followed Mario closely after his arrival there in January 1963. For the first four or five months he was unemployed; he lived briefly with Alfonso, then moved in with Lotta. He was apparently desperately unhappy. One report indicated that Lotta treated him like a small boy. He was totally dependent on her; she gave him room and board but no money, and reminded him constantly that he was a burden. She worked him "like a slave," waking him early so that he could drive her to work, then drive home again to do the laundry and cleaning and prepare supper. He would pick up Lotta at four o'clock, drive her home, serve her dinner, and wash the dishes; then they would talk or argue till 10. Mario acted the part of the woman; Lotta, of the man. He had no time to look for work.

One disturbing episode occurred that seemed related to Mario's being reduced to a female role. He asked his Aunt Cara to pierce his car; he was looking for a suitable ornament to wear, "like a pirate's earring." All the family were upset and called
the Puerto Rican interviewer often at this time. Later, Mario blamed Cara for piercing his ear. Cara claimed she did it because she was afraid of him. The two were not on speaking terms. Mario drank a lot and would get very excited. The family attributed his outbursts to alcohol, not to mental illness. During this period, Lotta was preoccupied with whom to blame for Catalina's death and was provocative in arguments with Mario. All the family members considered Lotta crazy.

After a few months, Mario changed considerably. He got a job as a tourist guide, earning $55 a week, $20 of which he sent every 15 days to Rosa, whom he believed to be living with her mother. He was dating a secretary, age 29, who lived next door to his brother Alfonso. Alfonso's wife, Jeanne, had introduced them. His family said she was "the sweetest girl in the world and very kind," and compared her favorably to Rosa as being better educated, lighter skinned, and prettier. The interviewers in New York had never realized how much Mario's family considered his marriage to Rosa as a marriage beneath him. Mario was, at this time, tranquil, adjusted, and happy, and drank very little. He attributed his improvement to his return to his own environment. He added that, if he'd stayed in New York, he would surely have been hospitalized again because of his debts, and because Rosa was too demanding and argued with him constantly.

The interviewer sensed that Mario had renewed his ties with his family and had reasserted his male position within the family. He is the oldest family male now living in Puerto Rico. In New York, he felt part of Rosa's family, who were on her side; in Puerto Rico, his family were his allies against Rosa. In speaking of New York, he became excited in recalling how afraid of him customers were; he said he had to show them he was boss at the store and talked of not being afraid of anyone and of being a man.

During this period, a serious struggle developed among the members of Mario's family over the inheritance from Catalina. She had been recognized as owner of the house in which she had lived, although it was registered in Lotta's name to avoid any claim from Sandor on behalf of illegitimate children. Lotta, however, began to claim the house as her own. No one took this seriously until she sold it for $32,000 and persuaded each of her brothers to accept $1500 as a "donation" with the stipulation that they sign "donation papers." They all acceded to this, but were furious. They called her mercenary, and expressed much hate and envy. All the family told the interviewer that she was like Sandor, with lots of houses and money. At the same time, their anger at her financial manipulation was tempered by concern about her mental state.

In November 1963, Dr. Z. saw Mario in Puerto Rico. He was still employed as a guide, and had been promoted to having a company car exclusively assigned to his use. He had broken with his girl friend ("I don't know—it just didn't work out—she's not for me."); the interviewer felt that the girl had broken off the relationship. Mario was spending more time with his brother Hector's family than with Alfonso and Jeanne. He saw Lotta occasionally. He appeared in a better state of mind than ever before in his contacts with Dr. Z.

Dr. Z. again saw Mario in Puerto Rico in February 1965. He had been promoted to special guide, responsible for VIP tours. He was married to a woman strikingly different from Rosa in appearance and disposition. She was thoroughly naïve, even-tempered, plain-looking, as characteristically Puerto Rican in speech and manner as Rosa's husband was a New Yorker. She seemed to worship Mario. Of special interest to observers was the fact that little Cara had become a behavior problem in New York. Rosa had written to Mario, asking if he would take her to live with him. The pattern of solving behavior problems by sending children back to Puerto Rico is not unfamiliar; what was striking in this instance was Rosa's implicit assumption that Mario was well and able to care for his daughter.

XI. Final Evaluation and Prediction of Future Trends

See Chapter IV.
XII. Changes and Developments Subsequent to Period of Study

No information.
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