

## The Importance of Alfred Adler for the Present\*

DR. FERDINAND BIRNBAUM, *Vienna*

Behind a sea of blood and tears lies the time when Alfred Adler himself spoke to us, his pupils, in this place, and through his pupils to the world. The world was satisfied with the echo of his voice. Yet the voice of Cain sounded over his own: "How does all that concern me? Am I my brother's keeper?" And added to it: "Where does science prove to me that I must not kill my brother, when I feel the burning desire to do so?"

I do not take seriously any longer the voice from above and the voice within myself. The preachers of morals, of ethics and philosophy, no longer move me. The thinking of these people has for a long time been unmasked to my vision as an assumptive, rationalized, pre-logical way of thinking. I want science to answer my question: "Why shall I love my brother?" But it must be an answer as clear and as exact as the thinking of those who designed the plutonium bomb!

There Alfred Adler had to be silent, admitting: "I would not know an answer to that."

Alfred Adler's voice became silent, but the sirens started to shriek into the godless world.

The question of Cain cannot be solved by means of exact science; Alfred Adler himself says: "The solving of this question cannot occur like the solving of a mathematical problem. I know it can be correctly solved, I know that it can also be incorrectly solved. It can only be the striving of each and all to reach a point where the unity of humanity is established. I would like to make a note here to the fact that we must not expect an absolutely correct solution.

"In this manner we will always find again and again in all expressions of the individual and of the many, the position they take toward the problem of community. Nobody can escape from this frame. Whatever he does in regard to this question is his answer to the challenge. If good solutions are found only in the consideration of the community, then it is understandable that there will be resistance within human relationship, if some make incorrect responses. This relates to those who are not embodied in the community, who do not consider themselves as part of the whole, who are not at home within humanity. The result is that what we call interest in the universal is only one part of belonging, and this we call courage: the rhythm that one has in oneself, to feel as an instrument of the whole. Do

\*Lecture given at the University of Vienna, May 20, 1946, on the occasion of the reopening of the Viennese Association of Individual Psychology. This was held in the same room in which the meetings were held before 1938.

not be confused if in considering the average of the present development we see how much is still lacking. This imposes upon us new tasks for our development; we must not feel our existence as *being* static."

And Alfred Adler continues:

"I would like to emphasize that the human psychic life of the soul is not being, but *becoming*. All those who are occupied with separating parts and complexes of this psychic life have not gone far, because they believe they are dealing with some kind of machinery. Just as every living organism is striving after a final form, so we find the psychic life seeking a route to overcome all difficulties which it may meet as questions on earth (within the community, within the relationship between the sexes)."

The whole psychic life is for Adler a stream, yet in a different sense than with James, who talks about a stream of consciousness. For Adler, the psychic life of the *individual* is a stream in the same sense as the psychic life of *humanity*: a striving after an ideal final state-of-being. And even more: what occurs in the soul of the individual is only part of the great struggle in which the whole of humanity forces its way up to the light; the individual human being is only the psychological place where the evolution of all takes place. The macrodynamics of the evolution of the human race is correlated to the microdynamics of the individual. And let us grasp the essential:

There is a close connection between the help for the soul of the individual and all work on the great cathedral of humanity. Here and there it is evolutionary help, here and there it is decisive in fulfilling the requirements for development with a minimum amount of damage: not to apply the brake but to oil, *to reconcile the individual or individuals with the evolution in a way that all become participants*, which implies in the case of the individual that he will devote himself more completely to the productive development of himself.

And now the immense unity of all that Individual Psychology does in practice becomes apparent: it accepts seriously that *all* help must be self-help; that all education must be help to self-education; that all psychotherapy must be a guide to the relinquishment of unproductive forms of the ego; and thus it becomes an encouragement to transcending oneself, so that really all help is identical whether it be classified and distinguished as psychotherapy, self-education, child guidance, or civic activity.

The method of Individual Psychology is in all forms encouragement, but it will adjust its approach in each case according to circumstances. We assist the small child by encouraging him, if we utilize his endeavor to become bigger in such a way that it will help him in civilizing his attitudes. We will always act according to the principle of letting the individual grow through his goals, surpassing the old goals by new ones. Naturally it will

often be necessary to step in with guidance by unmasking seemingly high goals as fictitious ones, bravado as a trick of cowardice. We are included in the great unity of the performance. One of the greatest and deepest words of Adler is that under optimal conditions we can become repentant sinners, and that we must be content to progress from bigger to smaller errors. Because we all are together, and each one for himself, experimenting beings. Our inadequacy is that we do not know but can only try, and our dignity is that we must act in free responsibility—they both belong together. And at best we find only better methods of trying.

That indeed is a new tune! Not long ago psychotherapy moved away from the superstition that the patient would be cured by inner magnetic forces of the psychotherapist, as even the pedagogues viewed the problem. Seen from an individual-psychological point of view, the real psychotherapy and the right education thrive on the self-education of the educator. His work on himself makes the educator understand. The more he is a real psychotherapist the more he will try to overcome in himself fear and stubbornness and reluctance to admit his own shortcomings. He will know that it is the understanding of his own reformation which helps him to understand the patient, the pupil. He will know upon what progress depends: to free oneself from childish securities, from childish models of life; to dare to grow continuously; to free oneself like a tourist from the compulsion of the railing; to dare to live on one's own responsibility; to be proud of the greatest gift of God—freedom—and not to sell it for a mess of pottage; and to become democratic inwardly, granting at the same time this same dignity to others.

The object of education is always the same: Humanity, self-education, education of the other, furtherance of humanity. That, of course, is not science; that is not psychology as we know it otherwise; that is the continuation of thoughts which were familiar to all the wise men at all times—it is not scientifically exact psychology. The science of today has emancipated itself from wisdom, and the traces of this emancipation lay at our feet. They are the ruins of our houses, the nameless pain of our time, the fear of still greater threats.

When the wisdom of humanism is thrown as food to the special scientific branches, when the symphony of humanity is silenced, the siren starts its song of mastery. Adler did not succeed in giving an exact answer to the question of Cain, and no Adler of the future will succeed, but what his Individual Psychology could do, it did. It is the continuation of the same work which Kant started, before it was recognized at all by his contemporaries, and that is, to make room for the practical understanding—the wisdom—in the face of the pretensions of exact science, which within its boundaries are undoubtedly justified.

It is not insignificant of Adler's intuition, when he chose as title of one of his books "Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology," to give first place to the practical reasoning.

When Adler approached the problem of the human psyche, he did it with a biologically trained mind and with a warm heart; and one can, if one will, try to retrace from these two components the structure of his science. With a *warm, feeling heart*: The first publication of the young doctor was a health booklet in which this sentence attracts attention: "The doctor can no longer shut his eyes to an approach which examines man not as an individual, but as a product of society." With a *biologically trained mind*: This view could be noticed at the occasion of his change from his practice as an oculist to the practice of internal medicine; and it could be seen in what he brought as "mental sight" from one field into the other. As an oculist, he had noticed the discrepancy between organic inferiority of the eyes of some individuals and their superior visual performance. Now in the sphere of internal medicine, it was the problem of compensation itself which began to occupy him more and more. It was there that he discovered the role of the central nervous system as the point between the inferior organ constitution and the remarkable superior performance of that organ. And suddenly the lightning of intuition struck through his mental horizon: "The human psyche is dominated by a striving, which runs from one point of inferiority to one point of superiority!" Certainly science in general progresses in patient and exact detail work. However, there are joyous moments in science when an idea displays itself in wonderful brilliancy and enlightens at once an immense orbit. It must have been such a festive occasion when Adler, for the first time, perceived psychic life as a continuous movement. Naturally, at that time he did not yet understand what he knew, to use one of his favorite expressions; he needed a second ingenious inspiration. Before he got that, his theory contained something which became for him a continuously prickling thorn. The image of man which he conceived at first was not exactly human; it had animal features like the image which at that time had been conceived by his great co-fighter against the darkness of the soul, Sigmund Freud. It was animal-like, only in a different way. In Freud's construction raged the sexual greed, and in that of Adler appeared the urge for aggression; but neither one nor the other construction resembled a concrete human being. Really, they were models only, with all the values of elucidation and with all the shortcomings which are characteristic of models. Adler's man, with the urge for aggression, resembled the picture which the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes had drawn of man: that of man facing man as wolf faces wolf.

Naturally, Adler indicated the route by which man with the urge for aggression could become again a human being, namely, in starting to

become useful. That was correct, but it was not all. Only much, much later, Adler was blessed at the end of a long chain of thoughts, with his idea of community (*Gemeinschaft*). This was an idea where the dynamic ideal of the infinite progress was coupled with the static ideal of the all-embracing harmony, thereby becoming the fixed crystallization point of all possible ideologies, without ever becoming an ideology itself.

Adler again and again recaptured this central idea: "What has happened to those," thus he spoke, "who have contributed nothing to the welfare of community?" The answer was: "They have vanished to the last man. Nothing remains of them. They are extinguished physically and psychically; the earth has swallowed them. That which has happened to obsolete animal species has happened to those who could not find any harmony with the cosmic reality." And again: "I would consider as justified every effort the direction of which proves irrefutably that it is aimed at the good of the whole humanity." In order to clarify the positive side to the students, Adler often used the legend of Dschuang Tse:

A bell-founder once made a chimes-frame for Prince Li, a creation which enchanted the whole world and which was admired as something miraculous. "Aren't you a simple carver?" asked the Prince one day. "Which secret process did you apply?" The carver replied: "When I began the job, I went into meditation and secluded myself for three days. There I forgot about the profit which the job could bring me. And after five days, I forgot about the glory, then about my body and my life, and lastly about you who had commissioned me. Then I went into the woods and looked at the trees from a comprehensive view. Then suddenly, the appropriate tree held my gaze, and I could see before me my creation. My delivered soul entwined with the free soul of the tree!" "All that is very normal," commented the Prince, "And yet it remains the greatest mystery of life."

Thus Adler described the proper way of life: A stream, originating at the point of inferiority and moving toward a point of unity with the higher stream. He who compensates for his inferiority-belief in such a way that *humanity* develops is living right. He who is not doing this is working on his own destruction; he becomes the potential object of psychotherapy. Adler started from there, before he decided to step into pedagogy and into social hygiene, which could be described as his most far-spread way of thinking.

The psychotherapy of Adler, as all his work, consists of encouragement. The patient is the victim of a misdirected compensation for his inferiority feeling. He is not progressing from hurdle to hurdle. He sees no pleasure in such progress which is in accordance with the advancement of life in general, with the striving of humanity, with the stream of evolution. This man stands apart. He does not see the world as it is, but distorted from a

biased viewpoint; he sees everything in the hue of his psychic spectacles. This now clarifies the difficulty of all psychotherapy, if the function of psychotherapy itself is viewed from the individual-psychological point of view. The neurotic, and this shall be here an approximate designation for all types of patients under psychotherapy, is not readily accessible to encouragement, because, according to his biased apperception, he has to see encouragement itself with his own biased apperception. He sees it either as a hostile attack or interference, or as a well-meant act which, however, seems to deprive him of his strength and thereby justifies his biased apperception. Thus the encouragement appears to be futile.

On the other hand the patient is also not able to let himself be robbed of his biased apperception, because he clings to it as a last resort. Without it he would be the victim of his inferiority feelings to the point of self-annihilation.

This biased apperception discourages, and the discouragement affirms the biased apperception. The whole forms a vicious cycle; and it is good to see clearly the theoretical dissolubility of such a cycle. From this angle, psychotherapy indeed implies making the impossible possible.

However, there exists a hidden gate through which the psychotherapist may enter; and indeed it is true that most methods make use of this little door, whether they be those of suggestion, psychoanalysis of Freud and Jung, or other therapeutic approaches. This little gate is the *original contact between mother and child*, to which the great Pestalozzi made the first reference.

Courage is only produced through courage in a process of self-generation. The prime courage, which the psychotherapist requires for his activity with the patient, exists in limited amount due to the original contact of this patient with his mother.

If the psychotherapist succeeds in becoming something like a substitute figure for the mother, though in a very faded way, he can try to glide through the little gate and to encourage the patient as fellow man to fellow man. In this manner he takes an enormous burden off the patient. We can indeed talk about relief! Only in the relieved condition may the patient become so far encouraged that he can try to face his inferiority feelings; then the de-suggestive work of unmasking can start—what is called, in analytical terms and thought, analysis. Since the psyche represents a system of inertia, any retraining would demand a retrograde de-practice. The practice for action will now be necessary according to the new aims.

In view of the fact that we have received from Adler, in this concept of courage, the key to all psychotherapy, we believe that we also have in our hands the key to the great variety of psychotherapeutical systems, enabling us to understand their dynamics and their common denominator.

In principle, this should be possible for every one of the systems. However, in considering the factor of simplification—in itself a problem of high logical order—we are encouraged to hope that we may contribute something from our standpoint to the solution of the urgent problem of integration. This could end the highly uncomfortable situation in which the one science seems to be predestined to be a second *scientia amabilis* (because its subject matter is understanding) and continues as a battle ground of conflicting schools of thought.

Returning to Adler's own work, we would like to refer to one point, which should lead us to the next sphere, to pedagogy: The essentials of psychotherapy and of pedagogy are of the same nature, namely, consisting of encouragement. As we have pointed out at the beginning, it implies inducing the individual to contribute to the evolution of humanity. Thus, psychotherapy also appears as a procedure in an entirely new light: It is not only healing, it is healing through one's own strength; it is the doctrine of using the patient's own suffering to achieve healing.

Every individual, whether seen as a child or as an adult, appeared to Adler as hypnotized by an erroneous aim, steered by a false opinion about the relationship between himself and the world. There were those who followed the mistaken idea of striving always to be on top; and others who were always seeking to be loved or served by everybody, or even to be pitied by everybody. Still others ran after the illusion of complete independence and could not be induced to join others and thereby to tolerate the influence of others upon themselves. As each one ran after his comet, they all appeared to him in this picture: the problem children at the guidance office, the neurotics, the addicts, the minor offenders, and the others with whom he had to deal. They had all failed somewhere, either to take real interest in the fellow man or in the job, or merely in the function of a student. They could not work with others for the same aim; or, as in the case of adults, tackle the psychic problem of sex in a casual, healthy way. Somehow all moved in the useless sphere of "the big and the little ones." Thus, Adler saw more and more in the adult the psychic structure of the child; and, conversely, he saw in the little ones their later way, foreseeing in their present difficulties their later forms of neurosis. They all appeared somewhat deterred, somewhat captivated by an individual error; they all seemed to have confined themselves to their own sphere of action. They showed the blemish of some kind of cowardice in life; they were deserters from the way of correct development. Somewhere, they must have lost the courage to go ahead. And among these also were those children who were brought before him by their teachers as unmanageable, impertinent young scamps. Each child was different and each one different in various situations, possibly with various teachers, yet each unchanged within himself

and understandable as the prisoner of a self-formed suggestion, of that self-blinding bias which we have already noticed in the specific area of psychotherapy.

Confronted with this display of future emotional misery, Adler asked himself in his book, *Understanding Human Nature*: "Which factor could correct the errors in the development of children and which may bring about an improvement? Our attention is first directed toward the school. A careful examination proves that the school in its present form is not prepared for this task. Hardly any teacher in the present setup of the schools can state with confidence that he can recognize the nature of the child's faults and eradicate them. He is in no way whatsoever prepared for that." And Adler said to himself: He who would like to educate correctly would have to try first to do away as much as possible with the occasions for discouragement. To achieve this, the public would have to do more than heretofore. Then the pedagogues surrounding the child would have to be enlightened as to the consequences of a discouraging education. And then?

It is this "then" which reveals the pedagogical doctrines of Adler in their golden clarity: then one would have to greet gratefully the difficulties with which the child has to struggle, and if there be no difficulties, they would have to be invented! *They* are the foremost means of education.

Yet one must teach children how to overcome difficulties, and the difficulties must have a stimulating and strengthening effect. The human being, even as a child, is constituted to seek mastery over obstacles. Man has been the great conqueror of the glacial age, the conqueror of his physical weakness, the protagonist among the creatures of this planet.

And because courage only grows on courage, a right educational contact has, in the spirit of Pestalozzi, to provide for the equipment of the child with sufficient courage and confidence in his own strength and in the strength of the community. And the child has to learn to be a good friend of the world beyond his mother. He should be endowed through his home with so much courage that he would be able to grow on his difficulties, to grow in such a manner that he would find his happiness in adding gladly his strength to the evolution of the community. Thus education should equip the child to get his strength from the evolution of the community, so that he would be capable and willing to enter and strengthen the community.

In this manner the school would have to become a school for generating strength, and the teachers would have to become engineers of the technique of encouragement and sit at the switchboard of education—as my dear friend Spiel used to say—and direct the strength of the students toward self-education. The teachers of the future, however, would have to be guidance counsellors, trained in all the intricacies of psychotherapy.



We may say that we are about to realize slowly this vision of Adler. Guidance centers have started their work, a new generation is trained for the job of guidance counsellor. Already it has penetrated deeply into the awareness of the teachers that success in teaching is closely connected with the dormant psychic life of the child, linked with spheres of psychic activity apart from consciousness. Therefore, a deep-psychological disclosure accomplishes often more than all punishment and educational schemes. If a child with an exaggerated desire for love succeeds in binding his parents to himself through his difficulties in learning, he will not be able to follow the efforts of the teacher in regard to progress, until the entanglement is solved within the depths of his psychic life.

The new education is oriented toward tasks confronting each individual child and offers a different kind of reliability from that which was concerned with the manifestations. A similar certainty of aim is required for education for the tasks of collective living. There, the education toward human perspective must become the center of crystallization, but formed in the pattern of the service for one's own community. We will put the leading question as follows: "How can we as individuals perform the best in the service of humanity?"

We do not doubt for one moment that the proper education, with all respect to all authorities which have a right to participate in the personality development of the child, would have to possess more substance than it had formerly. A huge volume of work confronts us, first of all in educating the educators. Here it is primarily necessary to replace the unproductive method of indoctrination with the method of letting the student find his own solutions. This implies not only work *by* oneself but also *on* oneself. The goal is the complete education of the public to such an extent that even the least educated member has learned to observe and is able to avoid bad mistakes in education; that it would be considered indecent not to want so to educate oneself further. The difficulty we have to meet is that a large number of "finished" people consider that they do not have to learn anything more and do not wish to educate themselves any further.

The complete education of the public implies the realization of the idea that the world will soon not be able to consider anything of more importance than education. This thought certainly surpasses by far what was designated heretofore as education.

The fringes of Adler's world of thoughts lead us to a sphere which can be called social hygiene.

When Master Eckhart said: "There is less need for teachers than for experts in the ways of life," he expressed the feeling of those who know about life. Alfred Adler became a teacher of the art of living, stirred by the sight of the suffering people who fled to him from the troubles of the

hell which he recognized as self-created. He was not satisfied to be only a helper to his protégés, patients, and problem children and to bring new things to the scientific world. He announced to the audience of the world that there are no frontiers between the *res publica* (public affairs) and the *res privata* (private affairs). He who wants to form his life correctly has to form it out of the spirit of unity in the public and in the private spheres. He has to enlarge his connections to the others in the sense of friendship and he has to contribute his share to the evolution of humanity. The one does not exempt him from the other. But this life in the community, which Alfred Adler hoped would be at one time as natural to man as breathing, is not yet here. It has to develop first, and it develops under pains. And these pains are: neurosis (and to some extent psychosis must be included), criminality, addiction, lack of interest for others, lack of interest for the total evolution, war and civil war. All these manifestations have been in Adler's eyes only manifestations of one thing: forms of error. And again for him this error was understandable, because while all animals have their formula of living, the formula for men, as he says, has not yet been found. The hand of nature no longer reaches into this zone. Man has to take his fate into his own hand, guided by intuitions, which shine into this world like the light from a far-distant world. The problem of mankind consists for Adler in the fact that the striving for completion has to coalesce continuously in a positive way with the feeling for community, if it is not to lead to striving for power, to belief in false gods, and finally to self-extermination. The demand is harsh and the way is only scarcely illuminated. Those who have been so close to him as we know how hard Adler struggled with the problem. On one side the existence of a research guided only by the ideal of truth was at stake; on the other, the sense or nonsense of the human form of existence itself. Behind that, for him, is the fact that man has to evolve for himself the formula for existence through the means of thought, while for all other creatures it has been prescribed by nature. And this thinking is guided by a model of perfection which does not exist in this world. For that reason religion does not appear to him as an illusion growing out of a net of instinct-sublimations, but as a trial to find a formula for his existence, a trial conducted by man but not stimulated by him.

Each one, however, is a center where humanity struggles for its formula, not completely lacking assistance which does not originate in his thinking, but nevertheless guided, and this in such a loose way, that the dignity of freedom remains intact in this way of evolution of the whole group and of the individual. How would the formula for all be found otherwise than in each becoming the keeper of the other, the brother of all others on this earth, a helper in the endeavor to do right, and to do it voluntarily? Adler knew that in reality God alone has the right to call a

"thou must" to men, but that the task from man to man can only exist in helping each other to follow this "thou must"; this means, helping him in a way which corresponds to the dignity of a responsible being. For that reason Adler refused to play the moral preacher who knows better than the other what is right, and was satisfied with the role of a psychologist who only understands better what the other knows.

In such a manner the formula for man is born, through reciprocal help in becoming free; and not only in education, but everywhere, in all human relations. We can reach it only by bringing out in one another the best qualities, by encouraging one another.

In this reciprocity of liberation lies the essence in all its manifoldness, which is designated by the name "Democracy." It contains the rejection of any worship of what we have been, you and I. It consists, one can say, in a process: that one furthers the other in his own sphere, and that one voluntarily and willingly listens to the productive criticism of the other and would be unhappy if the other would withhold from him the gift of his productive criticism.

It seems to me that here lies the great importance of Adler for the whole present: that he shows the road to outward political democracy as well as to the inner personal democracy. People should learn to educate each other to be reciprocating helpers, man to man, group to group. Until now it has been tried by nice sermons, through moral preaching. One tolerates such sermons where they are aesthetic in form or thought. Adler's approach goes further, and his road is that of psychology, a road of more or less self-discovery of the psychic backgrounds through which we become egoistic. Thus we often miss the contact with the stream of common evolution. How many values get lost where man does not even notice how the devil "Egotism" holds him by his collar while he, suffering from a delusion, fancies himself to be an angel in kindness and justice! Adler says: "We do not notice how we are dragged into the whirlpool of our complicated culture and form views which are extremely detrimental to a true understanding of facts, because we interpret everything about us from the standpoint of raising our feeling of prestige and consider everything only from the viewpoint of whether it enables us to increase our power." Today, the obvious egotism may be detected, but only rarely the hidden, and often subjectively justifiable, striving for power. Even less recognized is the particular egocentricity which in psychiatry is called "Autism." It constitutes a tendency to consider one's own personality merely as a magnet to attract troubles. For the public, these forms of egocentricity are often far more detrimental than the obvious anti-social forms. Everybody should see this by now, since we all have lived and suffered under the influence of such

fanatics who considered their cause as highly praiseworthy. Their good conscience destroyed a world.

Applying democracy to the outer world will be supported by personal inner democracy, for it can prepare a positive psychological readiness before social changes, as far as they are necessary, occur. Man has economized with the power of his machines by widening the radius of the use of this power. Perhaps he will also succeed in the future to diminish the impact of destructive social explosions and systematically divest them of their by-products by putting them into the service of evolution.

Alfred Adler has certainly contributed his share to the advancement of evolution. He was not afraid of universal consequences but always remained eye to eye with reality. He knew that he owed everything to practical experience, and for that reason, he often returned from a wide flow of abstract thought to the well-founded earth. He let this experience speak, as far as it could speak for itself; he always endeavored to simplify as much as possible the ideological network of his Individual Psychology. He was brilliant, but he saw therein the danger of becoming himself enchanted by the charm of his own formulations. The reproach of over-simplification, which was directed against his doctrines and him, their founder, left him unmoved. With justified pride he could reply: "There might exist more brilliant and more shrewd systems, but hardly one which is so useful to mankind as that of Individual Psychology." This usefulness for mankind was just what counted. This usefulness, too, was attacked as plain utilitarianism. To this he replied by asking that he be shown one single accomplishment in history, the greatness of which is not based on its usefulness. This polemic was from both sides a quarrel without substance. The opponents fought the much too pointed way of expression and Adler himself never thought of considering "usefulness" in the narrow sense as it may have seemed. But he considered such misunderstanding to be the smaller evil. Thus wisdom meant more to him than academic prestige. It is certain that future generations, who will be able to see more objectively the totality of his accomplishment for the world, will consider Alfred Adler, in spite of his importance for science, primarily as one of the wise men of this age, rather than one who led science itself out of its enchantment by its own accomplishment and made it again a tool of humanity. To have wisdom means to put things in their proper places. Adler points out to man that he has to fail in his way if he places himself in the center of the world.

Adler cannot prove to anybody that the standpoint of community is the absolutely correct one, if one insists on proof, as is common in the exact sciences. There is no answer to the question of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?" Adler believes: "I could, however, explain to him why he asks such a question!"

That is, of course, correct, but Adler himself had the feeling that one should not depend on a pure psychological consideration alone. Thus he pointed to the transcendental. His science, which was first of all rooted in the biological science, leads the way to the transcendental.

The work of the great humanist, the humanistic biologist, Alfred Adler, gave us the hope that we may find in science itself the springboard into the realm of wisdom, of reason, of humanism, of all-inclusive love.