

Willard Beecher

One of the oldest superstitions of the human race is the belief in the power of magical words to express the Devil. In one form or another, this belief appears in the folklore of every tribe. Most religions and ceremonies depend basically on it. Our educational system even believes that if a teacher can but find the right happy combination of words to explain something, every child who hears these words will "learn." In short, even our present social order is strongly dominated by the belief in word-magic--the power of language to work miracles.

One might think, however, that the sciences at least had rid themselves of superstition. Some of them have succeeded to a large degree. Psychology, however, seems fated to be the last to escape the tyranny of language. But, like other sciences, its future growth depends in a large degree on how well we can free from dependence on language our apperception of the nonverbal relationships which constitute human behavior. Psychologists are still too prone to teach, preach, exhort, advise at the verbal level and then to sit back and expect a transformation in the nonverbal behavior of the individual!

Individual Psychology is perhaps the least dependent of all psychologies on language. Doctor Adler used to say that if you want to understand a person, put your fingers in your ears and watch only movement. And his most effective therapeutic techniques were not just trick phrases or clever verbal arrangements aimed at his patients. He fully understood that the psychologist had to identify with the basic situation of the patient to understand him and then BEHAVE (nonverbal activity) in a way that will influence the behavior of the individual. Doctor Adler put little stress on the value or power of words per se and constantly pointed out the "poverty of language."

We who have inherited Doctor Adler's work ought not for a moment to lose sight of this most fundamental feature of it. It is easy to remember and quote his words or to use them to hurlat "patients"--or even at each other. We do this in the hope that it will have therapeutic value! But it is not language that educates either ourselves or others. People "get our number" (are educated) by the behavior we employ toward them and we are educated, in turn, by the way they deal with us.

Individual Psychology recognizes this as the fundamental principle of its therapy and designates COOPERATION as the only possible cure for any and all evils arising from human relationships. Individual Psychology might aptly be described as Cooperation-Therapy. And it is effective just as far as it remains on the basis of cooperation at the nonverbal level. It will fail as all

others will fail if its teaching and practice degenerates into nagging, lecturing, exhorting, advising, and other verbal attempts to force changes of behavior on others. "Magic words" and word-magic are all a part of the magician's paraphernalia. He assumes the role of the "superior" and the pupil is relegated to the role of the "inferior." In this way, cooperation is frustrated, for cooperation can take place only between individuals who regard each other as having equal status as human beings. The psychologist who presumes to force his "truth" on a benighted brother is not an Individual Psychologist, even though he uses the language concepts of Individual Psychology.

It is said that no "Cause" has more dangerous enemies than its friends. We have seen and perhaps been guilty of being neophytes in Individual Psychology, who, after becoming interested, sail forth to convert the world by scolding it for its "non-cooperation." Some remain at this verbal level of "therapy" and others struggle to free themselves of it. None can boast of being entirely free of this mistake.

Our only concern, however, should be to improve our understanding of what rightly constitutes cooperation and to become more cooperative ourselves. Like begets like, and cooperation begets cooperation. The better we understand this, the less tempted we will be to nag and preach that which we have not yet learned to practice in our own lives! The worst weakness of all of us who know Individual Psychology is to assume that because we advocate cooperation, we also cooperate! Adler pointed out that the world is full of Messiahs who are not on speaking terms with each other! To improve our own position, let us admit that we are not yet on good enough "speaking terms" with each other and far from free of the notion that we are Messiahs! Conflicts of opinion must exist in any healthy and growing social organ, but we must not use these as an excuse for hurt feelings or as an alibi for severance from the service of Individual Psychology itself. On the contrary, each conflict can be regarded as a "lesson" in non-cooperation that can give us valuable hints for future use. We must, sooner or later, get free of the belief that we are good cooperators simply because we admire or teach Individual Psychology. The future of Individual Psychology depends entirely on the success each of us has in this reform, for all education is, in the end, self-education!

All this comes back again and again to Adler's Superiority-Inferiority Complex. Disturbances in human relations stem from the ubiquitous desire to demonstrate personal "status" and our concomitant effort to belittle the status of others. It is not so surprising that we are all engaged in such a pursuit if we realize that it was only yesterday in historical time that the human race was sharply divided into a few who were "masters" and many who were "slaves." And even today, our social and economic life still encourages us to "look up" to some and to "look down" on others. Those who apperceive themselves to be above others feel divinely

privileged to employ and direct the efforts of others with little or no regard for their welfare.

This is the situation which presents itself whenever an individual is singled out for "psychological treatment." His behavior always betrays that he apperceives his situation (and himself) as being either "higher than the high" or "lower than the low"; his tragedy is that he cannot find his "equal" and therefore cannot cooperate with anyone. Individual Psychology (Cooperation-Therapy) must provide in the person of the psychologist someone who not only can talk about cooperation at the verbal level but one who also can relate himself as an "equal" at the nonverbal level! The patient has no experience in doing this, else he would not be a patient! It is stupid to tell him he MUST LEARN to cooperate, for he can always choose to remain a patient by further non-cooperation, thus defeating the arrogance of the one who attempts to "give him commands."

It is only by establishing the conditions of cooperation and equality at the nonverbal level of behavior that the therapist will succeed. Failures arise if this vital point is neglected. It might also be said in most cases that the patient does not improve because the psychotherapist has not learned the meaning of cooperation himself!

Now there is no fixed or Absolute Standard by which we can measure cooperation, equality, and such matters. But within certain limits we can agree as to what is cooperative and what is exploitative behavior. We are reduced to using similes such as "pulling one's share of the load," "sharing the disadvantages as well as the advantages of a situation," etc., to describe the cooperative situation. Disturbances arise as soon as someone pulls either too much or too little of the load. Behind every timid person is the shadow of someone who was too overprotective. And behind every disorderly or lazy person is the shadow of someone who did more than his share to create order and get work done swiftly.

The significance of this is too often not understood. "Therapy" is usually directed only against the "lazy" child himself, and the one who has made it possible for him to develop this style of behavior is unchallenged in his own mistaken ways. This can best be illustrated by the case of the father and mother of a very timid boy. Both parents were unusually intelligent and even well trained in psychology. They had used every verbal trick known to them to change their son into a more courageous person. Instead of getting better, he was beginning to fail in his school work and also to develop spastic cramps in the stomach when the situation did not please him. These physical symptoms only served to increase the anxiety of the parents over the boy so that they tried even harder to give him "emotional support" (to keep him free from fear). Now it is not possible to keep another free from fear; this is a job only he can do for himself. He can do it only as he faces fear

and learns to overcome it. But he neither will nor can do this while he is overprotected!

In such a situation, the parents have cast themselves in the role of God! This points to a certain pride and arrogance in them that must be reduced before they will be willing to let the child alone long enough to develop his own powers. Any therapy directed wholly toward the child has the cards stacked against its success. It has shown that the mother in particular had to develop her own courage before expecting the son to increase his independence. The parents came to realize that the boy had enslaved them through their fears rather than because of their love for him. As a result, they began to withdraw from the position in which they had been doing "more than their share" and altered their behavior more toward going only halfway with the child. The boy sensed the increase of courage in his parents and made satisfactory adjustments almost from the beginning.

Another interesting case is that of the very pampered woman who developed a nervous breakdown during her first marriage and got a divorce. She was then treated by a "psychologist" who advised a second marriage as a cure for her nervous difficulty! A man who was interested in her "got analyzed" so that he would be an ideal husband for her. During the first months of their marriage, all went well. Finally, he got a bit tired of her demands for attention and her nervous symptoms reappeared. In a few months, she had another "breakdown" and he took her to a private sanitarium. Her psychologist declared that she had "regressed to the level of a five-year-old child." She would not see her husband, but wrote letters blaming her marriage to him for her present condition.

The husband could not afford to keep her for the rest of her life in the sanitarium and believed it would be necessary to send her to a less expensive State institution. It was suggested that he contact her and offer her a divorce with alimony. When he saw her she was the very picture of exhaustion, lying on a bed with a cold compress on her head. When he made his offer, she rose up on her elbow and asked, "How much alimony?" Within a period of weeks she was out of the sanitarium in "restored health." In short, when she discovered no more overprotection and pampering was to be given her by her current husband, there was no profit in symptoms for her. But again, the therapy had to be directed at the husband to effect a change in his nonverbal relationships before she could or would change.

Another case is that of the elderly woman who had always been a most fastidious and proper person. One day she got drunk and all efforts to persuade her to give up alcohol failed. For weeks she did nothing but sit around the house and drink, in spite of the fact that she previously had always been averse to intoxicants. And the more she drank, the more attentive were her worried relatives. The more they tried to "reform" her, the worse she be-

came.

This woman had always felt herself far superior to her husband. One son was born to her and she made him her most intimate companion, thus shutting out the husband entirely. The husband died and the mother used this to tie her son even closer to herself. When he would fall in love with a girl, the mother would get him to tell her every intimate secret of the courtship! Needless to say, they did not last long. Finally the boy had a nervous breakdown and was confined in a mental hospital for a year. He finally escaped and returned to the city where he got a job. Then he refused ever to see his mother again. It was at this point that the woman began to drink. Because of her shocking behavior, the son broke his resolution never to see her and visited her three times a week!

Here again we find a situation where it would be a waste of time to try to correct the behavior of the offending party by any kind of word-magic. Drunkenness was the price she was willing to pay for three visits a week from her son, and she would never let him go free as long as she had any way to hold him! This was pointed out to the boy, and he realized that only by stopping all visits would she improve. "Cooperation" with the mother in this case demanded that he keep away from her until she could learn to be independent. This he did, and she soon learned that she could no longer be "master" over her slave by any technique at all. When she realized that she was powerless to frighten him into submission, she began taking walks, renewing social contacts, and generally building an independent life of her own.

All of these cases are cited to show that "cooperation" does not mean a supine compliance with the wishes of every Tom, Dick, and Harry. Nor does it mean one is a Pollyanna of sweetness and light. It is rather a firm determination neither to exploit nor to allow another to exploit! If one goes halfway with everyone, he does not exploit others; if he refuses to go more than halfway with others, he thwarts their attempts to exploit him! In either case he is cooperating at the nonverbal level of events; he "pays his own way in the world and takes no more than he is willing to give in return." No "master-slave," Inferiority-Superiority relationship can survive in the face of Cooperation Therapy.

This is the real therapy of Individual Psychology, Cooperation Therapy, and in so far as it is practiced at the nonverbal level, language confusion is avoided. Actions speak louder than words!