Reconciling Personality with Process:
Linking Two Different Views of the Enneagram
copyright by Susan Rhodes, rev. Dec. 2005, srhodesinseattle@hotmail.com

There are two influential models of the enneagram, the "process" enneagram of George Gurdjieff and the enneagram of individual differences by Oscar Ichazo. The latter is more commonly called the enneagram of personality or personality fixations. For our purposes here, I'll speak of the personality enneagram, although my own view is that individuality is not exactly equivalent to personality.[1]

Most Gurdjieff (Fourth Way) schools regard the personality enneagram as a somewhat degraded usage of the "true" (process) enneagram; most users of the personality enneagram know relatively little about the process enneagram, unless they happen to participate in a Fourth Way Group. However, many people who discover the personality enneagram regard as a wonderful tool for understanding the themselves and their relationships with other people.

I always wanted to better understand the relationship between these two views of the enneagram, but have no background in Fourth Way philosophy. The books I initially read on the process enneagram[2] were very interesting, but left me wondering how it related to the enneagram of personality. There are brief comments about this in Blake's book (on p. 281 and p. 287), but these were not sufficient to serve as the Rosetta Stone for which I was looking.

When I read Nathan Bernier's recently published book, *The Enneagram: Symbol of All and Everything*, I found the connection I was looking for. The relationship between the two approaches began to make sense for the first time. It's not that Bernier was particularly interested in connecting the two, but that the language he uses may enable someone familiar with the personality enneagram to see parallels between the two approaches.

---

[1] It's my view that it's a mistake to focus most of our attention on individual differences at the level of the personality, because this limits us too much. Individuality exists on many levels of the psyche, not just the personality level.

[2] Mainly *Enneagram Studies* by J.G. Bennett and *The Intelligent Enneagram*, by A.G.E. Blake.

Personality vs. Process

If we look at the personality enneagram, we see a system that describes nine points on a circle as nine point of view, each one looking at life in a different way. We can describe this view in terms of a personality type. And we can look at how this type is motivated and how it relates to other types on the circle in predictable ways, given its placement on the circle and how the inner lines connect with other points. We can study the nature of each point from many different angles, looking at such things as its fixations, passions, virtues, gifts, Holy Ideas, symbolic animals, etc. We can also subsume each point into a broader category (such as a center, triad, or hexad) or divide it into a narrower category (subtypes or wing types or a combination of both).

This whole approach rests on a spatial metaphor—the idea of having a point of view that differs from other points of view. It offers us a tool to look at ourselves, and especially at the motivations that underlie our actions. But what it seems to lack is a mechanism for explaining the reason why each type is motivated in a certain way—for example, why Ones seek perfection, Twos seek to give, and Threes seek success. What is it about the actual position of each of these points on the circle that gives rise to perfectionism, helping, and achievement? Why isn't position 1 associated with success-seeking or position 3 associated with perfectionism?

What I'm getting at is the notion that these personality types are not just arbitrary mental categories, but are points on a circle. To really understand the nature of the point, it's necessary to understand the nature of the circle. If we want to understand the nature of an organ, we have to look at the larger body of which it is a part.

When we do this, we automatically shift our attention from the personal world and all that it entails—personal problems, personal development, and personal enlightenment—to the transpersonal world, where we are looking at broader purposes, processes, and creative activity. We look beyond the personality itself to examine the context within which personality exists.

To do this, we have to be willing to examine our ideas about personality. Personality is a lim-

ited vehicle or function (just as each point is a limited view). If we look only at the point itself, we see only limitation and what it gives rise to—behavior that tends toward sin (from an ethical point of view) or dysfunction (from a psychological point of view). But if we look beyond to the point, to the circle, then what appears to be inadequate when looked at in isolation may be seen as simply a kind of specialized function. We don't expect the liver to think or the brain to digest food—why do we expect the personality to be good at everything? Maybe that's not its job. Maybe it's designed to make us pay special attention to certain things in life for reasons that can only be understood when we look at the larger whole, not the individual.

The process enneagram does just that—it directs our attention again and again to the circle itself. Each point matters, but only as part of some larger process. The process enneagram looks at the world (the circle) as a place for creative activity and at each point as a function or responsibility that arises at a given time in the creative process. From this perspective, limitation is not bad or wrong, but simply an inherent feature of this kind of activity.

Point 1 represents the beginning of the process and Point 9, it's completion. At the start of a new cycle of any kind, things usually seem pretty chaotic—not very focused or organized. Point 1 is the place where this changes—where half-formed ideas and vague imaginings are transformed into clear and focused intentions. Each subsequent point represents a further refinement in the creative process, with the emphasis gradually shifting from planning (at Points 1-4) to execution (at Points 5-6) to appreciation (at Points 7-8). Point 9 is the place between creative cycles, where attention is directed less to creative expression and more to cultivating a state of receptivity.

Each of the nine points on the circle represents a point in time (not space) when a change of direction or emphasis is necessary for the process to continue. If this shift does not occur, then the process does not continue.

So both approaches to the enneagram—the personality and the process approach—posit nine points around a circle. In the personality enneagram, the circle represents the sum total of all the possible attributes that a human being can express. In the process enneagram, the circle represents a completed cycle of creation, with each of the nine points representing a stage within that process. The first approach uses a spatial meta-phor to describe attributes while the second uses a time- or process metaphor to describe an event.

What is fascinating is that, for both approaches, the energy of each of the nine points is identical. Whatever way we look at the enneagram, the elemental nature of each point is the same. Only the application is different.

However, I can see why the process enneagram is regarded as the primary or source enneagram and the personality enneagram as a subset of the process enneagram. For one thing, the process enneagram came first and was the one Gurdjieff originally taught. Also, it can be used to describe a wide variety of events, not just human personality. I think that's why I thought that it would better inform my understanding of the personality enneagram.

A Purpose for Personality

Of particular interest to me was exploring not just the motivation of personality, but the *purpose* of personality. It's easy to think of personality in wholly negative terms because of its limitations, which give us blind spots and a tendency to make errors of judgment. The enneagram of personality is useful for telling us what sorts of errors to expect based on our point of view. Then we can avoid certain problems and compensate for others.

However, what we can't do is to be rid of the personality. Learning not to identify with it is about as good as it gets, because on this plane of existence, a personality is necessary and useful, whatever its limitations. But if we suppose that personality has an actual purpose to serve—that each personality is like a piece of colored glass in a larger kaleidoscope of light—then it might be possible to learn to relate to personality in a more productive way, to focus not just on its limitations but its possibilities.

What would it be like if we were to shift our focus from reforming or transcending the personality to see the role that personality plays in fulfilling our life's purpose or dharma? We would be looking at the glass as half-full instead of half-empty. For me, this is easier if I see how my role fits into a larger plan. And this is precisely what the process enneagram is helping me to see.

Bernier discusses the practical applications of the process enneagram on pages 325-333 of his book, and it was by reading this section that I was able to clearly see for the first time how the points in time correspond with the points in space. As a result of his explanation, I'm able for the first time to understand not only the motivation that

drives my personality type, but the context for that motivation—where it comes from and what purpose it serves. I can begin to see the role it plays in creative processes, in social situations, and even in the natural world. This gives me both greater compassion for myself and also the contextual understanding I need to see how to respond to any situation. It's like seeing the role I play in life and knowing better how to play it.

Below I describe how this seems to work for each point of view by taking what Bernier's says about each point in the process enneagram and showing how it relates to personality. In this way, I hope to build a conceptual bridge between the two approaches.

Using Process to Understand Personality

To understand where Bernier is coming from, we have to first understand a little more about how the process enneagram works. In the process enneagram, if we are describing a purposeful activity, we start at Point 1 and move clockwise from these around the enneagram to the place of completion at Point 9. Point 1 is where something starts to happen, an idea starts to form. Point 2 is where we imagine or plan for it. Point 3 is the first shock point—the place where our idea and imaginings transition into actually preparatory work at Point 4. The transition from Point 4 to 5 is a big one, because this is where the actual "production process" begins. If someone moves prematurely from Point 4 to 5, there are real consequences to deal with for the first time. At Point 5, production happens, but it can either be satisfactory or unsatisfactory in nature (that is, aligned or misaligned with a Higher Purpose).

At Point 6, there's another shock, and this is much more impactful than the first one, because it represents a barrier that separates work from the personality point of view from work from a transpersonal point of view. In order to continue past Point 5, we have to be willing to let go of the personal point of view, and this doesn't easily happen for most people. It is a somewhat mysterious process, and involves grace or help coming from beyond. At Point 6, we cross into another way of operating, so at Point 7, we may (mistakenly) feel we are home-free, when we actually have to take care of a number of details in order to create a product that is truly "finished." If we do this, we proceed to Point 8, the piece de resistance. At Point 9, we have another shock point, which involves the letting go of our previous project so we can be free to take on another.

The inner lines between the points describe the path of mental intention that precedes the actual activity as it proceeds around the outer circle.

At Point 1, we have to anticipate not only the general nature of what we want to do, but the precise nature of what needs to be done—the detailed specifications (Point 4). As the details begin to become clear, we are able to better plan and imagine what comes next (Point 2). But this only works if we can begin to envision the end result of our plans (Point 8), see how our production process will lead to that end result (Point 5), and ways in which the rough or unpackaged product will need to be refined (cleaned-up, marketed, or packaged—Point 7) in order to ensure a product that is completely satisfactory at Point 8.

What I've just described is a way of using the enneagram to understand how things happen over time—what happens at which point and how anticipatory mental activity (moving along the lines) interacts with activity in "real time."

But using Bernier's book, I was able to piece together how the two perspectives converge. It's a strange and paradoxical experience, though, because it involves mapping points in space to points in time.

How Points in Time = Points in Space

In the table at the end of this article, I summarize Bernier's notes on each point in a process in the **left column** (sometimes annotating them for the sake of clarity). In the **right column** are my comments on how Bernier's notes can be used to describe not just the process occurring at each point in time, but the personality attributes of each point of view.

Seeing both descriptions side by side is useful because the information in the left column elucidates the deeper *purpose* behind personality motivation at each of the points. It hints at the idea that core motivations we associate with each enneagram point do not originate on this level, but reflect a deeper sense of purpose.

The following paragraphs are my interpretation of Bernier's ideas in light of what I know about the personality enneagram. When necessary, I translate Bernier's terms into language that makes more sense from the personality side. For example, Bernier speaks of Point 2 in terms of planning and imagining an idea in order to expand it, I speak in terms of nurturing and encouraging an idea. The idea of nurturance at Point 2 is familiar to people in the personality enneagram community. This is consistent with Bernier's

concepts, but emphasizes the fact that nascent ideas need nurturing in order to develop properly.

Also, Bernier talks about only three possible ways to ducking the work we need to do at each point: (a) by moving backwards to the next point, (b) by moving backwards to the previous point, or (c) jumping forwards on the inner lines (moving *with* the arrows on the inner lines to the "stress point"). He does not talk about moving *against* the arrows on the inner lines (to the "heart point.") For the sake of completeness, I talk about all four possibilities.

My comments are brief. There are many more things that could be said. But at this point, my objective is to elucidate Bernier's basic ideas in a way that suggests possible ways to use this information can be used to better understand personality. Some prior familiarity with the personality enneagram is useful for seeing how the process enneagram can inform the study of the personality enneagram.

The process enneagram can be used to describe any sort of developmental process. But if we're going to talk about the enneagram as applied to the human psyche, then the process described has involve the growth of some aspect of the psyche. The next section shows how an idea evolves over time, and how the nature of this evolution affects the kind of personality profile associated with each point of view.

Point by Point Comparison

At **Point 1** in time, there are endless possibilities and imaginable ideas he can decide to develop; the challenge is to choose just one. This requires discipline, focus, and groundedness. If he loses focus, there is the possibility of falling into daydreaming (Point 9). If he gets too idealistically carried away, he may indulge in flights of fancy, either abandoning the idea for another (Point 7) or imagining the kernel idea is ready for advanced development (Point 4). If he lacks discipline, he may try to develop the idea (Point 2) before it's fully formed. So the mandate at Point 1 is to choose one idea and stick with it, no matter what. This makes the Point 1 personality one-pointed, persevering, and disciplined. But it also inclines the personality to perfectionism or compulsion. Also, the focus required here is such that the personality may not be able to sustain it at all times, which is why Ones have "trapdoor" tendencies.

Point 2 can be considered a continuation and expansion of Point 1, except that now the emphasis has shifted mainly to growth. At Point 2, the seed idea is fully-formed (perfected) but not yet developed. At this point, it's necessary to water the seed so it can begin to grow. This requires patience, tolerance, and imagination. So this is an expansive phase, like brainstorming, where the idea is played with, expanded, and nurtured in various ways. The infant idea will not be properly developed if it is not valued and therefore not encouraged (Point 1) or overly-valued—either pushed to "perform" (Point 3), wildly expanded (Point 8), or prematurely intensified (Point 4). The Point 2 personality is naturally nurturing and expansive, but the preoccupation with nurturance can make every situation seem like one that requires one's personal attention or intervention, so that very little is allowed to develop spontaneously. Also, if the personality is not ready for a parenting role, it can become overly childlike, refusing to take responsibility and depending too much on others.

At Point 2, the tendency is to endlessly groom, develop, and protect fledgling ideas, so they can grow properly. But there is a point where the ideas have matured enough to be subjected to "reality testing." This is what happens at **Point 3**. Point 3 is considered the first shock in the process enneagram, because it is the point at which there is a natural barrier that necessitates a shift of focus. At Point 3, the idea becomes a concrete plan about which questions may be asked. Is it practical? Is it efficient? Is there a better way? If the answers to such questions aren't satisfactory, the plan can still be reworked (at Point 2) or even scrapped (at Point 1).

The Point 3 personality's competitive spirit arises out of the mandate to test everything they encounter in order to see how well things really work. There is a special sensitivity to the practical side of things and an understanding of the need for objective standards. So the personality tends to be alert, work-oriented, and unsentimental. But if it balks at this point, the personality may hang back at Point 2, trying to be nurturing but without much real conviction. Alternatively, it may try to move forward to Point 4, becoming prematurely committed to a plan that has yet to prove its objective value. If the personality gets too caught up in its task of testing ("all work, no play"), it may either become agitated and impulsively try to rush the work to completion (Point 6) and/or collapse due to exhaustion (Point 9).

By **Point 4**, the plan has been subjected to sufficient development and testing to become a "work in progress." It is still a mental construct,

but is beginning to take on actual substance. It is in the adolescent stage of development and, like an adolescent, it is beginning to take on a life of its own, apart from its parent. But like an adolescent, it is still vulnerable. And what is more, it is not yet animated—not yet endowed with the life force it needs to be a fully independent entity.

This endowment must come at Point 4. Until now, the creator and her idea have been two separate entities. At this point, a transformation must occur: the creator must care so much about the work that she imbues it with her self, actually *becoming* the work in the process. This requires an intense commitment on her part. What is more, the commitment must be to the work itself, not to what it represents to the personality.

So a sacrifice is in order. It must be total and it must be voluntary. This act of commitment irrevocably changes the giver, who will from this time forth be seen not for herself, but through her work. As Bernier observes, "the better the work at 4, the less its author appears."

The personality at Point 4 usually has a hard time accepting the fact that what is needed most is its own disappearance. (Or more accurately, its transformation into a form that it no longer recognizes as *self*.) An impersonal requirement in a transformative process begins to look like a personal judgment—an indictment of the personality as inherently defective and thus unfit to live. This can evoke strong reactions—feelings of fear, shame, betrayal, and abandonment. It can also create envy, as the personality wonders why it alone is being singled out for affliction. The person may long to be "let off the hook," envying others who don't seem to be saddled with a responsibility she feels is beyond her.

So, as Bernier observes, the main danger at 4 is the "wish to appear." The personality can try various strategies to retain visibility, all of which are gained at the expense of the work. One way is to keep bringing in new material to "improve" the work (Point 1), which postpones the moment when the sacrifice must come. Similarly, it's possible to get extremely picky about various details, behaving alternately like a critical father (Point 1) and a doting mother (Point 2), so that the work is impeded. It's also possible to use the imagination (Point 2) to create a fantasy work that looks a lot like the real thing, and then pretend that intensive commitment is going on, when this is actually an illusion, a drama created to avoid real sacrifice. The last strategy to avoid commitment is an outright refusal, usually with a plausible-sounding justification. The work is passed on, half-baked,

to the next stage, where it tends to "blow up" in some way when it is actually put into practice.

As Bernier notes, "the inopportune passage from 4 to 5 is harmful to the whole process. In this passage, transformation is irreversible, and the price to be paid for [premature] precipitation at this point is high." The personality at Point 4 is aware of this on some level, but it can also feel so pressured that is reaches a point where the desire to be free of pressure becomes paramount, whatever the consequences.

Crossing from Point 4 to 5 means a big shift in focus, from preparation to action. Point 5 is the first point on the right-hand side of the enneagram, and it is here that work actually comes into manifestation. Points 5-8 describe the process by which this happens.

At the same time, Point 5 represents a continuation of Point 4, in that it is also concerned with commitment. The focus of the commitment, however, has shifted from the willingness to allow the self to be subsumed by the idea to the willingness to accept the responsibility for taking action.

At **Point 5**, this process of manifestation must begin. Manifestation is an irrevocable act; once an idea is made public, a blueprint becomes a house, or a child has been born, it has an independent existence apart from its creator. The creator no longer has the power to undo it as he did in the preparation stages. So it's important that it be released in the right way at the right time.

With this in mind, the personality at this point becomes extremely sensitive to *consequences*. It senses the potential for untoward outcomes and responds by thoroughly investigating any situation before taking action. This takes time, space, and an inward focus, which is why it is so sensitive to incursions from the outside. The investigatory process is a serious business, not child's play, and it requires a degree of concentration that is not unlike the focus required at Point 1.

However, the level of commitment must be such that, when the investigation is completed and everything is properly prepared, action will be taken.

There is a Catch-22 here, though. For the action to be appropriate, it must be informed. But the more one understands the situation, the more one understands the consequences of wrong action. So as understanding grows, so does the fear of acting. That's why "Ignorance is bliss"—the very understanding we need to act properly creates the fear that can inhibit action. Once we really understand what action entails, we hesitate,

5

unable to commit.

The personality can try to escape the need for informed action in several ways. It can avoid action entirely by engaging in an endless pondering of the situation (Point 4). It can delay action, justifying the delay by reason of the need to collect the kind of information that is most useful only *after* action has already been taken—which means focusing breath at the expense of depth (Point 7). It can temporarily dispense with the fear of acting by engaging in a fantasy of omnipotence (Point 8). Or it can push boldly (and counter-phobically) ahead to Point 6). This last course of action is rare, according to Bernier, because of what Point 6 represents.

It is at **Point 6** that we see whether the work we've produced can pass muster under real-world conditions—to what extent it is a failure or a success. If the work is self-transformation, it is here that we see whether the image we have of ourselves is who we really are. So Point 6 is a mirror. It reveals to us whether the transformation undergone at Points 4 and 5 is real or imagined. It represents the opportunity to find out whether the work done truly stands on its own or whether it will crumble in the light of truth. This is why it is called the second Shock in the process enneagram—what Bernier calls the "Threshold."

It was this looming Threshold that produced the "wait and see" tendency at Point 5. At Point 6, the fear is so great that it can easily make us forget the work itself. So at this point, the first order of business is to master the fear. This can be done by cultivating care and patience (recall Point 2) so that the fear can gradually be separated out from the person that experiences it.

If the personality is unwilling to face what it fears, it can escape this responsibility by reminiscing about the past (Point 5) or planning for the future (Point 7), meanwhile ignoring what is happening right now. Or can deal with the fear in a purely symptomatic way (trying to treat the symptom without searching out its cause): putting a false happy face on it (Point 7) or assuring itself that there is really nothing to fear and trying to relax instead (Point 9). It can also keep very busy with Point 3-type concerns (minor tasks and tests), convincing itself into believing that these lesser challenges are the main concern, when they are not.

If we manage to get beyond that fear, we open ourselves to working in an entirely new way, where we see things from the perspective of the Self or the Whole. If we do not make this transition, we will find ourselves trapped into an in-

creasingly crystallized (and uninspired) way of working. The crystal is the unresolved fear, frozen into form. It forms a barrier that seems like protection, but what it protects is an illusion.[3] So Point 6 is the point at which we either leap forward or fall back—we can't stay the same.

At points 4-6, the work is revealed to be more important than the one who creates it, so each of these stages demands a sacrifice of the personal self. If at Point 4, the work must be imbued with personal life force and at Point 5, it must be courageously put into action, then Point 6 represents the final step in this process of self-sacrifice—the place where any identification with the personality as "I" must be irrevocably surrendered. The result will be a sudden transformational "reversal" where we see everything from the perspective of the whole, instead of the parts—where we realize the true nature of the work and our own nature, as well. The personality remains, but in a completely different role. That is the nature of the second shock.

However, it this reversal is properly prepared for at Points 4 and 5, then it is the wisdom of the heart that informs what happens at Point 6. The reversal is still a shock, but one that can be faced with grace and courage.

At **Point 7**, we have crossed over the Great Barrier, and have a feeling of unaccustomed freedom and lightness. But this lightness of being is ungrounding, because the personality has lost the sense of "I-ness" but is not yet used to living in a universe without an "I," so it's hard to get any sort of stable perspective on things. Thinking becomes quick, diffuse, and full of curiosity. The new perspective is so interesting, but in a world full of interesting things, how can any one of them really matter very much?

But the work *does* matter—the task is not yet finished, and we have a responsibility to complete what we started. What remains to be done is to refine the work, so that it can benefit others—it must be made ready to be "seen, shared, and used," in Bernier's words. This work of refinement requires focus and attention to detail at a time when it is particularly hard to come by. So the sacrifice at this point is the giving up of an infinite sea of possibilities in order to follow through to the end with one small task. It's not

---

[3] It is Bernier who speaks of the tendency to *crystallize* at Point 6. He notes that some people at this point "crystallize a positive or negative self-image and spend the rest of their lives trying to confirm it."

that the task is "small" in the sense of not matter- ing, but that the widened perception at this point makes it difficult to focus on anything in particu- lar for any length of time, because the "whole" seems to matter so much more than the "parts."

This sense of the vastness of life is not only distracting, but also potentially overwhelming. Unlike the fear of impending doom at Point 6, the fear at Point 7 is more diffuse and harder to pin down. It's the kind of fear we feel that comes from awe—the feeling we get when we realize we are a very small fish In a very big pond.

Fear of the vastness can make someone try to get away from it (shrinking back to Point 6— identification with the personality self) or trying to make it smaller by converting it into a giant collection of information (Point 5). The dislike for detail work can create a resentful attitude to- ward restriction (Point 1) or the attempt to move to completion (Point 8) without having done the work necessary for completion.

At **Point 8**, we see our final result of the work. We don't so much marvel at the vastness as identify with it: "L'etat, c'est moi!" We have literally embodied the Work in every sense and are now in the position of "noblesse oblige", where we are obliged to pay our debts and share our blessings with others.

But the very expansiveness of this position can pose a problem. It can make a person feel too strong relative to other people. Instead of helping others to develop their strengths, the Point 8 person may be tempted to take advantage of the weakness of others. At the very least, he may find it hard to allow himself to be vulnerable or accept vulnerability in others.

Point 8 is a position of responsibility and leadership. Taking this responsibility means see- ing one's role not as a king, but as a steward. This responsibility can be avoided by refusing to grow up (Point 7), becoming self-indulgent and lazy (Point 9), failing to act when action is called for (Point 5), or cultivating an attitude that is domineering instead of protective (Point 2).

At all the points, it's possible to use the con- nections with other points for positive uses, rather than simply as escapes, and nowhere is this more evident than at Point 8, because Point 8 is the po- sition where it is most difficult to appreciate any- thing outside itself. The person at Point 8 can benefit by drawing on the strengths of the wings and connecting points—seeking an enthusiasm for life at Point 7, a willingness to be open at Point 9, the ability to introspect at Point 5, and humility and personal vulnerability at Point 2.

Point 9 is the place between the previous cy- cle and the coming cycle. Here it's necessary to allow the accomplishments of the previous cycle to be set aside, to not intervene in the "sloughing off" process, and yet at the same time to retain self-awareness (not to identify the self with the self's accomplishments) so as to be ready when the time comes to initiate a new cycle. So the person stands with a foot in two worlds, the mani- fest and the unmanifest. And in the world of the manifest, there is also a pull in two directions: the past and the future. So there is a lot to balance at Point 9.

If Point 7 is the awareness of Connectedness, and Point is the awareness of Oneness, Point 9 is the awareness of Nothingness. It is the return to Source for renewal, and as such, is the counter- balance to the other eight points on the process enneagram. There is no task to do here other than being receptive so that renewal may take place.

However, renewal requires the maintaining of a state of active receptivity, and this is easier said than done. If there is nothing to do, it's hard to remain alert. So the work at Point 9 is "non- work"—cultivating the kind of inner alertness that allows a free flow of information between the inner and outer selves. The worth of this step cannot be overestimated, because if this receptive consciousness is not cultivated, then the decisions made at Points 1-8 will not be informed by the voice of inner wisdom.

Escapes at this point are designed to lessen the tension of maintaining balance between past and future, inner and outer. There's a tendency to substitute mulish stubbornness for inner stillness (Point 8), to move mechanically into project creation at Point 1 (before it's the right time), to retreat into familiar routines as a way of defining one's role and lessening anxiety (Point 6), or to get involved in lots of irrelevant activity at Point 3 (substituting doing for being).

Integration of Personality and Process
My purpose in this article has been to use Nathan Bernier's work on the process enneagram as a jumping off point to build a bridge between two ways of looking at the enneagram—one as a way of describing a process and the other as a way of describing a personality type. I'm finding that exploring the process at each point in time can provide insight into the "product" (personality) of each point of view. I've tried here to give a brief

introduction that shows the basic relationship be-			tween the two.

	COMPARISION OF PROCESS & PERSONALITY ENNEAGRAMS	
POINT	**CREATIVE PROCESS & HAZARD[4]**	**PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC**
1	New ideas come into the mind. One must be selected for development. Hazard = INDECISION. This is refusing to face the limitation imposed by having to chose just one idea to execute.	The innate sensitivity to the possible danger of not facing limitation tends place your attention on only one thing at a time to the exclusion of alternatives. This one thing is easily idealized as the best thing to attend to. So there's only one right idea, right way, right focus.
2	The selected idea is expanded & developed. Hazard = IMAGINATION. Because there is more than one way to develop the idea, it's possible for the developer to get lost in imagining so many ways of doing the project that she never commits to one particular approach.	The understanding that it's possible to scatter one's energies in what Bernier calls "playful planning activity" creates an impetus for both avoiding mental play and seeking emotional investment in a single plan, so that it becomes "your baby." When you care about something, then you have the motivation to do what is necessary to care for it properly.
3	This is the first shock. The idea starts to move out of the mental realm and into the material realm. Hazard = PROCRASTINATION. When it's time to begin the process of materialization, one must not hang back in nurturing activities but move forward into testing.	The sensitivity to time and the need for materialization makes you inclined to act, not wait. You see the need to test ideas in the real world, to see whether they can succeed there. Nurturing must take a back seat to testing at this point.
4	The idea is intensively reworked and made ready for launching. Hazard = DETAIL & ANONYMITY. The idea cannot be made ready without a deep commitment (detailed work) on the part of its author. But" the better the work, the less the author appears." The author's fear of disappearing can derail the work.	The fear of disappearing can make you fail to commit, to relax instead of working. You try to get "more attention through absence than through presence." In other words, you prefer incompetency to anonymity. The antidote is making a deep commitment to the work and being willing to totally invest yourself in it, doing whatever is needed for it to move ahead.
5	The work moves into "production"—something begins to be irreversibly transformed. Hazard = ACTIVISM. The process can easily become automated (unconscious), so that the transformation happens too fast for assimilation.	The sensitivity to automatism makes you want to make everything conscious so you can monitor what's happening. You want to avoid the consequences of unconscious creation, so you prefer conscious inaction to unconscious action. The challenge is to become conscious and to act (even in the face of your fears).
6	This is the second shock. The process of transformation results in a profound shift in perspective. Everything appears as it actually is, including the self. Hazard = FEAR. The ascent towards clarity is terrifying. Grace provides a descending shock (a "wake up call") in whatever way align the self & the work.	At this point, you've invested yourself in the work and have allowed irreversible changes to take place. You've created the potential for Grace to descend and provide the impetus for a complete shift of perspective. It will be like a "pole shift." Afterwards, you will experience yourself and the work in a whole new way. The fear you feel is in anticipation of this shift.
7	The shock at Point 6 transforms one's perspective on the work. The work that is "ready, clean, and beautiful," but will not fulfill its purpose without disciplined attention to packaging and presentation. Hazard = ISOLATION. Completing the work means adding the finishing touches so that is can be "seen, shared, and used." The work still has a purpose. Lack of interest at this point creates isolation from the larger community.	The relief in getting past the second shock and sudden opening of perspective makes you eager to experience your newly-found freedom, not be tethered to your work. You want to fly, not walk—to do many things, not just one. It's hard to see the importance of follow-through and it feels like a sacrifice to continue working. But the work still matters. And your expanded perspective puts you in a unique position to transform a work into a work of art.
8	The work is essentially complete, but is perfected only by the right attitude in the doer—humble, grateful, and beneficent. Hazard = INGRATITUDE. Successful completion can bring overconfidence, arrogance, and ingratitude.	Now that the work is complete, you feel big, strong, and powerful (especially as compared to others). It can be hard to remember that the power you feel is not really yours, but comes to you from a higher source. It can also be hard to admit your vulnerabilities, to give credit to those who helped you get where you are, and to willingly harness your talents in the service of others.
9	This is the third shock. All the work of the previous cycle is assimilated and then left behind. All that remains in the doer who no longer has anything to do.	Now is the time for inner renewal. You feel receptive without knowing quite why. You have a hard time knowing who you are, what you want, why you act. You are between cycles, so life seems to lack a

---

[4] Bernier uses the work "danger," but this seems to me to connote physical danger, so I substituted the word "hazard," which is somewhat broader in scope.

Hazard = STATUS-QUO. Satisfaction with previous achievements can become a barrier unless one realizes that experiences are to be assimilated as food for thought, not accumulated like trophies.	unifying theme upon which you could base your actions. Such desires as come are transient and hard to sustain. Eventually, some themes begin to emerge into consciousness. An idea gradually starts to form. Anticipation builds. Nine moves to One, and the cycle begins again.