

INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY BULLETIN

SIX-TWELVE NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE , CHICAGO

PHONE DELAWARE 9033

EDITORIAL STAFF

RUDOLF DREIKURS, M.D., EDITOR
CATHERINE BROWN, M.A., ASSOCIATE EDITOR
MARY BUDD, ASSOCIATE EDITOR
DORIS EASTMAN, BUSINESS MANAGER

ADVISORY BOARD

ALEXANDRA ADLER, M.D., BOSTON
CHARLES A. ADLER, PH.D., CHICAGO
H. L. ANSBACHER, PH.D., PROVIDENCE, R. I.
NITA M. ARNOLD, M.D., CHICAGO
AEROL ARNOLD, PH.D. CHICAGO
WILLARD BEECHER, NEW YORK
ROBERT C. FAGAN, MAHWAH., N. J.
FREDERIC FEICHTINGER, M.D., NEW YORK
ANNY HEINRICH, NEW YORK
GINA KAUS, HOLLYWOOD
ANNABELLE LEWIS, WESTPORT, CONN.
SIBYL MANDELL, PH.D, STOCKTON, CAL.
EDITH B. MENSER, SALT LAKE CITY
ELEANOR REDWIN, CHICAGO
REGINE SEIDLER, AUBURN, N. Y.
LYDIA SICHER, M.D., LOS ANGELES
N. E. SHOOPS, NEW YORK
MAX STRAUSS, M.D., NEW YORK
ERWIN WEXBERG, M.D., NEW ORLEANS
DR. JANUARIO BITTENCOURT, BRAZIL
ANTONIO BRUCK, COSTA RICA
DR. ELSIE LINDENFELD, CANADA

April, 1942

Dear Friends:

The responses we received from our friends indicate the need to clarify our own opinion about the best ways to further the progress of Individual Psychology. We all agree that the present time urgently demands our contribution. But the question is still open as to the way in which we can offer the most valuable service. We must unite our individual efforts with those of others who build up better understanding between human beings and stimulate cooperation, preparing the way for peace and democracy. But is it sufficient that we, as single individuals, transmit our personal knowledge which we have gained in studying Individual Psychology? Are we each one alone as strong as we could be as groups? Here opinions diverge.

Objections against us as Adlerians are often based on the assumption that we try to overstress the importance of Individual Psychology. Others oppose our point of view, because their own interests are endangered if our ideas, or we as a group, gain recognition. Many of our friends report that they encounter professional difficulties because they declare themselves openly as Adlerians and do not follow general trends of thought.

We do not want to fight others, but we must help each other, we must give moral support for maintaining the necessary courage. What are the best ways of doing that? In this issue we publish a number of recommendations which show your sincere interest in attempting to find adequate ways, but reveal also the difficulties in getting the general agreement on any suggestion and in carrying out plans which promise success. We are grateful to all of you who have expressed opinions, and we are looking forward to many more responses, so that we shall discover in which direction most of you want to move. It is encouraging to know that each one of us is not alone in his effort to spread knowledge vital for the development of our youth and for the encouragement of our fellow citizens. We can hope that with the increasing awareness of how important are adequate education of children and keeping up the morale of the adults, the general public will become sensitive to the recommendations which Individual Psychology has to offer.

The Editor

CHILD GUIDANCE CLINIC AT ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTRE

Elizabeth Baker

In February, 1939, the child guidance clinic of Abraham Lincoln Centre was established under the direction of Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, Adlerian psychiatrist. In the beginning it took the form of individual interviews, but very shortly the group method was instituted, and this practice has been continued successfully. The parents sit in a circle facing the psychiatrist, who addresses each parent concerning the problems he is experiencing with his children. As this individual interview progresses in the presence of the group, other parents recite how they have handled similar problems with their own children. From time to time during the interview the psychiatrist asks the other parents how they understand the particular behavior of the child, or what they would do under similar circumstances. He also discusses these issues from time to time with the social worker.

Thus the parents help each other by realizing that it is not they alone who have problems and make mistakes in managing their children. They are also frequently better able to accept an explanation or suggestion given to another parent than when it is given to them directly. After the interview with the individual parent in the presence of the group, the parent leaves the room and his children are brought in from the playroom for an interview. They usually sit on a bench together and address themselves to the psychiatrist. In this interview the other parents are only onlookers. During the ensuing discussion with the children, the psychiatrist gives them an interpretation of their behavior and frequently discusses it with the social worker.

At the conclusion of this interview the children return to the playroom and their parent returns to the clinic room. The psychiatrist explains the meaning of the children's behavior and attitudes to him and discusses with him some specific educational approach-

es on which to concentrate in the interim before the next appointment.

Sometimes very young children insist upon remaining with their parents in the clinic room. There is no objection to this as long as the discussion can be maintained without undue interruption. Many times this has resulted in quickening constructive results with the child, since he frequently grasps the psychological import of the discussion better than the adults, because he has fewer inhibitions than his elders. Generally these periods of remaining with the parent in the clinic room are of short duration and thereafter the child is content to remain in the playroom with the other children. The only reason all the children are not kept in the clinic room throughout the clinic session is that as a group they have proved too disturbing to the clinic procedure.

The social worker is used in the clinic as a third person to assist in interpretation by objectifying the discussion. Also, she usually knows the parents and children well and can contribute to a discussion of incidents and interpretation from this resource as well as act as the known factor to the parents and children. From time to time the nursery school supervisor acts in this capacity instead of the social worker. On referred cases from other agencies their social worker on the case frequently supplants the clinic social worker in this regard. From time to time there are visitors, such as social workers, teachers, or students, interested not in any particular case but in observing the methods employed. These persons also enter into the discussion, although not as much as do the parents. Recording of the interviews in the clinic is generally done by a student interested in further understanding of the methods of Individual Psychology.

The playroom is under the supervision

of a volunteer, usually a student in sociology or group work. Materials such as modeling clay, jigsaw puzzles, pencils, paper of different colors, crayons, story and picture books, and toys are used to occupy the children. Sometimes the playroom supervisor tells stories to the whole group or plays games with them, although on the whole they are so individualistic and disorganized that group conduct is relatively impossible.

The social worker introduces families into the clinic by several methods. The most desirable situation is that in which the parents perceive that something is wrong in the adjustment of their children and, seeking assistance in a solution, ask for an appointment to come to the clinic. These parents are the most likely to succeed in changing their own behavior and that of their children toward a more social adjustment, since it is their wish to effect a change. The social worker then elicits from them in an interview social history information, some details of the complaint, the relationship of the various members of the family, and their methods and success in pursuing their separate goals. Subsequently she makes a clinic appointment for the family and, as the treatment continues, makes appointments for future clinic attendance in consultation with the psychiatrist. Frequently parents apply for admission to the clinic after they have attended the parents' group discussions on child behavior which are held monthly.

Another method of introducing families into the clinic is used when some difficulty is perceived in the behavior of the child in the group, such as the group work department or the nursery school. Then the social worker proposes to the parent attendance at the clinic. This method is likely to be less successful than the first, since the idea comes from the social worker and not the parent, so that the parent frequently feels that clinic attendance is unnecessary and superimposed. However, occasionally the parent has been suffering from the behavior of his children and gladly accepts an of-

fer of assistance.

The third method of recruiting for the clinic presents difficulties similar to those of the second. It consists of referrals to the clinic by other agencies. These also are frequently cases where the idea for treatment originates with the social worker rather than with the client. In such referrals the clinic social worker receives from the referring agency a social history before the family is admitted to the clinic, and in turn reports to the referring agency the recommendations of the psychiatrist from time to time during treatment and his conclusions at the end of treatment. It is invariably helpful to the other agency to have the social worker on the case attend the clinic in order to cooperate in interpretation to the client and assist in the manipulation of environmental factors where indicated.

A fourth source of referrals involves no social agency connection. Such persons may have seen the announcement of the clinic on the bulletin board, may have been told about the clinic by some former patient, or may have had it recommended to them by a private practicing psychologist. These cases offer fairly good promise of success, since the persons make application for the most part on their own volition.

The majority of parents attending the clinic are mothers, partly because some of the fathers work during clinic hours and partly because the fathers frequently feel that the job of rearing the children rightly rests with the mothers. The cooperation of the fathers, however, is very important, for although they may hold the maternal responsibility theory, usually it does not deter them from interfering in the management of the children, particularly if they are in conflict with the mothers, when they may try to win the children to themselves. Several of the fathers have participated regularly in the clinic. In other cases it has been possible to arrange an interview with the psychiatrist for the father at a time when he is not at

work. In some instances the social worker has interpreted to the father the recommendations of the psychiatrist outside of clinic hours in the office or in the family's home.

Frequently the social worker has known the family for a considerable length of time through the Centre, because of the children's attendance in the group work department or at camp. In such instances the pre-clinic interview is mainly preparation for the clinic rather than obtaining social history information; because of the information already gathered, the social worker is able to prepare a summary of the situation for the psychiatrist without an extended interview for that purpose.

Social treatment is facilitated by the Centre social worker by manipulation of the Centre program, alteration in the placement of the child in the group, consultation with the school, and making available to the client other resources, especially those of the Centre such as particular activities, special groups, and camp. From time to time therapeutic or special groups have been conducted by the social worker under consultation with the psychiatrist. These groups frequently include children who are attending the clinic as well as those who present maladjustments in the group work program. The psychiatrist has met monthly with the case-group seminar, composed of staff workers, for interpretation of child behavior problems, including those of the clinic children. This furthers the possibility of uniform understanding and approach to children in groups by the group worker, thus facilitating the work of the clinic. The psychiatrist has likewise worked with the camp staff at intervals, with a similar purpose and effect. He has also conducted weekly evening seminars for case workers, group workers, teachers, and others interested in Individual Psychology. Members of the Centre staff have attended these seminars for a further insight into its technique.

At the time of this summary, the clinic

has functioned 22 months, from February, 1939, to January, 1942, except during vacation periods from June through September. Clinic periods have comprised one $2\frac{1}{2}$ -hour session each week, augmented by the other services already indicated. During those 22 months, 40 different families including 50 parents and 87 children were served by the clinic. The children ranged in ages from small babies to seventeen-year-olds. These 137 persons made 743 visits to the clinic. Of the 40 families, 17 were white and 23 were Negroes; 26 were Centre clients; 10 were other social agency referrals; and four were private families with no agency connections. During 1940 six of the families from the 1939 sessions continued to come to the clinic with the same number continuing in 1941 from 1940. Ten new cases were admitted to the clinic during 1941; 12 during 1940. All were admitted to the clinic free of charge except for two of the private families, who paid a small fee scaled according to income.

As has been indicated, the greatest measure of success in treatment may be anticipated from those cases in which the parents seek assistance with their problems. This is aided by whatever environmental factors may be manipulated advantageously by the social worker. Some of the families made rather spectacular gains, although probably none could be called "cured," inasmuch as no treatment can be described as ultimately successful in all respects. The following cases represent perhaps some of the most interesting situations:

The C family consisted of a father, mother, and six children of whom the fourth, named H, presented marked problems. The C family was a foreign-speaking group and the father the dominating figure. H, aged five, presented the appearance of a feeble-minded child. There is no doubt that he was retarded, but the parents, particularly the father, had accepted this too literally and the child had received almost no training. He refused to eat unless coaxed and fed with much attention. Otherwise he

would throw the dishes across the room. He urinated and defecated without control in his clothes and in the bed. He seemed frightened by the toilet and did not respond to that stimulus for evacuation. He was extremely fearful of people, of noise, and of fast-moving objects such as trains, street cars, and automobiles. He spoke only one or two words. He was easily excited, would cry and storm, and had a tremor of the hands and arms. He could be quieted temporarily by bright colors and soft, harmonious sounds.

After winning the cooperation of the mother, it was possible to change the training habits fundamentally. First, the unnecessary ado about eating was stopped, and the boy started to eat normally. He also responded quickly to toilet training. Then the parents were advised not to give so much undue attention to him. He was encouraged to do things for himself.

During treatment over a period of 27 visits, H improved remarkably. He began to talk in both languages, to eat by himself, and would even go through the first motions of preparing his food when hungry. He was trained to go to the toilet with only very occasional lapses. He played with other children, learned to ride a tricycle, obeyed his mother, and lost almost completely his tremors, his sensitivity, and his fears. He gradually developed in the natural habits of childhood. There were periods of regression, but improvement continued in greater measure. H attended camp for two weeks and play school quite regularly. His behavior presented difficulties to workers, but his development in the group was marked.

The M family consisted of mother and four children. Mrs. M was oversolicitous of the children and they had made a slave of her with their various attention-getting mechanisms. B, aged ten, was very slow, refused to do things for her own benefit, and was regarded as a "bad" girl by the other children. MJ, the second child, an eight-year-old girl, succeeded in getting attention both at home and at

school by ridiculing and mimicking adults. J, the third child, a seven-year-old boy, habitually refused to comply and used to pound his fists on the desk at school shouting, "I won't learn to write!" R, the fourth child, a five-year-old boy, was envied by the other three as the baby who got the advantage of everything. R was capable of getting almost anything he wanted in the dime store by going into a tantrum. At home, after mother had finished cleaning the house, R would follow her about pulling tablecloths and bedspreads onto the floor. Mrs. M stated that she frequently gave in to him at home because she feared the noise of his tantrums would bring complaints from the neighbors. R also consistently slept with his mother. Although she frequently put him back into bed with J late at night, in the morning she would find him again in bed with her.

The main difficulty was to stop mother from overindulging. She made herself the slave of everyone and at the same time impressed each of her children that she cared more for the others. Especially B received the most attention although in a discouraging and antagonizing way. The mother learned to understand why each of the children behaved as they did and tried to counteract more successfully their intentions.

During the treatment of nine visits the two boys improved much more markedly than did the two girls, although the latter also showed some improvement. J became the responsible member of the family. He would get up in the morning before anyone else, start breakfast, and run errands for his mother. He became quite solicitous of his mother and would often ask if there were something he could do for her. R discontinued most of his babyish behavior and after one discussion ceased sleeping in his mother's bed. MJ became more constructive in her approach. B showed the least improvement, probably because Mrs. M seemed firmly convinced that B was bound to be "bad" and would not recover. B did gain considerable self-confidence during treatment but left much to be de-

sired. Mrs. M discontinued coming to the clinic partly because of her hospitalization but later also apparently because of her conviction of B's incurability.

The W family consisted of mother and three children, of whom the middle child, A, aged seven, presented the major problem. The mother had good insight, cooperated well, and was anxious to change her attitudes for the welfare of her children. The oldest child, aged 15, was substantial, reliable, and independent. The youngest, L, aged four, was babyish in his behavior. A would usually do the opposite of whatever her mother indicated.

As treatment progressed the mother was able to relate herself more to the middle child, who then gave up most of her antagonisms. As A improved L progressed. One day Mrs. W asked in the clinic if a child could become deafened by street noises. L never seemed to hear her when she called him. With an explanation of this behavior, intended to get attention which L was fearful of losing since A had improved,

and with recommendations for treatment, Mrs. W handled the situation successfully. She stopped coming to the clinic after seven visits because her children were progressing as they should and because she had come to understand how to treat little difficulties as they arose and forestall greater hazards.

In summary, it may be said that the settlement provides an excellent base for the establishment of a child guidance clinic. People are more apt to go for assistance to an agency with which they are already acquainted and which they know is interested in the welfare of their children and themselves. The known factors help to dispel the difficulties of the unknown. It is a fairly tangible and quite fruitful method of parent education. The combination of these services offers a marked aid to the coordination of case work and group work for the greater service to individual and group. This particular type of psychiatric work, especially the group treatment in the clinic, is uncommon in this country and therefore offers a rich field for experimental procedure.

IN MEMORIAM

Five years ago, on the morning of the 28th day of May as he was walking down a busy street in Edinburgh, Scotland, Dr. Adler was suddenly stricken. That day he was to have completed a series of lectures for the University of Edinburgh. But his work was cut short. The news of his death was quickly carried by radio to his thousands of friends and followers in all parts of the world. With the shock of the news, there also came the sober realization that the continuation of his work had now become the responsibility of those left behind, who were in any way equipped to carry it forward. That responsibility was part of the heritage from him.

Therefore, in spite of our sadness, the Chicago Association went on with the lecture and discussion which previously had been scheduled for that day. It was believed that our greatest mark of gratitude would be our efforts to share with others the understandings which

we had come to through him and his work.

It is in that spirit of doing our best--under whatever difficulties--to extend the work which he began that the Bulletin is issued. Its pages record the work of many who attempt to plant and spread the scientific understanding that human nature is characteristically social, and that each of us is an individual-in community.

In a world now giving agonizing evidence of the need for greater "sense of community," among both individuals and nations, every effort toward that end--no matter how small, nor from what direction--is a help. Let none of us be disheartened by the size of the task. Each, in his own way and place must assist however possible. In that direction lies the most sincere tribute we can pay to Dr. Alfred Adler, our loved and understanding friend, and to his great work. --Edyth B. Menser

THE MEANING OF THEORIES

Willard Beecher

The bitter arguments which rage between different members of differing schools of psychological thought point to a forgetfulness or a lack of realization of the true nature of a theory. The didactic nature of the assertions made in the support of this or that theory indicates that its proponents may have come to regard it as a "scientific truth" rather than as a scientific theory. There is considerable difference between a discussion of the relative merits of theories and a verbal battle to prove one right and the other wrong.

It might be helpful to review briefly some points from Vaihinger's "Philosophy of As If." He calls to our attention the fact that we can't really know what is either inside or outside of our skins--the so-called World of Reality is, in the final analysis, unknowable to us! The human animal "knows" only sensations he gets via his nervous system. To remain alive or adapt to the world and people, he has to place interpretations on the sensations he gets as to whether they are leading him in the direction of survival or not. In short, it is the apperceptions he creates between his sensory and motor nerves which determine the quality and social direction of his activity, his death or his survival as an organism. He has no equipment capable of giving him any recognition of an "absolute truth" even if it exists.

But from the moment of birth, he is confronted by the necessity for making adaptations to the outside world. In the beginning he merely "feels." Certain sensations he seeks to repeat and other sensations he tends to avoid. As his memory of such experiences grows, he apperceives things and sensations; he no longer merely feels. Now he begins to act "as if" he could depend on his interpretations of sensations to lead him toward survival. Since he cannot know the absolute nature of

things, he must evolve fictions, "as ifs," theories, etc., which will make adaptation possible. From his past experience and his apperception thereof, he must be able to predict about the future with regard to a statistical probability of survival. If his "as ifs" (apperceptions) correspond to what is in the outside world, he has a higher probability of survival than if his guess is too far off.

There is hardly any doubt but that there is an outside world of reality even though we can never hope to know its absolute nature. Our trouble really starts only if we believe that our "as if" or theory we use for adaptation is a copy of reality itself! The ancients and primitives had dozens of theories of "as if" about thunder. The Greeks, for example, thought that Zeus threw something that made the noise. To them Zeus was a "fact" and not an "as if"--so it was easy for them to imagine him making a noise. But where is Zeus today for us and where is the "right" of the explanation which depended on his existence?

Then, to add to our confusion, our language is full of words referring to categories, such as hot--cold, good--bad, normal--abnormal, strong--weak. To make the situation worse, we elaborate from these categories such entities as Goodness--Badness as essences or absolute standards of comparison. Considering our industry, it is not surprising that we have built up a lot of concepts in our heads, such as categories and essences. The human tragedy begins only when we fail to realize that these categories are "as ifs" which exist only in thought and cannot be found in the outside world.

A theory, then, is in no sense a "copy of reality"; it is nothing more than a *modus dicendi*, or a "way of looking and apperceiving" so that we can make more and safer guesses in the direction of survival. Any theory or "as

if" or fiction must be a logical entity within itself. The Greek theory of thunder had to hang together as a Gestalt or picture even though it is a fiction and animistic. As long as we are conscious that it is only one of many possible ways of looking at what goes on in the outside world we can use it or lay it aside depending on how well it serves our purpose; we need never find ourselves in the position of defending it or fighting those who do not accept it as truth. If we find it increases the number of "right guesses" we can make about the coexistence and sequence of events in the future, then we had better stick to it till some other "as if" comes along that gives us a better guessing average.

With regard to what is called eclecticism, a few theories are similar enough in configuration so that certain parts may be comparable and interchangeable without violating the basic logic of the "as if." But there is no such thing as taking the "best part" from every theory and putting them together. One can, however, view any situation from one unified reference-frame (as if) or another, or from several concurrently and it may be helpful, depending on the guesser. We must never forget for a moment that we are firmly caught in a net of apperceptions, obliged to guess in which direction survival may lie for us.

Every theory, including a scientific theory such as ours, must be consciously thought of at all times as a *modus dicendi* and not as truth. At a seminar Adler warned us not to believe that anyone "has" an inferiority complex. He told us that the inferiority complex existed only in Dr. Adler's head and not in the individual. Adler said that it was his invention (as if) which he found useful in predicting how the individual would relate himself to the outside world and in confronting situations, but that he (Adler) never forgot for a moment that it was a fiction and not a reality.

There have been many ways of looking at "reality" in the past and there will probably be more in the future.

The ancients believed in magic and animism, which were the "as ifs" most agreeable to them. Modern men--especially scientists--tend to regard the outside world from two different frames of reference: that of cause--effect and that of means--end. It is useless again to argue whether things are the effects of causes or means to an end. We can look at anything "as if" it were either one or the other. That is a matter of our choice and tells us nothing about the reality of what we see, for that is unknowable to us.

Physics was once described in terms of cause--effect. More recently there has been a trend toward viewing the same phenomena as means--end relationships. Psychologists have tried both ways of accounting for human behavior. We have schools of psychology that view the faculties a person possesses as the "cause" of his "effects." Adler chose to regard faculties as developed means toward the end of survival. You pay your money and you take your choice; there are easily proved absurdities in either "as if," if you enjoy quibbling with words.

Now all this brings us to the question of why people subscribe more readily to Freud's, Watson's, and other cause--effect or possession psychologies more ardently than they cling or subscribe to Adler's psychology of use or means--end.

It is possible to invent many "as ifs" about this, too. The historian might tell us that cause--effect kind of thinking (logic) is one of the oldest. He can point out how people have thought that great disasters were the result of divine wrath. He can show us that this reference-frame or *modus dicendi* had a wide geographical distribution for so long that it would hardly occur to anyone to examine the reference-frame by which he arrived at his explanation.

The anthropologist, who is interested in the study of cultures from the viewpoint of their relative structure, might call attention to the fact that

we are children of western civilization. In our culture, the pattern of dominance--submission has been passed down to us, shaping our beliefs and disbeliefs for thousands of years. From it we have inherited an ingrained belief in superiority and inferiority of individuals, as well as a strong incentive toward competition, self-aggrandizement and boasting. Adler's psychology and philosophy are contrary to all such personal aims. For this reason it contradicts our whole cultural pattern, just as Christianity does. Two thousand years of Christianity have not made us Christians. Is it to be wondered at that Adler's command to regard others as equal members of the human family should attract few listeners? Courses of instruction that promise personal dominance and the ability to rule others gain widespread attention and adherence. Lectures on Individual Psychology draw visitors at the beginning. As it becomes clear that Individual Psychology is not a magic formula for self-aggrandizement, but demands that we live as equals, the crowd melts away. Only a few remain to carry on the work. And it may be said of many of these that they, too, are more interested in "adjusting others" than they are in altering themselves. The desire to influence other people and thus to occupy a position of fictive superiority is so much a part of our cultural inheritance that not one of us is free of its blighting influence.

The anthropologist further points out that the formal institutions and canalization of our common-life customs are built on superior--inferior relationships. This patterning of social organization does not favor equality; a feeling of closeness is discouraged between employer and employee, etc.--a distance is maintained.

As a result, the "superior group" holds the power. They act as a priestcraft and are always strongly traditional and conservative, fearful of changes lest they lose control. A new psychology, new teaching methods in schools, new socialized plans for

medicine, business, insurance, or anything else, are hindered in their growth. Most psychologies are a product of our culture and therefore favor the belief in superior--inferior relationships or regard them as unavoidable or irremediable. For this reason they gain ready acceptance in the priestcraft, since they can be "kept exclusive." The goal of Individual Psychology is that all should understand it! The priestcraft interpret this as a direct affront to themselves and fear the spread of such information. They wish to maintain their fiction of omniscience, as well as their pretense of infallibility.

The fundamental teachings of Individual Psychology are so useful that even the priestcraft cannot deny their usefulness. At the same time, they cannot admit the sterility of many of their presently held views. To get out of their bad situation they take bits at a time of Individual Psychology as their own original idea--"as if" they thought of it. Gradually they will get around to accepting its total structure,¹⁾ but under their own aegis; they never admit their lack of omniscience by a reversal of policy.

For years we have witnessed the same thing in the field of politics. The minority parties of the United States advocated for years certain reforms long overdue, only to be defeated at the polls. In time, sentiment and circumstance obliged the majority party to alter its viewpoints or lose power. The so-called crackpot ideas of the minority parties finally became the property of the priestcraft of the majority group!

In the light of these observable trends and relationships existing in our culture, Individual Psychologists should not be discouraged by the small number of adherents and by its slow growth. It will never grow swiftly unless our cultural pattern alters so that cooperation is more valued than competition. These terms are descriptions of two ways of getting things done. The race is won by

1) For example: Karen Horney's "New Discoveries in Psychoanalysis."

the swift in this civilization, and the runner does not expect to help his competitors! We still hold up the ideal of Rugged Individualism as a goal for our striving, and we encourage children to "get ahead" in the world--to prepare themselves to grab the "main chance." By direct pressure and inference, a child is influenced to train only those faculties which will help him surpass others. He sees that too much friendliness delays him in his race--that a higher degree of hostility is necessary to preserve the degree of self-interest necessary to defeat others. Defeating others is essence of competition.

As a result of improved technology, our old competitive ideals are proving inadequate. Our ideals of social organization are undergoing sharp changes that will be felt more and more as time passes. As the pinch grows stronger, people will begin to doubt the neurotic certainty they now have that competition is the best way to get things done in human affairs. Doubt is the beginning of all wisdom! They will have to realize that their affairs can be set in order only by more cooperation and less dog-eat-dog. Then they will suddenly "discover" what Individual Psychology has been teaching all these years. No one is so blind as he who will not see, and none is so deaf as he who will not hear! The world at large is still listening and looking for ways to surpass. We can only hope to influence those who are prepared in advance for more equal relationships.

Dr. Adler pointed out that it is necessary to "disturb and destroy neurotic or mistaken certainties" before one can teach Individual Psychology. For this reason, I no longer try to form Individual Psychology teaching-groups. My experience of many years

is that they die out as soon as the members realize they can't use Individual Psychology to make a fortune or to rule others. But I have been more fortunate in keeping alive some free-discussion groups in which anyone can come and talk freely of any problem on his mind. The members of the group give a variety of viewpoints--each according to his own "tendentious apperception." Then it is possible to use Individual Psychology to cast doubt into minds as to the validity of mistaken interpretations and to offer a better insight. This often succeeds in interesting them in Individual Psychology. At this stage one can give them Adler's books and personal information, for then they can have their ears and eyes opened. But I have found that the complete teachings of Individual Psychology must be held in the background until the soil is cleared of weeds about the virtues of competition and superiority. If this is not done, individuals are offended by our views and become resentful of us. One cannot teach a resentful person! By showing them that there are many "as ifs" by which one may regard a situation--none all "right" and none all "wrong," they often alter the view which creates the impasse in their own lives.

It will probably be impossible to make Individual Psychology the dominant psychology now in our time, but it is rapidly being absorbed under other names and disguises. This is all to the good. In the years to come when the partisan spirit has died and the present priestcraft have been gathered to their fathers, younger and less prejudiced minds will recognize that Adler was the source of this wisdom. His books are stamped with dates of copyrights! Then credit will be given openly where credit is due. We cannot force the time or the place.

WHAT DOES LIFE MEAN TO US?

Antonio Bruck

"We" is the totality of all those personal pupils of Adler who do not feel that an extensive psychological practice will alone give a true meaning to their lives, who are not willing to sell or conceal their Adlerian convictions for a lecturer's chair, and who do not strive to hide the fact that they are pupils of Adler, behind a smoke screen of a new terminology.

Only the most commonplace element of Adlerian psychology has, up to now, gained world-wide acceptance: the importance of the Feeling of Inferiority. There are, however, two vastly more important elements: the concept of the Style of Life and Adlerian philosophy. Whatever we may do to make a living, psychological practice or teaching, both or neither, we should always consider it as our main objective in life to fight for a world-wide recognition of these latter two elements, to make the Style of Life become the basis of psychology even if all "psychologies" form an axis directed against us, and to make out of our philosophy a world-wide basis for education and re-education.

Our three fundamental concepts are:

The Feeling of Inferiority

This concept has been "eclecticized" out of Adlerian thought. It is now used by all psychologists, but the ties that united it with the Style of Life have been torn and it has been misnamed a "complex." Most people look at it as something psychopathological, something that only "patients" can have, just as if it was a brother of that imaginary Oedipus complex, while, in reality, the Feeling of Inferiority is a perfectly normal consequence of certain clearly traceable facts and circumstances.

We Adlerians should always correct all those who use the expression "inferiority complex" and explain that there exists only a more or less profound and more or less pervading feeling of

inferiority. If we do so, we shall get a chance to help people who have protested for years against the idea that they might have an "inferiority complex."

The Style of Life

We know that the Style of Life is the result of an OUTLOOK UPON LIFE acquired in early childhood. We know that in order to get a consultant to change his erroneous style of life, we must first show him that it is based on a wrong outlook upon life and how this outlook originated. Only if in our talks with the consultant we have led him to change his outlook upon life can we start him on the road of auto-reeducation, i.e., the destruction of his "automatized" style of life and the development of a new one.

Thousands of psychiatrists and psychologists fail to understand the concept of the Style of Life; that is why there still can be so many "psychologies and why new ones can crop up all the time.

We know that no real help can be given to any consultant if his style of life remains unchanged. So, besides our efforts in favor of a new education which will create styles of life correct from the start, we must also fight for the general acceptance of the concept of the Style of Life, in order that those who have psychic difficulties may be really helped.

We must prevent all such "eclecticism" as that of a young New York psychiatrist who used to come to Adlerian lectures in New York some eleven years ago. He said to me then in a conversation that took place on the Welfare Island Ferryboat: "I handle the cases of children in accordance with the ideas of Adler and those of adults following the ideas of Freud."

Adlerian Philosophy

When we are working with consultants, we do make them see that only by liv-

ing on the social side of life can they get significance which will also give them happiness. Yet we should all clearly realize that we do too little if we teach our philosophy only to people who have failed.

We all must try to be what Adler was, teachers of logical living, and consider it our main task in life to make the world re-educate itself and educate its future generations in such a way that they will have a logical outlook upon life and a logical style of life from the start.

The world is in a crisis because human beings have not yet learned to live logically, i.e., in accordance with their own psychic constitution and the inescapable realities of human co-living. We must make the world understand that the fundamental element of our psychic constitution is the desire for significance. Whatever happiness we get out of life is due to some form of significance, be it in the eyes of others in general, in those of one person by whom we particularly want to be considered significant, or even only in our own eyes. And, in accordance with the inescapable realities of human co-living, only socially positive significance can give us happiness, and the depth of this happiness is directly proportional to the degree of "sociality" of our significance, while asocial or antisocial significance can give only temporary and superficial satisfaction. And we must make the world strive to live logically.

International cooperation, this vital necessity of the human race, will never be truly possible until the individuals who make up the smaller components that would have to cooperate have learned to live logically, in accordance with the fundamental wisdom ("sophia") here expressed.

Adlerianism is not, in the first place, a method for "curing neuroses,"; it is only also that. In the first place it is a wisdom that we must get the world TO LOVE, a philosophy that we must get the world TO LIVE, even if it should

be said that we are propagating "a new religion," even if we should be called "unscientific," even if the psychoanalysts, who think themselves to be so terribly "profound," should call us "naive."

The Psychologies and We

We, the Life-Style-Changers, are up against a united front of psychoanalysts, medical psychologists, symptom-fighters, eclectics, and givers of good advice, even if they all do disagree among themselves as well. These are only some of those who try to "cure" and "influence" people; Ferdinand Birnbaum, in his "In Memoriam" written at the death of Adler, shows clearly how many more psychologies cannot reconcile their ideas with ours, and how, in order to join us, they would have to throw practically all their own ideas overboard.

You can reconcile "negative practice" with "desensibilization," but you cannot reconcile these methods of symptom-fighting with the idea that the style of life must be changed, so that the symptoms will disappear and no new ones will crop up.

There is also the economic motive to be considered. The practice of Adlerian psychology is not a money-making proposition. We cannot make people come for months and years, make them lie down on a sofa and break their heads--it does make them suffer--in order to find something new to tell us; we must try to make our consultants understand the errors in their outlook upon life as quickly as possible and must make them enter into the period of auto-education as soon as we feel that they do no longer need us.

There is, furthermore, the American tendency toward methods which do not reckon with the "unscientific" intervention of the personality of the psychologist. We Adlerians can only succeed if we are understanding human beings visibly eager to help, and if we give the impression that we are not bothered by our own unsolved per-

sonal problems; while methods like "negative practice" or "desensibilization" give the psychologist the easy and impersonal role of the prescribing physician.

Adlerian Psychology
and the Medical Profession

The M.D.'s among us should reflect upon how far they still feel like physicians. Personally, I never yet have met a true Adlerian M.D. who would have been interested in the practice of medicine and who did not try to escape from it, in order to devote himself exclusively to psychology. This is easy to understand, since the first consequences of a true understanding of Adler is the desire to become a teacher of logical living, to help by solving psychic problems, and not to fumble with bodies. It seems to me that most of those who come to us from medical practice would never have taken that detour had they known Adler's teachings before starting in the field of medicine.

This is very important, because there has been a tendency in our movement to concentrate all efforts upon getting physicians to join us, regardless of whether or not they had that philosophical mind and the disposition to be an educator which the Adlerian

M.D.'s will doubtless find in themselves. I think that too much importance has been given to the physical symptoms that might accompany psychic difficulties and too little to the type of mind needed for Adlerian work, be it psychological practice or the spreading of Adlerian thought. If my thesis is accepted, that Adlerianism is, today, more a philosophy of logical living and an educational program than a method of curing neuroses, we must all, M.D.'s and not M.D.'s, teach, teach, teach, and create a new generation of well-trained Adlerians, no matter from what field of activities they come to us. It is the attitude toward life that counts most, not previous education; and the attitude of the average M.D. is absolutely un-Adlerian.

We, the personal pupils of Adler, have twenty or thirty years more of active work life. Let us use them well. It has often been said that those who have not been in personal contact with Adler cannot be true Adlerians. I do not think this is absolutely true. I have probably learned more from pupils of Adler than from Adler himself, and I know we all can train new Adlerians if we only look for the right type of mind and attitude toward life.

Let us work together. All of us.

* * * * *
Child Guidance as a Community Service

B. Brind, Ph.D.

Settlement houses, community centers, and similar institutions seem to offer excellent opportunities for establishing child guidance clinics. The Queen's Nursery School serves the New Housing Project at Long Island, New York. For 2½ years I have been conducting a consultation service for parents of problem children. Thirty-six of the hundred children attending the nursery school were referred for consultations by the teachers, who discussed the cases with the principal prior to referral.

After a child was referred to me, I observed him during the playing and eating periods. Every child was given a test (Buehler or Stan-

ford-Binet). Then the parents, usually both, were invited to the office. After two or three consultations with the parents, I visited the home to check whether the given directions were being followed, and how the child was handled at home. Thereafter, children and parents came together to the office. The parents complained mostly of bed-wetting, speech defects, untidiness, and unmanageability.

During the winter months, all the parents of the nursery school children were invited to general meetings with lectures about the education of the normal and the difficult child.

THE FUTURE PROGRESS OF INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOLOGY

We have received a number of contributions regarding the present situation and the possible development

of Individual Psychology. We are glad to present some of them in this issue.

H. L. Ansbacher, Ph.D., Brown University:

The teaching of psychology assumes much greater proportions in this than in any other country. General psychology is one of the most popular courses in all colleges, and courses in Mental Hygiene and personality are taught at many high schools. The American Psychological Association has 2,937 members and associates, a large number of whom are engaged in teaching psychology. They represent the organized science of psychology, and any attempt to further the dissemination of knowledge of Individual Psychology should take this group well into consideration.

How can these academic psychologists be approached? The overwhelming majority does not adhere to any psychological school. Rather they stress the common truths as they are revealed from all approaches. They are mildly behavioristic, even as Adler was behavioristic to a certain extent; they appreciate the contributions made by Gestalt psychology; they have found the typological approach to personality as unsupportable by research; they are interested in psychoanalysis, but regard it with skepticism; and a great many have recognized the value of Individual Psychology. The basic common denominator of these psychologists is that they view psychology largely as a quantitative science which endeavors to find facts in such a way that they can be verified by other investigators. This is experimental psychology in the broadest meaning of the term.

In 1933 Alfred Adler wrote a brief paper entitled "Individual Psychology and Experimental Psychology" (Character and Personality, Vol. I, pp. 265-267). In it he concluded: "Experiments do not assume a more scientific appearance and in fact look only like a shadow of reality. Nevertheless, ... they can provide good results for stu-

dents trained in Individual Psychology ...; they also allow them to understand the individual, since the results which have been reached can be further tested. It is possible to demonstrate that they agree with other forms of expression and with the individual personality, as well as to determine the unvarying distance from the ideal social feeling."

With these words Adler showed the way toward the synthesis of Individual Psychology with experimental findings. But in the nine years which have passed since then, as good as nothing has been done in this direction.

Actually, the vast amount of factual data which is continually produced is full of implications for Individual Psychology. By using this material a textbook of Individual Psychology might be written along the following lines: All of the general statements found in the Individual Psychology literature, particularly in the writings of Adler, should be wrought together in a systematic manner. Each of these statements should be followed by references to and citations from the general psychological literature as they are pertinent.

Such a book would be a welcome aid to the many psychologists who regard Adler's common sense approach as the most helpful, but regret that it is based entirely on the case history method. Valid truths can in many cases be stated in quantitative terms. Such a book would reveal that the original Adlerian tenets are exceedingly well supported by subsequent quantitative research, a result which the old Adlerians would expect, but which would make an appreciation of their importance much easier for new students. It would also show that the general trend is much more in accord

with Individual Psychology than is usually assumed by the Adlerians themselves.

The preparation of this book represents an immense task, but at this stage of the development of psychology in general nothing better could be done to further the knowledge of Individual Psychology than to give the

profession of psychology a book which would speak its own language and which would make it possible to concede to Individual Psychology in college and high school courses the place it deserves on the basis of its superior theory. At the same time the book could be sufficiently non-technical to be used in less formal courses and discussion groups.

Mrs. Raissa Adler, New York:

Dr. Adler lectured in 1936 and 1937 in Long Island, Medical College, Brooklyn, New York, on Individual Psychology. The lectures were excellently attended. Dr. Adler liked these lectures especially. The students took examinations in In-

dividual Psychology. Dr. Adler reported that many of them made excellent contributions. Unfortunately, the time was too short to give sufficient roots to this new science, so that it might have been made compulsory for the students.

Robert C. Fagan, Mahwah, New Jersey:

...the organization of classes and study groups is undoubtedly the most effective way to promote the teachings of Individual Psychology in our present fear ridden, competitive, and demoralized society.

My experience with teachers and children has convinced me that the so-called problem child in the school can quite readily understand the cause of his anti-social behavior and will improve if he is treated in the proper manner. It is much more difficult to make a teacher realize that she, in any way, is a contributing factor in problem behavior cases. It is strange that pupils are frequently reprimanded for doing the same acts that a teacher does with regularity. The teacher who fails to complete her assignments as instructed will be most apt to demand punctuality from her pupils.

In every case of impudence, indifference, or acts of so-called insubordination that has come to my attention, I have found a child who felt that the teacher was unfriendly or unfair. (I often think the child correct in his judgment.) A bit of clarification and a visit with the teacher in the office always makes work more pleasant and profitable for the child.

It is fashionable to discuss and em-

phasize individual differences in courses of education, institutes and faculty meetings, but how many teachers have real understanding of individual differences in her group? The goal of the average teacher is academic accomplishment as measured by grades or marks. In fairness to the teacher, she is a victim of a system in which parents are competitive and demand marks or grades for their children, especially for those who receive high grades. A child is considered cooperative when he obeys commands quickly or remains passively submissive and does assigned tasks in a way which pleases the teacher. It is difficult for teachers to see that they have a part in cooperative activity other than dictating orders or administering retaliatory measures for lack of conformity to their standards of conduct and workmanship.

Formal education, in the Elementary School, the Secondary School, or the University, seems to be largely a glorified quiz program in which the student learns many facts, of doubtful value, which are unrelated and which in no way appear to give interpretation or meaning to life as a whole.

Until we have people in our teacher training institutions who are better qualified to select applicants and

better qualified to train teachers, the outlook is not bright.

I feel that it is essential to establish a modest teacher training institution in one of the larger cities, an institution in which every faculty member would be properly adjusted to give understanding of human behavior and conduct to prospective teachers. The curriculum could be set up to meet the requirements of non-educators in control of state educational policies and procedures but the actual teaching could be done in accordance with Individual Psychology principles. Of course extreme care would be necessary in the selection of the faculty, because it is difficult for me to reconcile the statements and opinions of some professed Individual Psychologists with the statements and ideas of Dr. Adler. I want to follow Dr. Adler's techniques because his ideas have worked in the cases studied by me.

I also feel that if we are sufficiently interested and united as a group, we could, with sacrifice and effort, establish a teacher training institution for teachers that would meet state requirements and develop socially-minded teachers. What more fitting monument to a great teacher? Teachers from such an institution would soon be in demand and other schools of education would follow with similar instruction.

Dr. Sibyl Mandell, Stockton, California:

I am giving courses this year, following Dr. Adler's precepts of using our experience, our Individual Psychology views, and our "guess" technique. It is new to most of them and they seem interested.

...Fundamentally, we may have different approaches, but there is much to be learned from other groups. A certain so-called "eclecticism" need not necessarily be superficial, although it takes such a form in a shallow mind. Eclecticism is just as good as the eclectic who practices it; so are Individual Psychology, Christianity, and a few others I could mention.

A new dawn must follow the existing nightmare if humanity is to endure. The principles of Individual Psychology must be developed and strengthened among the peoples of the earth if life is to be worth living. It is our job to help the unfortunate, the ignorant, or those who seek light, peace, and contentment. The results that would be achieved seem worth any effort expended. What are we really going to do about the situation?

Could we produce a faculty staff competent and willing to operate the type of educational training institution that we deem essential? How many of our group will be willing to undergo the sacrifice, resistance, and ridicule that would be associated with the venture at the outset?

There certainly is one or more people willing to endow such a worthy project, if the matter was properly presented. Some of the people, who have received direct or indirect benefits from their knowledge of Individual Psychology, would render assistance to the cause. It can be done. Our potential energy needs to become kinetic if we are to make progress.

Our actions will be much more convincing than all our words.

As to intelligence tests, after my lecture concerning them in our Individual Psychology society on the Schwarzenbergenstrasse, I consulted with Dr. Adler himself. I had previously refused to give my talk until Adler returned from America. I said, "Well, do you disagree?" He answered, "Fundamentally, we are in agreement. You use tests in our sense as a part of the pattern." The lecture appeared in the Individual Psychology Journal under the title of "School Problems and the Family Constellation." An understanding of such psychology as underlies human behavior as well as a clear under-

standing of statistical concepts is necessary before one can appreciate

the values and the limitations of any objective test.

Sydney M. Roth, Chicago:

That task of dissemination presents problems not unlike those which have had to be met by schools of thought in other fields. I am reminded of the type of effort made for that purpose by the followers of Henry George. It would no doubt be enlightening and helpful to make a study of all of the means used by that group to help spread their ideas. There is one mechanism used by them which you might want to add to the methods suggested in this Bulletin.

In considering the possible usefulness to Individual Psychology of this mechanism to which I am referring, one recalls Dr. Adler's great interest in the schools and that much of his hope for the widespreading of Individual Psychology was connected with his opinion that the principles of Individual Psychology could be employed fruitfully by school teachers. It is superfluous to add that there is hardly a school teacher who could not apply some of those principles with great benefit to herself and her class. Since school teachers almost invariably have one or more students who create disturbances of some sort which interfere with the functioning of the classroom group and which place a considerable strain upon the teacher, it seems reasonable to believe that, because of their direct need for it, teachers could definitely be interested in some means which offered them a way of dealing specifically with the problem children in their classes. If, at the same time, this help could be offered the school teachers under circumstances which enabled them to fit it into whatever free time they had and which did not require them to make special trips to specific meeting places, it could reach certain additional large numbers of them.

We are aware, too, that at present only an extremely limited number of people are qualified to teach the principles of Individual Psychology.

Therefore, a method which extended as widely as possible the efforts of the present individual psychologists would be very desirable.

With these things in mind, it might be possible to organize an Individual Psychology Correspondence Division directed to school teachers--those very school teachers who now feel burdened with the necessity of coping with problem children and their disturbing behavior. There are various ways in which a course by mail might be operated; and the decision as to the best method with which to begin would no doubt grow out of the discussion among those persons interested in the idea.

I believe a copy of the letter sent out by the Correspondence Division of the Henry George School of Social Science might serve as the stimulus for such a discussion. You will observe that a recipient of the letter automatically becomes an enrolled student when he answers the questions enclosed in the letter. It may be that the Correspondence Course idea could serve to overcome the limitations on dissemination through attendance courses imposed by limited time, great distances to travel, and lack of a larger number of persons now trained and qualified to teach Individual Psychology.

May I take this opportunity to tell you how pleasant it has been to witness the development of the Individual Psychology Bulletin. You, your staff, and the Association are certainly to be congratulated and deserve the thanks of all of those interested in the subject. It was with great regret that Mrs. Menser and I ceased the publication of the International Journal of Individual Psychology, following the Anschluss and the death of Dr. Adler. It was Mrs. Menser's hope that some means of carrying on the work performed by the Journal might be undertaken. It was gratifying indeed

that you and those associated with you picked up the torch; and that each

succeeding issue of the Bulletin finds it burning with increasing brightness.

Nahum E. Shoobs, New York:

1. The lecture system is too one-sided. It does not allow for give and take.

2. Therefore, we run a half-hour lecture followed by discussion from the floor. The lecture illustrates one principle, giving the Adlerian view on the subject. For example, the principle of masculine protest is developed and illustrated in a talk entitled, "Can we be happy though married?"

We have a lecturer plus a discussion leader who knows how to encourage listeners to express their views.

3. Near the close of the meeting we ask the listeners what problem they would like to take up next week. The audience then chooses the problem for the next session. We accept their decision but ask every one to bring in one question on the subject.

Willard Beecher has used this method successfully.

4. Sometimes we take smaller jobs. A successful buyer in a large department store, an insurance agent, and a merchant and their wives were interested and met to study Individual Psychology from a business viewpoint.

5. A college was having difficulty

Max Strauss, M.D., Lakewood, New Jersey:

On several occasions Dr. Adler decided to give extra talks to physicians, school principals and others at the Long Island School of Medicine.

Then and on various other occasions I noticed that after the first or second talk the group became smaller. Unless the talks were given as a series of lectures as those at the MacMillan Theatre under the auspices of Columbia University, where the name and reputation of the institution carried much weight, the private groups dwindled rapidly. Especially was this true

with some of its students. One of the doctors met the dean to discuss some of their problems. He interviewed several students.

6. The Y.W.C.A. on our invitation sent us the problems troubling their members. From these problems we developed a set of sex discussions, illustrating Adlerian principles in regard to sex.

7. From our experience, we feel that the key to teaching Individual Psychology will begin with our deeds and services. Theory will come later. Example: In the 1920's, an Adlerian who has since turned Freudian, interested a school principal. An informal guidance bureau was set up in that school. Once Dr. Adler addressed the Parent Teachers Association. The principal was transferred to another school and later became a superintendent. Ten years later, a new junior supervisor offered to conduct courses for teachers from the Individual Psychological viewpoint. And in spite of the Freudian climate and control of this city school system, the superintendent, mindful of the successful Adlerian school experiences, accepted the offer. So in spite of all opposition, Individual Psychology is being taught and practiced in that city.

where the groups consisted mostly of physicians. It is not necessary here to go into the details and reasons for the behavior of this particular group.

In my own experience I have given talks for three years in this resort town of Lakewood near New York City. It was a most difficult task to keep even some small part of the group together.

Individual Psychology is essentially the knowledge of human nature, and in view of the fact that every individual

has some of that knowledge it is reasonable to expect a greater individual resistance to this knowledge than to any other. This knowledge can be more readily spread or imparted when one feels the need for it. If an attempt is made to do so regardless of this fact, then it is taken as if the knowledge the individual possesses is negated, for many of us feel masters of our own knowledge of human nature. That accounts for the fact the Individual Psychology although so fundamentally useful is so little universally known as such.

The above description of my experience should not be construed as a means of discouraging one from undertaking to

Dr. Erwin Wexberg,
New Orleans, Louisiana:

I agree that knowledge essential for improved living ought to be spread, and every form of organization serving this purpose is to be considered useful and desirable.

I have contributed some in this respect, in books and articles. However, I do not believe it advisable to let the lay public in on scientific debates and to propagandize one theory as against another. It serves no useful purpose to teach social workers, teachers, or parents that psychoanalysis is all wrong, even though we believe it is. They are not equipped to check up on what we are telling them. Discussions of this kind ought to be limited to psychologists and psychiatrists who know--or are supposed to know--the conflicting view. For similar reasons--and not because I hesitate to admit to be an "Adlerian"--I do not mention except casually, in my pertinent publications, the name of Adler. What we intend to do is to give the lay public a valuable piece of applied science, i.e., of knowledge which we honestly believe to be closer to the truth than other theories and which can immediately be put into practice. Never mind who said it first! We would probably be amazed to see, after some study of bibliography, how often we "ought to" quote Pesta-

spread the knowledge of Individual Psychology. It serves one very well, however, when confronted with these difficulties not to meet with the consequences of disappointment.

I might add that the imparting of the knowledge of Individual Psychology is an individual art which every one of us who considers himself an Individual Psychologist employs in his every day contact with people. The question may be put how can one become an Individual Psychologist if one does not get the instruction in a group? The answer is one gets little of the real meaning behind human actions unless it is given individually to the one who seeks it.

lozzi, Rousseau, or Komensky, to mention only a few great educators of former centuries. And yet we do not quote them, simply because we are much less concerned about priorities than about teaching what we believe is the truth.

To label the organized endeavor which we are interested in with Alfred Adler's name serves only to stigmatize it with the flavor of sectarianism, which does not help at all. Millions of people are applying today conceptions and terms conceived by Adler, knowingly or unknowingly. To tell them that they are Adlerians or ought to be, would only have the effect in many instances of making them wary because somebody warned them awhile ago against Adler. That does not do much harm to Adler, and anyway, let his biographers and us friends of his take care of his reputation as a man and as a great teacher. What we have to do, first of all, is to spread useful knowledge, no matter where we got it from. It is neither customary nor necessary in popular writing and teaching to confirm by exact quotations everything we say. Of course, in scientific publications, it is a different matter.

For these reasons, I still do not see much point in organizing Individual

Psychological units. Instead, let us introduce knowledge which we believe to be important and useful wherever we find already existing lay organizations mainly interested in practical psychology, knowledge of human nature, or education. The fact that in such

circles we will also meet Freudians, Jungians, Rankians, Semanticists, and what not, makes it all the more interesting. No use killing one another. They might benefit from what we have to say and vice versa. There is probably some truth in their mistakes, too.

Here we have various points of view. The suggestions are important enough

to demand more discussion. Please write us your opinions.

* * * * *

WHAT WE ARE DOING

Nahum E. Shoobs and George Goldberg made a great contribution to Individual Psychology with their new book, "Corrective Treatment for Unadjusted Children." That is an important step toward making teachers aware how to use Individual Psychology in improving their own efficiency and in helping the children. One of the most valuable aspects of this book is the skill with which theory and practice are linked so that the spirit behind each move becomes apparent and the implications of each theoretical principle for practical use are clearly visible. A more detailed report of this most valuable book will appear in the next issue. We hope that in the meantime our readers will make themselves acquainted with this new publication on Individual Psychology.

R.D.

In the Sunday Times-Union, Jacksonville, Florida, September 14, 1941, the following note appeared:

"The many friends of Professor and Mrs. Leonard Deutsch will regret to learn that they left yesterday for New York City, where Mr. Deutsch will continue research work for the collection of folk songs which he is planning to publish.

"During their brief residence in Jacksonville, Dr. and Mrs. Deutsch were distinct additions to the community. Professor Deutsch, famed Viennese musical pedagogue and double-keyboard piano artist, gave numerous lectures on his method of sight-reading and of

the teaching of piano at the Jacksonville College of Music for the local Music Teachers' Association, and for several other local musical organizations, in addition to which he was heard in many piano recitals.

"Mrs. Deutsch, psychologist and teacher of the theory of Individual Psychology founded by Alfred Adler, of whom she was a pupil, lectured for the Parent Teachers Association of Lee High School, before a class at the Jacksonville College of Music, for various social agencies and before numerous other organizations."

We wish Dr. and Mrs. Deutsch much success in their work in New York. There are many interested in the particular way of teaching music which Dr. Deutsch has founded in accordance with the principles of Individual Psychology. We hope that he will succeed in making this technique available to our teachers all over the country.

Miss Regina Seidler is giving a class about the pre-school child as part of the home defense action at the Union Neighborhood House in Auburn, New York.

This class is for women who will do volunteer work in the kindergarten and in play and nursery schools.

The class was received so very enthusiastically that after the first lecture Miss Seidler was invited to start a new class after the completion of the first.

Mr. Guimaraes, former secretary of our Rio de Janeiro group, sends the following report about the Sociedade de Psicologia Individual de Rio de Janeiro:

"The group meets on the first and third Wednesdays every month in order to study theoretical aspects of Individual Psychology and concrete cases. It has been led successively by Dr. Lourenco Filho (end of 1937 and 1938), by Dr. Januario Bittencourt (1939 and 1941) and by Dr. Luiz Viana (1940). The yearly activities begin in the latter half of March and finish in the first half of December.

"The group is now providing for issuing a quarterly bulletin in which its activities will be stated. You surely will receive it as soon as it is published.

"As ever, Dr. Januario Bittencourt is one of the leading spirits of the group and is now our president. The vice-president is D. Celina Nina, Director of the Kindergarten of the 'Instituto de Educacao' of Rio de Janeiro, now working with Dr. Lourenco Filho in the 'Instituto de Estudos Pedagogicos.'

"The group has more than thirty members; several of them are physicians."

Mrs. R. Frohnknecht informs us about the recent activities of the New York group. The Individual Psychology Association of New York City began on April 8, 1942, a very promising series of lectures at their Club Rooms at the International Center, Y.W.C.A., 34 East 17th Street. This is the first time that lectures have been held for the public outside of the group.

The lectures are as follows:

April 8 ... Willard Beecher,
"Can We Live Together?"

April 15 .. Martin Stainman,
"Thoughts about Criminology"

April 22 .. Annie Heinrichs,
"Does the World Owe Me a Living?"

May 6 ... George Goldberg,
"How to Get Along with Parents"

May 20 .. Dr. Frederic Feichtinger,
"How to be Happy though Married"

June 3 .. Nahum E. Shoobs,
"Be Thankful for your Inferiority Feelings"

June 17 .. Danica Deutsch,
"Check up on Yourself--Early Memories and Dreams"

Stephanie Kratovil sends the report of the Individual Psychology Association of Chicago:

On February 13 Dr. Dreikurs spoke on "Problems of Neurosis." In March Charles Adler, Dr. Nita Arnold, Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, Mrs. Marjorie Keenleyside and Dr. Harry Sicher participated in a symposium on "What is Morale and What Shall We Do About It?" In April Dr. Irving Lee, of Northwestern University, spoke to the group on "Prejudice." Following the lecture of Dr. Lee, who is the author of a book on Semantics, "Language Habits in Human Affairs," members of the Association compared some of Dr. Lee's statements with the Individual Psychology point of view.

Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs is at present conducting a class in Principles of Individual Psychology, which held its first session on April 13. An advanced class is contemplated.

On the fourth Friday of each month the group invites teachers, educators, and psychologists to informal discussion of educational problems. These meetings offer an opportunity for free discussion of problems with which we and our co-workers find ourselves confronted in our practice. Emphasis is placed not on demonstration of instructive cases but on checking our approaches and receiving practical suggestions for the solution of difficult problems.

The Association has at the present time eighteen active Central Members, seventeen Inactive, and twenty-six Associate Members. Our lectures are open to invited guests.