

groups is lacking, in society as well as in science. There will come a time when differences of opinion and interest will not constitute hostility and adversity, but multifold and colorful cooperation.

ed in extensive and carefully prepared publications, would give everybody interested in psychology an opportunity to build his own opinion on first-hand information.

We could easily envisage a procedure by which the various schools of thought could unite in offering to the public and to professional workers an integrated picture of the various approaches. It would be possible to arrange conventions where the representatives of all psychological schools would meet to lay down the fruits of their comparative studies. Instead of a one-sided, eclectic description of all the various schools by one author who doesn't do justice to any one direction, the various representatives would compare with each other their findings. They would probably have to elaborate three points: 1) where they agree; 2) where their conceptions mean the same facts, but describe them differently; and finally, 3) where they disagree fundamentally and their conceptions cannot be unified. Such discussions between these groups, present-

Another way of informing the public could be provided by test cases, presented to the different schools; a publication of their collected analyses, interpretations, and suggestions would enable the public and scientists to understand the various approaches and techniques, and thereby promote mutual cooperation. There probably are many other ways by which the integration of all schools into one psychology could be achieved. The obstacle seems to be that as yet all schools are less interested in cooperating than in asserting their own particular "truths." The fight for prestige, covering our own insecurity, is still stronger than the social feeling. Perhaps we Adlerians are no exceptions to this rule; but we should be able, nevertheless, on the basis of our knowledge, to realize the necessity for cooperation--and to encourage it by our work.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

Willard Beecher sends us the additional remarks to the preceding paper:

The "eclectics" seem to have no idea or notion of what a "theory" is supposed to be--that any portion taken from a configuration is hardly to be considered much of a "Truth." They take their little "bits" from one place and another and seem quite happy with the meaningless jumble. Their antics always remind me of a story about Darwin.¹⁾ It is said that his pupils

1) This story has also been told about Louis Agassiz and others. (The Editor.)

wished to play a joke on him: they took the body of one insect, the wings of another, the legs from another, etc., and glued them together. Then they took it to Darwin and asked if he had ever seen such a bug--and what its name might be. He glanced at it and said: "Gentlemen, I think this is a Humbug." Those individuals I have met who claim to have the "best of each

school of psychology" had mostly a broad ignorance.

Then to those who make such a fuss about "objective" psychology; they ought to read Vaihinger's "Philosophy of As If," especially the part on categories; then let them point to the line which "shows" where "subjective" divides itself from "objective"!

The findings of the "testing psychologists" operate to injure their victims. And the public at large does not know the blight cast on the future of a child when he is "discovered inadequate" in one of their tests; even the average teacher considers such results a "true measure" of the capacity of a child. Too often I have seen teachers neglect a child and justify such treatment because the test shows (?) he has not the capacity to profit by instruction! For the most part, these tests have become a "scientific" excuse or alibi for teachers who do not know how to teach; they perpetuate the mistaken belief that some children are "born short" in the power to comprehend. I am sure that one of those "objective tests" would show that I had no card sense and (for this reason) I would be unable (rather than unlikely) to succeed at bridge. I have no "card sense" because I have no interest in playing cards--this, however, tells nothing about my capacity--if I were interested.

On the other hand, a child who gets a low rating in a test is handled

"as if" he had no capacity, when any fool can see that he has no interest! When will some of these so-called educators give up the belief in something called "intelligence" which operates on all things impartially and independently of what we call interest? As far as I can see, no one is ever "smart" in anything which does not interest him. All learning begins with a question in the mind of the individual. The present system of education dumps factual material into the minds of children for their "intelligence" to grind up and digest without ever arousing a question in these minds. Such treatment is worse than rape! It is no wonder that children revolt and reject such material, If these "objective tests" show anything, it is probable that they show how successful some children have been in resisting our senseless violation of their mental processes.

There is a serious misconception in the minds of most people in this country: that Adler's psychology is a "bastard form" of Freud's. Few have any idea that it is wholly different in structure. Because of this notion, few take the trouble to read Adler at all, being willing to accept the designation "superficial" which the Freudians employ to describe Adler. I have never met a single critic of Adlerian psychology that knew the difference between "teleological" and "mechanistic." If people would read Adler, all would go well enough--we must challenge them to "look" before they "compare."