

CORRECTION TO: CARL ROGERS IN DIALOGUE WITH MARTIN BUBER: A NEW ANALYSIS

***Kenneth N. Cissna
Rob Anderson***

The article by Kenneth N. Cissna and Rob Anderson, “Carl Rogers in Dialogue with Martin Buber: A New Analysis,”² which appeared in the Fall, 1997 issue of *The Person-Centered Journal* (volume 4, number 2, pages 4-13) was printed without most of the notes that accompanied it. The one note that was printed contained errors. The original essay, a book chapter that we reprinted, contained five end notes, to which the authors added two short footnotes for *The Person-Centered Journal*. The correct notes appear below. We first note the location of each missing note, quote briefly from the sentence in which the note appeared, and then produce the correct note.

page 4, title

“Carl Rogers in Dialogue with Martin Buber: A New Analysis*”

Reprinted from *Martin Buber and the Human Sciences* edited by Maurice Friedman by permission of the State University of New York Press (c) 1996. The title has been changed, the opening paragraph revised, and a few minor changes made. Readers may also be interested in these authors' new book, *The Martin Buber-Carl Rogers Dialogue: A New Transcript with Commentary*, also available from the State University of New York Press (1997). Requests for reprints should be addressed to Kenneth N. Cissna, Department of Communication, CIS 1040, University of South Florida, Tampa FL 33620-7800 (kcissna@Luna.cas.usf.edu).

page 4, paragraph 1, lines 3-6

“we summarize our studies of one of these remarkable conversations ... between Carl Rogers and the philosopher of dialogue Martin Buber.”¹”

¹Our thanks to Professor John Stewart for providing us a copy of the audiotape of the Buber-Rogers dialogue and helping us revise this essay. Maurice Friedman also encouraged us in this project, shared his impressions of the event, and helped us refine our analysis. Thanks to the staffs of the Martin Buber Archives at the Jewish National and University Library; the Michigan Historical Collection at the Bentley Historical Library and the Harlan Hatcher Graduate Library, both of the University of Michigan; The Carl R. Rogers Collection at the Library of Congress; and especially Nel Kandel and Avis Johnson of the Carl Rogers Memorial Library at the Center for Studies of the Person. The authors also acknowledge the assistance of their institutions in providing research support for this project. Both authors contributed equally to this study.

page 4, paragraph 3, lines 5-7

“We focused temporarily on the Buber-Rogers dialogue in our paper for the 1991 Buber conference* and became captivated by the rich implications of this one conversation.” *Our work on the Buber-Rogers dialogue began with a paper, “The Buber-Rogers Dialogue: Studying the Influence of Role, Audience, and Style,” which we presented at Maurice Friedman's international, interdisciplinary conference, “Martin Buber: His Impact on the Human Sciences,” at San Diego State University, 1991. The book (Friedman, 1996) in which this essay (Cissna & Anderson, 1996) first appeared was a product of that conference.

page 6, paragraph 2, p. 5, lines 3-6

“[Friedman] also prescribed the roles of Buber and Rogers very clearly: ‘And the form of this dialogue will be that Dr. Rogers will himself raise questions with Dr. Buber, and Dr. Buber will respond, and perhaps with a question, perhaps with a statement.’^{2, 3}”

The ground rules for this event were given to Friedman by DeWitt Baldwin, who ran the conference (Friedman, personal communication, December 14, 1991).

Our quotations from and references to the dialogue are from the transcript we produced from the audiotape rather than from any of the published transcripts (Buber, 1965; “Dialogue Between,” 1960; Friedman, 1964; Kirschenbaum & Henderson, 1989), or from the original typescript of the dialogue circulated by Rogers (“Dialogue Between,” n.d.). We found that much has been omitted and some statements changed in the earlier transcripts; several changes are very significant and alter our interpretations of what Buber and Rogers meant. We do not claim that our transcript is “correct”; by the standards of contemporary conversation analysis, a transcript of this ninety-minute discussion would require a small volume. Specifically, we have added speaking turns, noted audible material not in the transcript, and restored original language where it had been changed. We found some lengthy pauses where none were indicated, and found some indicated pauses quite short. Sometimes we did not hear the same emphasis as one finds indicated by italics. To examine the whole transcript, a reader should consult our recent book (Anderson & Cissna, 1997).

page 6, paragraph 4, lines 3-6

“The highlights of Buber's response included...(b) Buber's description of a crucial autobiographical episode that was so personal he never was able to write about it . . .”

We are referring to the barbaric killing of his friend Gustav Landauer at the end of World War I. Friedman identifies it as one of the three most important events in Buber's life. To the end of his life Buber was “preoccupied” by it and, despite Friedman's urging, “too close to this event to be able to write about it.” Although in the dialogue he does not mention Landauer by name, describing him only as “a great friend,” he never wrote about this episode and apparently spoke publicly about it and its impact on him only in this dialogue with Rogers (see Friedman, 1983a, pp. 257-258; 1991, pp. 114-115).

page 6, paragraph 5, lines 2-3

“Rogers reported that an hour or so before the dialogue Buber had mentioned that his sponsors had ‘told him not to speak with Rogers about psychotherapy.’⁵”

If the reader finds this statement perplexing, perhaps Rogers also was surprised at the time. Actually, the dialogue was almost cancelled. Leslie Farber, then chairman of the Washington School of Psychiatry, suggested to DeWitt Baldwin that the dialogue be omitted because, Baldwin reported in a letter to Buber, it “would concern itself with psychiatry [and] he felt that this subject should be left with your Seminars in Washington since the Washington School of Psychiatry was paying your expenses to this country and paying an honorarium” (Baldwin, 1957b).

The correspondence from Baldwin to Buber also showed something of how the topics for the dialogue evolved. In an earlier letter, Baldwin suggested that the dialogue deal “primarily with what you have found out about men and how to affect better human relations” (Baldwin, 1957a). In letters to Buber and Rogers dated nine days before the conference began, Baldwin confirmed Rogers's suggestion that the dialogue concern “the nature of man as revealed in inter-personal relationship” (Baldwin 1957c, 1957d). Surely Rogers would have wondered how psychotherapy could be excluded from such topics.

Editorial Note:

It is with deep regret that the omissions and corrections were necessary. I am grateful to the authors for their forbearance and continued work to correct these errors and therefore more clearly reflect the high quality of their work.