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Abstract: This Trends article discusses the Maslowian hierarchy of needs in the context of 9-11 terrorist attacks and the relationship between executive and judicial branches of American government.

The formal history of psychology cites Abraham Maslow as the creator of a theoretical hierarchy of needs. The hierarchy is usually depicted as an isosceles triangle rising from the most basic physiological needs through safety/security needs to the least basic need—one that can only be satisfied after all other needs have been taking care of: the need of self-actualization that comprises doing what a person is uniquely and individually suited for.

In this context of Maslowian motivational theory, one might profitably consider the remarks of a federal trial judge who criticized United States (US) Department of Justice officials for refusing to name those people arrested on immigration charges post-9/11. As quoted in The New York Times, she stated “the first priority of the judicial branch must be to ensure that our government always operates within the statutory and constitutional constraints which distinguish a democracy from a dictatorship.” She also is paraphrased as stating that the physical security of US citizens is the obligation of the executive branch.

By Maslow’s criteria, the judge is ascribing more basic needs to the executive than to the judicial branches. Because the judge made a decision—since overruled—that the executive branch must conform to the judicial prerogative, she seems to be suggesting that Maslow’s hierarchy needs to be modified. She may also be suggesting that the primary responsibility of a political entity—even if that responsibility is less important than some other entity’s primary responsibility—should be discharged with all due energy as if it were more important than a more important responsibility. This special interest approach to a federalized checks and balances perspective may or may not be what the US Founding Fathers had in mind. However, it seems to touch on a Platonic notion of ideal forms (of democracy) that may transcend human life. In an era of countering terror with global reach, the notion that democracy can survive in the absence of democratic people seems uncomfortably close to a totalistic and utopian view of life that may be responsible for many of the atrocities in human history. (See Diaz-Guerrero, R., & Diaz-Loving, R. (2001). An approach to the origin of values. Psychology & Education: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 38, 49-53; Lewis, N. (November 19, 2002). U.S. says revealing names would aid Al Qaeda. The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com; Maslow, A. (1970). Motivation and personality. (2nd ed.) Harper & Row; Xiao, J. J., & Fan, J. X. (2002). A comparison of saving motives of urban Chinese and American workers. Family & Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 30, 463-495.)
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