

## The Influence of Alfred Adler on Current Psychology\*

ALFRED FARAN, *New York*

Today, psychotherapy is no longer a revolutionary endeavor. It is recognized and appreciated as one of the most important services to the public. To become a worker in one of the many fields of modern psychology is the wish and professional aim of thousands of young people. This was not quite the case at the beginning of our century.

Alfred Adler is one of the pioneers in the science or, as he would call it, the art of psychotherapeutic practice. He was not favorably accepted by his colleagues, neither those of the old school who did not believe in a human soul, nor those of the newer group who ridiculed his discoveries. But he possessed the strength and courage he so often asked of his fellow men. And eventually he found a handful of faithful students and friends whom he won over by the spiritual power of his philosophy of life, as well as by the realism of his approach. Today, forty years after he developed Individual Psychology, Adler is considered an outstanding figure in the development of psychology.

I would like to explain Adler's work as an historical phenomenon which is connected with the past and future in its totality. This cannot be done however, without giving a rough picture of modern psychotherapy as a whole. In order to do this, I must omit many things. I cannot go into details, and I must assume that this audience is familiar with the basic facts.

The history of psychotherapy is a story of great individual feats, but of little organized and systematic work. That is why many people even today believe that modern psychotherapy came into existence through some kind of magic performed by Sigmund Freud. But it

---

\*Lecture delivered at Hunter College, October 12, 1951, and sponsored by the Individual Psychology Association, New York.

occurred quite differently. Psychotherapy is as old as mankind itself, and certainly older than medicine. Even before medical men were able to treat diseases with drugs or surgery, primitive magical and religious practices were in use. Every era knew men and women whom we should call "psychotherapists," such as, doctors, teachers, philosophers, and priests. Pythagoras cured mentally disturbed people with music. Hippocrates realized that paranoia was a mental disease. Plato described art and science as sexual sublimations, as the Freudians do. Arabian doctors of the 10th century A.D., such as Rhazes and Avicenna, were modern psychotherapists. Paracelsus, at the end of medieval times, once said, "If a medical man does not understand and love philosophy, one should not consider him a medical man." The so-called romantic medicine of the 19th century was psychotherapeutically inclined; thus Dr. Hahnemann's homeopathy advocated the spiritual influence of drugs.

Freud's work itself is inconceivable without the strange and bold discoveries made by Charcot and Bernheim in Paris and Nancy about hypnosis. Their work could be traced back to the Austrian, Franz Anton Mesmer. The great psychiatrist, Karl Georg Stahl, recognized repression as the underlying cause of mental diseases, as far back as 1690; Karl Gustav Carus (a friend of Goethe's) wrote about dreams; Scherner wrote the first book about dream-symbols in 1861.

And how about the poets, our greatest teachers in psychology, as Adler used to call them? Decades before Krefft-Ebing wrote *Psychopathia Sexualis*, before Havelock Ellis's *Studies in Sexuology* was written or Weininger's *Sex and Character*, Balzac and Stendahl had written their books about the love life of man. Dostoievsky reveals the most amazing insight into dreams in his novels. And does not the following sentence, "The wish to overcome an affect is nothing but the stronger urge of another affect or of some other affects . . ." sound like a quotation from a textbook of modern psychiatry? But it is a quotation from Friedrich Nietzsche, written in 1880.

Of course, all this cannot minimize the achievements of a genius like Freud. Whatever a great man finds at his disposal is only the material for his creativeness. We just want to make it clear that psychoanalysis did not spring from Freud as Athena did from her godly father's head in the Greek legend. However, the organized and systematic work in depth-psychology started with Freud.

There is a joke about the girl who came to the analyst and looked at a picture on the wall, a watermelon on a plate. The analyst asked

her, "What comes to your mind?" The girl without hesitating answered, "Sexual intercourse." The analyst was a little surprised about the connection and asked her, "Why does it come to your mind?" So the girl said, "Because it is always on my mind."

If we were to ask the average man on the street today, "What is your first thought if you think of psychoanalysis?" (assuming that most people, at least in New York, would know about it) it is extremely likely that the answer would be "Sex." That most people would give this answer can easily be explained by their interest in sex; they take out of analysis what they like best; but the less superficial question is: "Why does psychoanalysis really put the emphasis on sex?"

Consider the historical development, look at the European situation in the last decades of the 19th century, and you will understand it. People always had sex on their minds. It was an era of peace and prosperity, at least for many people, although there were millions who lived under terrible social conditions. The ruling classes and the intellectuals of this era pretended to be on their way toward overcoming everything "bad," "dirty," and "dark" in human life of the past. Progress in all fields of science would lead mankind straight ahead into Paradise. Life was obviously under control, man on his indisputable march to the fulfillment of his mission on earth. Alas, it was not quite so, as our own experiences show. It fits into the picture of this era, that sex was despised as the dirty part of human nature. Man had always lied about sex, but probably never more than in the Victorian Age. Sex was covered up. They despised whores, but never before had so many pornographic books been published as in the 19th century, never before had so many brothels been installed. A "fine, clean, decent lady" was not allowed to know that such women and houses existed. A decent lady would not even use such suggestive words as "trousers"; but I have statistics before me, published in 1898 by a certain Dr. Blaschko, a German state physician, stating that of 50,000 men in the 30-year age group 24,000 had had gonorrhoea, and 11,000 had had syphilis. Doctors had the same prejudices as their patients. They wrote books and magazines to enlighten the public about the dreadful consequences of masturbation. In their opinion, masturbation was responsible for all kinds of nervous diseases, strokes, takes, blindness, paralysis, and senile dementia. And a man by the name of Alexander Weil wrote in 1895, "A man who has sexual intercourse with two healthy women at the same time, will undoubtedly acquire syphilis, even if

both women are faithful to him, because vice and unfaithfulness are in themselves the cause for a venereal disease."

This was not an exception. Ivan Bloch, one of the foremost scientists of the epoch, the author of *The Sexual Life of Our Time*, a progressive man who fought in his books for equal rights for women and defended free love, wrote in 1908, "Babies should wear mittens while sleeping to avoid masturbation. The method of some doctors to threaten a little boy that they would cut his genitals off if he was to continue masturbation, can sometimes be of great value. Small operations, performed by a skilled surgeon, are often a radical cure and can be recommended. . . ."

If we look at facts like that, we will understand the overemphasis Freud had to put on sex, and share the admiration for what he did in liberating the minds of people.

Turning now to Freud and concentrating on the most important events and the essence of psychoanalysis, the most decisive achievements of Freud are, in my opinion: First, the discovery of the infantile sexuality; second, the first scientific approach to neurosis, and third, the theories about the instincts.

Freud started with hypnosis as a possible cure for neurosis. It was the first time any one had tried to remove the cause of a neurotic disease, i.e., hysteria, instead of relieving a symptom. When, in an hypnotic state the patient had "spoken out" the real cause, the symptom which substituted for a repressed wish disappeared. But Freud found this method of "cleaning out"—catharsis—unreliable; he was looking for a better and improved one. The patient should be awake and talk freely from the bottom of his unconscious. So Freud discovered free association. He called his new method "psychoanalysis." For ten years there was only *one* man on earth who knew about analysis and could perform it—Freud himself.

After the turn of the century, his dream theory was published. The man on the street who always had believed that dreams had a meaning was right. Dreams *had* a meaning. Since our repressed wishes are sexual wishes, Freud pointed out, all neuroses have a sexual etiology, and dreams have a sexual meaning, too. It is a fulfillment of a wish, a fulfillment of a sexual wish. Freud found that the symptoms of neurotic people, the dreams of all of us, and even the daily slips of tongue, show the same kind of dynamic mechanism. Sex, always sex, taboo in our society, wants fulfillment against the demands

of culture, and finds an outlet in a slip of tongue, in a dream, in a neurotic symptom.\*

Freud looks at mankind with a deep feeling of pessimism. The Paradise Lost of the principle of pleasure. Each child wants to repeat the old way of mankind, the pleasure-drive of mankind, fighting against the principle of reality. The result of this fight is what we call character. Culture is, as Freud once said, a bubble; any minute it can burst.

*Oedipus*, the first nucleus of his philosophy of life, shows the same tragic pessimism. No one can escape this fate. Children are not innocent, as so many generations believed, but go through different phases of sexual development. Starting with pleasurable sensations all over the body, the infant later goes through the oral phase, the anal-sadistic phase, and reaches the genital-oedipal phase before the onset of a long period of latency. Man is the only animal who starts his sexual life twice. Maybe, says Freud, this is the reason for our neurotic diseases.

*Libido*—the energy of the sex drive, a tremendous somatic energy, is the second nucleus of Freud's theories. Freud's approach to all problems of personal life is a biological one, and even his approach to group and cultural problems is based on his instinctual theories.

In the meantime Freud had won some reputation, and a few people had joined him in his scientific research. Among them was Alfred Adler whom he had invited to discuss important problems with him. In 1911 a revolution started. It was Adler who was the first to refuse to acknowledge any longer the *exclusiveness* of the sexual concept of neurosis. "Neurosis is not only a sexual problem," Adler said, "it is a character pattern." Not the *libido*, but the style of life of a person is important. And here in his breaking away from Freud we begin to see one of the basic differences between the two men: Adler is the *optimist*. The *life style* of a person is a creation, that means *it can be changed*.

From now on, Freud was forced to revise his concepts again and again. The ego, free of sexual impulses in Freud's original concept, becomes now itself an object of love: self-love. Narcissism started to play its great role in analysis. In this connection Freud's ideological

---

\*But if pathological symptoms have so much in common with the most harmless slips, where is a limit to psychopathology? There *is* no limit. Daily life is filled with it and what we called "psychopathology" becomes normal behavior.

superstructure came into existence. Ego, Id and Superego are three different levels of the psyche. The Id is unconscious as a whole, knowing only *one law*—to have pleasure. It is the eternal child in us. The Id is uneducable. The Ego—partly conscious, partly unconscious—represents our feelings, our thoughts; it *can* be educated, *can* be civilized. The Ego is able to repress unacceptable drives into the Id. But the strongest repressing power is the Superego. It is our conscience in later life. The Id is *born* with us, the Ego *starts with our birth*, the Superego *develops out of the Oedipus-situation*; it represents our inhibitions—parents, society, God. The Ego has to fight against three overwhelming powers—against the reality of life, against the drives of the Id, and against the threats of punishment of the Superego. No wonder there is anxiety. In his original writings Freud thought of anxiety as a physiological process: transformed sexual libido. Now he had to revise his theory: neurotic defenses are developed in an attempt to cope with anxiety. Anxiety is a danger signal—a danger signal from within. It expresses itself by symptoms and by the defense mechanisms of the ego; e.g., to return to an infantile situation (regression); to produce a physical symptom (conversion); to accuse someone of what one is doing or wishing oneself (projection), and so on.

More and more Freud focused his attention on the Ego. All drives of life, of love, of self preservation, said Freud now, are “Eros”; all drives against life—“Thanatos”—the death drive, the drive of aggression, sadism, masochism, destruction. All life wants to return to immobility—to its inorganic state. Again in his last theory about drives, Freud’s unavoidable fateful pessimism is confirmed.

In the meantime, several of Freud’s pupils and followers had gone their own ways. Wilhelm Reich wrote on character analysis, Anna Freud on ego defenses, Rank on the birth trauma, to mention just a few. Then a big change took place in the transference situation: the doctor-patient relationship. The inactive listening of the analyst was transformed into a more active partnership; and suddenly it was discovered that analysis is a human relationship! “An analyst cannot help a patient,” said Ferenczi, “towards whom he cannot feel friendly.” Reich showed that definite patterns are always used by the patient as a form of resistance. To show this pattern again and again to the patient, to make him consciously aware, can hasten the procedure of analysis. Rank said, “A patient does not suffer always from his childhood. We have to deal more with the present than with the past.” Karen Horney said later, that the analytic situation is not always the

reliving of a parental situation; it very often represents other important relationships too, and the relationship to the doctor is a very special situation in addition. It is a struggle for power between the patient and his analyst.

It is quite apparent that the nearer we come to the present time in our review of psychoanalysis, the more familiar it sounds to Adlerians. In the last decade of his life, Freud himself became more and more interested in problems of society as a whole. As mentioned already, he based his cultural outlook on his biological theories and was, one could say, deeply disinterested in historical facts and social conditions. Horney, Fromm, Sullivan, all go in the direction of a social outlook on life and culture, rejecting the libido theory as a Freudian bias. This is a major tendency in psychoanalysis today.

We have not talked much of Adler yet, but he was always present. If we look at the historical way of analysis, the most decisive change in the last fifty years was a sharp turn from *biology* to *sociology*. Today, the social and cultural factor plays the most important role in all psychological schools of thought. And the man who anticipated this development and influenced all these schools—consciously or unconsciously—was Adler. *Individual Psychology is a turning point in psychoanalysis*.

Let us delve deeper now into Adler's own teachings.

There are three fundamental periods of development in Adler's work—the biological one, the social one, and the metaphysical one.

In the center of his work are the *inferiority feeling* and the *inferiority complex*, two psychological terms which have become more famous than anything else discovered by Adler, and which at the same time are still misunderstood by most people.

An inferiority *feeling* is not a part of a neurosis; it is a natural, normal feeling that everyone has, if the situation justifies it. Adler himself said, "To live means to have an inferiority feeling." Our feeling of inferiority stems from childhood. The little being comes into a world of giants. Nature often enough gives us deficient organs. Society very often gives us deficient conditions for growing up. Inferiority feelings may be biological ones (by birth) or social ones (by acquisition). But man, poorer and more helpless at his birth than any animal, has not only the gift of ability to compensate very often for physical defects, he has a special tool: his soul, to compensate psychologically for physical *and* psychic deficiencies. In our culture, there is a strong temptation, however, not only to compensate, but to over-

compensate in an unproductive way. Here starts the path to neurosis.

The difference between an inferiority *feeling* and an inferiority *complex* is exactly the difference between a *healthy* reaction and a *neurotic* one. If one's whole style of life has become poisoned by the fear one cannot cope with the demands of life, then we can call it an inferiority *complex*. If a man does not want to fly a week after experiencing an air crash, he is definitely *not* neurotic; but if, after this bad experience, he becomes a recluse and does not leave his home anymore—then he certainly *is* neurotic.

There is a bridge to the other people, a real one: *Social Feeling*, another term of Adler's greatly misunderstood by many. Social feeling is not a demand given by a philosopher. Social feeling is a necessity given by nature itself; it is a biological fact, crippled and undeveloped by our culture. Man cannot live without eating and drinking. Man cannot live without social feeling. He just does not know—yet, because one does not know, one does not die of lack of social feeling immediately. But millions of people *have* died in the past thousands of years, and are going to die in the future, if we do not become aware of and are willing to accept the basic fact of our life on this planet: that mankind is a unity. The one world thought of today was anticipated by Adler thirty years ago.

Adler called his philosophy "Individual Psychology." This means that just as *mankind* is a unity, *man* is a unity. *Individuum*: he cannot be divided into parts, if we want to understand him. Whatever he does, whatever he thinks or feels, follows the same secret pattern, fulfills the same dynamic law, belonging only to him. How he remembers his early childhood recollections, how he laughs, how he sleeps, every gesture reveals his personal style of life. And whatever he finds coming into the world: advantages and disadvantages of inheritance, of environment—important as it may be—what counts, is only what a man does in his given conditions, which goal he has in mind, whether he wants to live a useful life for himself and others—or a useless one for himself and others, seeing life only as a struggle for personal power.

What is a neurosis? It is a socially wasted life. In Adlerian philosophy, it is the wrong answer to the three unavoidable tasks of life: social contact, love, and profession.

Freud wrote in 1914, "Psychoanalysis has never claimed to provide a complete theory of human mentality as a whole. . . . Now Alfred Adler goes too far: he seeks to explain the character of human beings



as well as their neurotic and psychotic manifestations." This implies that Freud at that time not only greatly underestimated the value of his own work, but that he reproached Adler exactly for what has become in the meantime one of the latter's greatest merits: the concept of the *totality of the character*.

Character develops, in the opinion of the Freudian, along the libido line, and is a fixation upon one of the early states of development. Abraham and Fenichel have later described very clearly, for example, the anal and the oral types. For Adler the character of a person is not the product of a mechanical biological process, but a social response of a human being to the demands of life. The child trains his character traits and can exchange them for others from one day to the other, if they prove useless for his special purposes. Children are stubborn or obedient because of their living experiences. Man *chooses* his character. When Erich Fromm, one of the contemporary cultural analysts, says that a stingy man does not suffer from constipation because he is an anal type, but rather because he is stingy in all situations in life, and consequently must also retain his feces, he accepts the total concept of character. And when Fromm later adds: The development of a child's character is the interaction between child and "parents," he comes very close to Adler.

Let us point now to other differences between Freudian and Adlerian psychology. Repression and anxiety are in Adler's opinion just masks of the style of life. Behind all phenomena we see the inferiority feeling and the wish to overcome it, to reach by every means a feeling of superiority. The Oedipus complex, too, is a way of reaching this goal. The jealousy of the child is not necessarily a sexual one; it is a trick of using one's weakness to force the parents into one's own service. A fixation on one's mother is not necessarily sexual desire, but fear of life. The mother-child relation is of highest importance, however. It is the mother who leads the child toward community life or toward neurosis. This is such "common sense" as we were always told, that it had to be *re-discovered* many years later in one of the newest contemporary books, Bergler's *Oral Neurosis*.

We often hear that Adler rejected the unconscious and the interpretations of dreams. That is not true. He simply believed so strongly in the unity of the soul that dream interpretation was sometimes not even necessary for him. Each gesture of a patient had shown and revealed to him already the same unconscious pattern which a dream could have revealed. His total concept of the unity of the conscious *and*

unconscious mind is accepted today, by all analysts, whether they know it or not. What else are the short interviews of clinical psychologists and psychiatrists, but a way of finding out in the shortest possible time by a few questions the unconscious tendencies and the totality of a dynamic character pattern of a patient? And one of the cultural analysts, Sullivan, says: "We have to center our main interest on the behavior of a patient in everyday life, to understand him and to treat him successfully."

Adler's therapy is based on the human inter-relationship between the patient and the analyst. There is no longer any use for a couch, this remnant of the hypnotic period of psychoanalysis. The authority of an analyst has its roots in his deeper insight into the situation: two people working together in close co-operation, the analyst an active participant, examining the present conflict and the past conflict as well, insofar as it still has influence on the present one. Of course the patient has the tendency to minimize the effort of his analyst. Because to give up his neurosis means for him an end to his childlike behavior; and to grow up means at the same time to admit the analyst's victory. The neurotic can only think in terms of gaining or losing power. He is not reliving sexual fixations of his childhood transferred to the analyst. He fights him because he fights *everyone* in his peculiar cowardly way of escaping life.

Do you remember now the later developments in transference-situation which we mentioned before—Ferenczi, Reich, Rank, Horney?

Now about sex. Many still believe that their attitude toward sex was the greatest difference between Adler and Freud; that Adler rejected sex. How could a psychologist of his rank deny the importance of one of the strongest human drives? He *did not* deny it, but he did not glorify it. Sex is for Adler *one* function of life among *others*, and it is molded just like the others, by a person's style of life.

The rather ironical truth is: If one reads with open eyes the books of Sigmund Freud, now many years after they were written, one gets the feeling that this great sex-liberator of mankind himself fell victim to the sexual prejudices of his era; that *he* is the one who rejects and even despises sex, but continues diligently with his work as an honest man, sadly knowing it is his duty to finish his job. On the other hand, if you read Adler, who never emphasized sex as extremely important, you get the feeling: Here speaks a man who accepts sex with a friendly attitude, not as a threat, but as one of the greatest sources of joy and emotional satisfaction.

The real difference between Freud and Adler is not their attitudes toward sex; it is the emphasis Adler put on the *Ego-psychology* as early as 1910. I quote: "One cannot get rid of the unity of the ego. One can see it from all angles, from the conscious life, from the unconscious life, from the libido, from the external world; one can compare it with a machine, with a bloodthirsty animal, with a stream of life, yet the result of all research will always be: the Ego is a reality, the only one we can deal with." This again sounds like common sense, but it seems to me that there is a peculiar trend among psychologists—they do not like common sense. If a book is not written in a way that nobody can understand it, it cannot be good. Nevertheless, in the long run, Adler's simplicity was victorious. Rank was the first one of the Freudians to emphasize the Ego. For him Id and Superego were not the overwhelming powers as for Freud. The conscious Ego is the representative of our will. It has realized and recognized the external world, later the internal world; it is the self-creative power of human development.

Today, Ego-Psychology is in the center of all psychological and psychiatric attention. And the drive of *aggression* too, Adler had never grown tired of pointing to it. In connection with it, sado-masochism became a big problem in psychoanalysis. Adler had found his own way in this direction very early. We speak of the "masculine protest."

What is the "masculine protest"? In our culture a woman feels inferior to men; she protests against her biological fate. The envied man on the other hand feels inferior, too, to other men who are stronger than he, who are more successful than he. So the woman wants to be a man, the man wants to be a hero. This neurotic battle going on for centuries is only on the surface a sexual phenomenon; in reality it is a social phenomenon, the tragic result of the overestimation of man's position in our culture. Will-power and decisiveness are not exclusive "male" qualities; cowardice and obedience are not "female" ones. Both sexes use sadistic and masochistic character traits, whichever fits better in their life plan. One can reach one's goal of superiority both ways. Obedience sometimes turns out to work better than the strongest will. It was Wilhelm Reich, however, who was the first one of the analytical school to accept sado-masochism as a social function.

But even social feeling has conquered the analytical system. Are there not similarities between superego and social feeling? Just as the childhood situation of the inferiority feeling should be solved by social

feeling, so the childhood situation of the Oedipus should be solved by the superego. But there is an important difference too. Superego is a moral value, created by man: "Thou shalt." . . . Adler's social feeling is an inborn collective-biological fact.

The nearer we come in our survey to our time, the more psychology becomes social science. Psychologists, historians, anthropologists, are working together. We now speak of the so-called cultural school; Horney, Fromm, Sullivan, belong to it. First, let us talk about Karen Horney and her discoveries. Horney says that anxiety characterizes our culture. There are four ways of protection and security: 1. To have the love of one's environment; "If he loves me, he *is not permitted to hurt me.*" 2. The will for power; "If I have power, *no one can hurt me.*" 3. Submission: "If I submit to him, *he is not going to hurt me.*" 4. The last consequence: escape.

What is Horney's "idealized image"? To have a false picture of oneself, which one uses as a protection and defense, gaining at the same time a feeling of superiority, although this is a poor substitute for dealing in a non-neurotic, productive way with people and situations. This sounds very familiar.

And now I read literally from Karen Horney's *New Ways in Psychoanalysis*. She says, "It is much easier for a woman to think that she is nasty to her husband because she was born without a penis and envies him for having one, than to think that she has developed an attitude of righteousness and infallibility, which makes it impossible to tolerate any questioning or disagreement. It is much easier for a patient to think that nature has given her an unfair deal, than to realize that she actually makes excessive demands on the environment and is furious whenever they are not complied with." And concerning these statements, Gardner Murphy in his *Historical Introduction to Modern Psychology*, says (p. 345) "If we read sentences like this, we understand why the Adlerians claim that Karen Horney is a plagiarist." And another critic, a New York journalist, wrote some time ago, "Dr. Horney has written a new wonderful book by Alfred Adler."

Now a few remarks about Fromm and Sullivan. Fromm says, "The most beautiful as well as the most ugly inclinations of man are not a part of a fixed biologically given human nature, but result from the social process which creates man." From there he goes his way. Drives are a biological fact and we can find them all over the world. Hunger and sex-drives are the same in Western civilization as in New Zealand. But hunger and sex-drive *development* is different all over the world.

The history of different cultures is a social process. Society as a whole is not only a repressing power, as Freud believed, but a creative one as well.

There is a will for power in man, but we have to differentiate between rational and irrational authority. Rational authority is the deeper insight of an individual in given conditions; his higher rank among others is based on a realistic fact. Fromm says further, "Man needs moral standards to develop his abilities. Egotism is not our worst evil. How can the neurotic love himself, when he doesn't know what love is at all. The modern man is completely disinterested in the most pressing problems of life; namely, what man really is and how he should live to liberate his own energies, undiscovered as yet."

Sullivan believes that man has two main goals: satisfaction and security. Satisfaction deals primarily with biological drives; security deals with cultural needs. Some psychological problems have to do with these drives, but most of them are social problems. Security, in its deepest sense, means belonging somewhere. Man wants to be accepted, wants to avoid being rejected. When Fromm speaks of the "true self," he means it more in the sense in which Jung uses the term: "our very existence." When Sullivan speaks of it, then it is a growing potentiality developed by the burning desire for acceptance and the fear of rejection. Two people together are already a group. What goes on between two or more people, Sullivan calls "interpersonal relationship." We cannot meet anyone without establishing a relationship the very moment we meet. This relationship can be a realistic one, but much more often this is not the case. All kinds of unrealistic connections with other people can exist. We cannot only identify a person with other experiences, but we can idealize him; he may even become a product of our imagination. The analyst is himself involved; he has to be a participating observer; he has to *observe* the patient at the same time life goes on. In analysis the analyst is involved in an interpersonal relationship with his patient. He is a *participant*. Transference is much more complicated than Freud once thought. It is not the repetition of a parental situation alone, for everyone who plays a role in the life of the patient—whether rational or irrational—can be identified with the analyst. This is what Sullivan calls—"parataxic distortion," and from all these irrational playgrounds he has to lead the patient to a higher degree of reality-approach. The more the patient sees the analyst as he really is, the more the patient can be considered "cured."

We have seen from this brief survey that Fromm and Sullivan are not Adlerians but we have also seen at the same time how strongly the whole cultural school is influenced by Adlerian philosophy.

There is another field which was influenced by Adler, who was one of the great educators of mankind. He was the kind of educator that Pestalozzi (another great educator) wanted all teachers to be: not a "Lehrmeister"—a master in the art of teaching—but "Lebemeister"—a master in the art of living. The essence of Adler's theories of education is: there isn't such a thing as a hopeless pupil. If the pupil is hopeless, the teacher is hopeless too, and shouldn't have become a teacher at all. Of course, there are limits to all abilities, but how can one know where the limits are, if one has not tried to find out again and again? Training should be your future magic word. Stop at a certain point because you were not successful and you may ruin your own chances of success. Who knows? 605 times Paul Ehrlich failed in his experiments. If he had stopped discouraged and hopeless, Salvarsan never would have been discovered. It took him 606 *experiments*, just 606, and no one could have foretold that it would take him just 606 to become a success instead of failure. Yes, Paul Ehrlich was an outstanding man; but Adler has proved in thousands of cases of average plain people that talent is the effect rather than the cause of training in a particular field. Courage, said Adler, can be taught like history or geography. The world is full of pampered children and neglected children—adult, but not grown up. Both groups are unprepared for life, because both groups are afraid, feeling that the world is full of enemies one cannot fight. Education therefore has to start with teachers and parents, and since he was a courageous man himself, Adler left his quiet doctor's office and stepped out into public life to teach encouragement in a practical way.

Within a few years, a work which was destined to have historical consequences emerged. Adler with his friends and pupils made the Vienna of thirty years ago a Mecca of modern psychotherapy. Model schools, advisory councils, guidance clinics, consultation centers, all the fields of mental hygiene we today call "Social Therapy" were established for the first time, first in Vienna, later in Berlin and other European cities.

Adler said that even the best psychiatrist could not help a disturbed child without the help of the teacher, because the teacher is familiar with the home life of the child and knows about the influence of friends, neighbors, and relatives of the child. On the other hand, he

does not understand too much about the dynamics of neurosis. So why not work together? And why not work together with the parents? Try to explain to them the difficulties of the child instead of leaving them to their own ignorance and prejudices. Adler's opinion proved to be right. Many "stupid" children have turned out to be just as intelligent as the rest. "This boy cannot learn and he never will," but he *did* learn as soon as his emotional blocks were removed.

Today wherever you find social workers either as psychiatric assistants in wartime, or as trained helpers for needy people in peacetime, or wherever you find vocational guidance clinics, psychological counselors, school psychologists, whether or not these people are Adlerians (mostly they are *not*), it is *Adler* whose life-work has paved the way.

One can hardly find a field of modern psychotherapy which this great pioneer has not influenced. Psychoanalysis has conquered the world, but Adler's ideas have penetrated the whole world of psychoanalysis. It is as if he, a big magnet resting in the deepest level of unconscious psychoanalysis, has forced all the powers to turn towards him.

It is interesting to note in this connection that Adler's indirect influence is even greater than his direct one. I have a report before me about group therapy published some time ago in the *Journal for the Advancement of Psychotherapy*. "There are patients in the group who never talked about their own problem, but being part of a group seems to change their own point of view almost by itself." (Looks like development of social feeling!) And further: "Patients who could not lose their feelings of guilt despite years of private analysis, lost them in a short time in group therapy. The desire not to be better, nor worse either, than the others seemingly has liberated them from their guilt feelings." (I remember an Adler sentence, "Guilt feelings are inferiority feelings.") And these two statements mentioned in the report (among others showing the same trend) come from psychiatrists who are certainly *not* Adlerians!

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that Adlerians have elaborated in different fields on Adler's theories with great success. Shoobs applied Adler's psychology to school discipline through personality adjustment. Marguerite and Willard Beecher have published a booklet on their work with children who could not learn to read despite all efforts. Many Adlerians and non-Adlerians work in remedial reading. There is an alarmingly high incidence of reading failure in this country. The Adlerians believe that every child (unless he is

feeble-minded) can learn to read. They refuse to apply any kind of mechanical or forceful methods. Children who cannot read, do not *want* to read for emotional reasons. Remedial reading is the effort to understand the unwillingness to read, as a symptom only of a wrong approach of the child toward life as a whole. These children, socially humiliated again and again by teachers, classmates, and parents, consider reading a horrible task. They have to learn first to enjoy to play with words, before they can and will learn to read.

Another educational method is Leonard Deutsch's sight reading method in piano teaching. Deutsch found that facility on the keyboard develops through trial and error, and that this development does not depend on a particular aptitude but calls for a tremendous persistent effort. The "talented" are those who are ready to do this hard work. The average pupil either shuns the effort or has too high expectations. Therefore, the fundamental problem of piano instruction is psychological; to help the pupil to increase his effort and to accept the results as they are, without being discouraged. This problem as Deutsch has shown can only be solved with the help of Adlerian psychology.

And now, after some detours, we come to Adler's *metaphysical attitude*. It may be hard to believe that Freud's attitude was a metaphysical one. A man faithful to the materialistic viewpoint of his youth, a rationalistic thinker all his life, speaking of the chemistry of sexuality, comparing some neuroses with phenomena produced by injection of toxic drugs, emphasizing that libido is the psychic correlate belonging to biological facts we don't know yet—how could he be considered a metaphysical philosopher? But he is the same man who wrote: "Besides the Ego we recognize another psychic world, much greater and darker than the Ego, and this we call the Id. The Ego is between reality and the Id, and the Id is the real psychic world. . . ." Of course psychoanalysis is a metaphysical philosophy and Freud *must* have known it. But he has *repressed* it and that is the most decisive reason, in my opinion, why he had to reject Adler and Jung. Because both of them had an anti-materialistic outlook on life.

But how different are the two men (Adler and Jung) in their metaphysical approach. We have heretofore hardly mentioned Jung. He stays outside of the analytical movement. For Jung the Ego is a small island in the infinite ocean of the unconscious mind. All mankind rests by its very existence in the cosmos, and the common symbols of mankind—the archetypes—are mirrored through the collective unconscious in the individual. Adler's standpoint is a synthesis of a real-



istic attitude to life and a transcendental approach. For him a human being is first and last a member of the society in which he is living, connected with all other members of his community. But as mankind as a whole is part of our planet, man by his practical effort to improve the life of mankind is connected in space and time with the cosmic existence.

And here the *moral value* of Individual Psychology comes into the picture. Social feeling is a biological fact, but, I think, Adler's optimism is a moral factor. It is an optimism of a special kind. Adler's optimism is unlimited. Adler understood the inherent tragedy of life only too well. Life is difficult, life is dangerous, man is weak. But as no one yet knows where the limits of our potentialities are, let us keep up our fighting spirit. The spirit of optimism is not the tool by which we will succeed under all circumstances, but it is the only tool by which we may succeed at all. Further, Adler's optimism is a creative one. Here the free will of man enters Adler's philosophy. The psyche of man does not follow mechanical and physical laws. Dynamic forces are directed toward chosen goals. Creation is going on—"Panta rhei"—and man by his soul is part of living life and has his say about it.

At least one more field of achievement in Adler's life should be mentioned: his pioneer work in psychosomatic medicine. This should be discussed at length in a special issue.

It was always known that there is a connection between psyche and soma; that for instance, ulcer sufferers are very often in a bad mood and that bad moods have an unfavorable influence upon ulcers. But psychosomatic medicine, developed in the last thirty years, wants to find out how the relationship between emotions of the soul and the biochemistry of the body really functions, and in which way common dynamic laws are at work. Despite all of our efforts we still all have reason to be humble. We know very little. We still think too much in terms of psychic life influencing the body, and vice versa. But it seems that the body and soul's common work can only be understood in relation to a *third* power, we don't know yet, which is behind both of them. Apparently psychosomatic medicine can only be understood (and will be understood that way in the future) from a transcendental background. But this is *my very own personal opinion*. What we know already is, that certain types of personality-diseases exist; that means that there are definite connections between character patterns and *some* disease groups; i.e., headaches, allergies, gastrointestinal and cardio-vascular disease. Disease can be a character-

phenomenon. And all this was anticipated partly and described in detail by Adler in his earliest book, *Study about the Inferiority of Organs and its Psychical Compensation* as early as 1907.

In discussing Adler, the philosopher, psychologist, educator, physician, it is to be hoped you have not received the impression that we want all the laurels of modern psychotherapy for Alfred Adler. There are many good ideas in all schools of thought, and it is about time to join our forces and work together. What we really want is that credit be given Adler when other schools use his thoughts and discoveries. If for instance, Binger in his book *More About Psychiatry* gives the names of twenty people as pioneers in the field of psychosomatic medicine, without mentioning Adler, and when Zilborg in 600 pages of his *History of Psychology* writes six lines about Adler, this is unfair (to put it mildly). It is certain Adler himself would not feel handicapped or neglected by this omission of recognition; yet such recognition would add a certain weight to his life work and would be helpful to his followers in carrying it out.

Despite all difficulties the Adlerian movement is growing from year to year. More and more people, laymen as well as psychologists, are recognizing the values of Adlerian psychology.