Chapter 7
Adler's *Menschenkenntnis*

I never was a student of Freud
Adler to Abraham Maslow, 1934

Alfred Adler (1870–1937), Viennese physician and founder of individual psychology, proclaimed loudly to Abraham Maslow in 1934 that he had never been a student of Freud's. Jung said the same thing, but the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ernest Jones, and most of the Freudians who followed Freud said otherwise. Are we to believe the protagonist when he talks about himself? After all, that is what Ernest Jones asked the world to do in his three-volume life of Freud whenever Jones referred to himself. Or should we rely on the allegedly more objective opinion of others? Either is, of course, dangerous if you do not ask about motive, point of view, and precisely when such statements were made. There is no doubt, however, that Adler's individual psychology is nothing like Freud's psychoanalysis or Jung's complex psychology. For himself, Adler focused on *Menschenkenntnis*, the intuitive, practical understanding of human beings in their natural and social context, and the ways in which the individual developed with regard to social feeling (*gemeinschaftsgefuhl*). As a result, his theories had a completely different life of their own than any of the other depth psychologies.

Adler was born outside Vienna in 1870, the second child in a family of six children.[1] He seems to have been closer to his father, a grain merchant, than to his mother. He also had an antagonistic relationship with his only older brother. Early schooling was unremarkable. His training in medical school taught him to pay attention to the patient as a whole and that the emotional disposition of the physician had also to be taken into account. He joined the student socialist movement and became an advocate for reforms. In this circle, he met his future wife. Here he also absorbed a certain amount of Marxist philosophy that influenced his later work on the influence of environmental and economic factors on personality. He became interested in the common man. He received the MD in 1895, was married in 1897, and his first child arrived in 1898. The same year, his first book appeared, *Health Manual for the Tailoring Trade*.[2] In 1902, he also began publishing in a newly launched medical journal, in which he was the main contributor.

He began his medical practice in a lower middle-class section of Vienna, next to a well-known amusement park. There, he served a mixed clientele of professional,

E. Taylor, *The Mystery of Personality*, Library of the History of Psychology Theories,
DOI 10.1007/978-0-387-98104-8_7,

waiters, acrobats, and artists, and there he first began to understand the weaknesses of apparently strong people—that their strengths often grew out of their compensation for their inferiorities. He became particularly adroit at both diagnosis and treatment. He also studied his own children and developed theories of education and child guidance.

Adler first encountered Freud in 1902 by reading his work, which had immediately engendered opposition from the established medical community. Without having actually met the author, Adler defended Freud's right to a fair hearing in print on two occasions, one of which was a response to *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Adler also adapted Freud's methods to his own independent ends, as he would do throughout the course of their relationship. He had already been reading Charcot and Janet when he heard Freud lecture for the first time in 1899. In 1901, Freud invited him to discuss his ideas before his Wednesday evening circle. Adler joined in 1902, but never saw himself as an acolyte or disciple. Freud nonetheless maneuvered things to make him stay, which he did for 9 years. Adler not only began to advocate for psychoanalysis, a term that meant something much more general at that time than today. He also published several works on the subject. But these works were a continuation of his own ideas. In a break with the ethnic identification of psychoanalysis with Judaism, for instance, he converted to Protestantism in 1904, demonstrating ideological commitments beyond the Freudian circle. By then, in his writings he had already established the idea of organ inferiority, the ideas of the pampered child, self-confidence and courage, and a complete theory of education.

In 1907, Adler published an influential monograph, *Studie über Minderwertigkeit von Organen*, translated into English as *Studies of Organ Inferiority* (1917).[3] In it, he put forth the idea that all mental inferiority stems from organ inferiority, which the individual deals with either through denial or through compensation. Freud thought it an important contribution to psychoanalysis and hence began the idea of the inferiority complex, attributed to Freud, but originated by Adler. Despite the fact that Adler was 14 years younger than Freud, each absorbed much from the other, which Adler's followers later meticulously tried to catalog. Adler proposed a separate aggressive drive, for instance, which Freud rejected at the time, but later embraced after Adler had left the fold. Adler first defined the inferiority complex, which later authors attributed to Freud, and so on. The list is long. He was one of the original four who first constituted Freud's circle and was a member of the inner group until 1911.

At the same time, working on his own ideas, Adler turned out to be mainly a listener, which annoyed the Jewish analysts following Freud, and he often took contentious positions toward what was being discussed, so he was not popular to begin with. Thus, he could not identify with their general feelings of persecution, either as Jews or as psychoanalysts. It was always Freud who was the bridge builder. Adler thought the drives to be very important, but he did not assign sexuality the valence that Freud did.

The open split between them began at the Nuremberg Conference in 1910, when Freud engineered Jung into the presidency of the International Psychoanalytic Association and turned his back on the older Viennese group made up of his Jewish

followers. To appease them, he put Adler in charge and allowed them to start a new journal, edited by Stekel and Adler. Adler strongly emphasized physiology and heredity more than Freud and did not believe that early sexual development was decisive for the making of character. He rejected the theory of the sexual etiology of the neuroses, the Oedipus complex, the child's psychosexual stages of development, and the centrality of sexuality as a definition of libido. Instead, he believed every neurotic seeks to compensate for some organic imperfection. Biology was destiny. Neurosis was a failed compensation for inferiority feelings. Infantile traumas have significance only in relation to the inferiority of organs. The child loves others first, not his body as Freud maintained. Thus, the sexual component was never central to Adler's theory.[4] Adler used terms to fit his own meanings. Society finds its center in man's bisexuality, for instance, that is, in the interaction of man and woman and their division of labor. This is quite different from Freud's idea about the inherent bisexuality of all individuals, or Jung's idea that symbolically, males and females carry archetypes of their gender opposites in the unconscious.

As he did first with Jung and later with James Jackson Putnam, Freud tolerated these deviancies. Freud gave Adler free reign during the early years and even ignored his criticisms, instead considering Adler's ideas as valuable supplements to psychoanalysis. Later, however, Adler accused Freud of creating a philosophy without love. Freud's reaction was what Adler called the revenge of the insulted Goddess Libido. Adler aired his views on problems with psychoanalysis and also the topic of the masculine protest, a man's overreaction to the stereotype of his own masculine prowess, in February, 1911 and Freud finally openly attacked him. Within a short time, Adler was relieved of his presidency of the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society and asked to step down as editor of the local psychoanalytic journal. Freud then denounced him as paranoid and delusional. Adler, in turn, claimed that Freud was trying to castrate him in public. That was the end of it. By the end of the year, Adler and 10 followers left to form their own group.

After that, Freud literally wrote Adler out of the history of psychoanalysis. For his part, Adler reformed his own followers around a more liberal idea of depth psychology and as a result, they flourished. That was in 1911. By 1912 he was ready to release his newest book, *The Neurotic Constitution,* which elaborated on the theory of psychogenesis, the hyper-division of the opposites such as the masculine and feminine, and the masculine protest. In it, he fused depth psychology with Marxist social theory, believing that the individual owed much to the culture in which he was immersed. Organ inferiority and the aggressive drive within the individual he now adapted to understanding the neurotic character. The theme of the work was that all the activities of the neurotic conspire toward one goal, driven by impulses of the person toward social interest (*gemeinschaftsgefeuhl*), especially of a spiritual or cosmic nature. Publication of the work was delayed. In 1913, Adler's group became known as the Society for Individual Psychology and they launched a journal. Suddenly, however, World War I broke out and their efforts scattered, as many were drafted into the military. Adler himself was mobilized in the army as World War I broke out, where he served as a military doctor. After the War, *The Neurotic Constitution* was finally published in 1916 (English translation, 1917).

Adler's most important years were during the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932. In the new climate, he rejected politics and threw his energies into his own system for reform, individual psychology. Adler remained for most of his career in Vienna. He had become an Austrian citizen in 1911, but had difficulty launching a school of thought recognized as independent of Freudianism. He was rejected for the position of *privatdozent* at the University by Warner-Jauregg, for instance, because he was considered a Freudian.

At the same time, his journal, launched in 1914, which was suspended during the War, afterward was restarted as an international publication, and then renamed when it moved to the United States as the *Journal for Individual Psychology*. Adlerian groups by then had spread throughout Europe and the United States. Adler traveled, lectured, was awarded a professorship, and expanded his publications. He also began traveling extensively in the United States, attending, for instance, the Wittenberg Symposium in Springfield, Ohio in 1927.

In 1924, Adler had become a member of the Teachers College at the Pedagogical Institute of the City of Vienna. There, he influenced hundreds of teachers who came to his lectures voluntarily of their own accord. He taught an innovative method of case study research for teachers, in which individual psychology was applied directly to students in the classroom, the effect of which was often immediate on the child's behavior. As an extension of these lectures, child guidance clinics of a voluntary nature were developed along the lines of Adler's teachings. The child being studied had to be accompanied by a parent as well as his teacher, in which the child was a co-participant in diagnosing the problem and discovering its solution. The clinics were tremendously successful and were flooded with applicants. Adler himself worked at one of these clinics and through direct demonstration in front of small audiences of professionals further extended his influence. At one point, in Vienna alone, there were 28 child guidance clinics managed by the Vienna section of the International Association for Individual Psychology. Other clinics operated in Munich and Berlin.

In 1924, he published *The Practice and Theory of Individual Psychology*. In it he maintained that individual psychology covers the whole range of psychology in one survey, and as a result it is able to mirror the individual unity of personality. [5] The contents of the work were individual lectures, first on general topics of individual psychology, and then more specific ones followed on its application.

Individual psychology, he said, does not deny, as other theories do, experience, conscious intent, artistic and creative vision, and intuition itself. He espoused rather, a comparative individual psychology by starting with the assumption of unity within the individual. In this sense, he said, his method was similar to that of William Stern. The path the individual follows is important, because it tells us what the person's goal is. It tells us his "life line." We are always goal oriented, especially with regard to our living out of an "imagined terminal goal"—something that has not come about yet, but toward which we aspire and strive to achieve. All thoughts, words, and deeds are then preparations for achieving that goal: "All psychical powers are under the control of a directive idea, and all expressions of emotion, feeling, thinking, willing, acting, dreaming, as well as psychopathological phenomena are permeated by one

unified life plan."[6] The general mood of the person is always one of compensation from inferiorities. He gave as an example the man with a bad memory. The man usually is not suffering from a hereditary problem or some intellectual defect. With regard to the overall scheme of things in his life plan, he is just under the sway of something he does not want to remember. Similarly, traits of character are always adjustments to the individual's life plan.

Community feeling (*gemeinschaftsgefeuhl*), the development of an appreciation for social relationships, became the primary avenue through which a person was able to strive for superiority and to exercise his power over others. It was physiologically rooted, and the person's attitude about it could always be traced back to an origin in early childhood. There, compensation for physical inferiorities began to express itself psychologically as the child developed, which then found expression in the social sphere of adolescence and of adulthood. These lines of development since childhood, he thought, could only be broken by "an exceedingly high degree of introspection" or though psychotherapy.

Adler also continued to develop his ideas on sexual hermaphroditism and the masculine protest. Each of us, regardless of our gender, has masculine and feminine traits that define our personality. Some traits are more enduring than others, but what prevails is largely guided by the individual's life plan. At the same time community feelings help shape identity. Men, in particular, are encouraged to express themselves as real men, which takes the form of an overexaggeration of the image of what the accepted male image would look like. The urge toward an ideal of perfection begins in childhood in terms of compensation for physical inferiorities. This might take the form of deficient height, weight, physical prowess, or size of one's sex organs. Psychologically it extends into the expression of masculine rather than feminine traits of personality. Overcompensation for inferiorities by exaggerating masculine traits Adler referred to as the masculine protest.

He then followed with chapters on hallucinations, dreams, the masculine attitude in female neurotics, homosexuality, compulsions, hunger strikes, the role of the unconscious in neuroses, the importance of early childhood education, and the case of demoralized children.

In 1927, *Menschenkenntnis* appeared, translated into English as *Understanding Human Nature*.[7] It was a major summary of his dynamic theory, in that it was not so much a preconceived theory as an intuitive characterization of personality, which could be reached by anyone putting any thought into the subject. The character of the individual in normal adult life, he said there, is already laid down within the first 4 years and changes very little from that time. The study of children is therefore recommended as the place to start in understanding human nature. If you want to change the behavior patterns in maturity, then start with those laid down in earliest childhood. From there we are led to pedagogy and the wider field of education if we want to understand the science of human nature.

Adler believed that empathy comes through having lived through psychic crises, not from reading books. What one should look for was the unique core of the person, the soul. From the very beginning, Adler made use of the soul as a referent to the individual. From this we see that the psychic organ is always goal oriented.

It demonstrates purposive teleology. Life is a preparation always for some future situation. In this way the soul is always associated with movement.

The soul that cannot withstand the pressures of survival on its own necessarily joins the herd for increased protection. This leads to the communal life because man, unlike other animals, cannot exist by himself in nature. Weak animals never live in solitude. Instead, one is surrounded by layers of protection, from help during childbirth, to protection in the first few days of life, to avoiding the vagaries that beset the survival of children in the early years. Inferiority and insecurity are thus built into the individual's constitution. Desire, will, understanding, and speech have all grown up to assist the person who is inferior in nature to adapt in the communal life. Legal codes, totems, taboos, education, and laws all then become necessary in regulating this relationship. Adaptation to the community is the most important function of the individual soul.

Every type has a meaning only when we understand its relationship to its environment. The soul is born in early childhood in those situations whose function is to make normal life possible. The different types of individuals begin in this early period. The goal is maximum satisfaction of the instincts with the least possible friction. Similarly, reflections of the environment are to be found in the behavior of every child.

Creative education can always come out of striving to accommodate one's inferiorities. It begins with organ inferiority and proceeds to psychological, then sociological weaknesses. The sense organs are the first to show these tendencies to adaptation. Usually a child overemphasizes one or the other of them and though compensation develops a repertoire of identifiable traits to his or her personality. Sense organs lead to perceptions and to the creation of memory and imagination. Fantasy is yet another creative activity of the soul, always concerned with the future. The striving for power often plays a dominant role. This also implies a goal, usually one involving social recognition and significance. It is well developed in the weak that use it to deprecate reality and elevate themselves to a fictional level in their own imagination. Thus the main outlines of his theory were laid out. The unique expression of the soul begins to flourish in the recognition of organ inferiority, which generalizes to psychological and sociological adjustments, and the paramount importance of social striving.

The Case of Fritz

Several volumes appeared during this time explicating Adler's method with examples.[8] A case in point was a demonstration Adler himself gave in *Guiding the Child* (1930a).[9] The case was a 12-year-old boy named Fritz, whose mother had brought him to the Clinic with the complaint of enuresis. Adler explained that the boy was militant and probably pampered when younger but since had been displaced by other siblings. He did not feel well and made excessive demands on his mother. He was slovenly, had difficulty eating, and wanted always to be the center of atten-

tion. He seemed to do well in school, however. It was important to get all the details of the study to get the origin of these behaviors. The fact that the boy wet himself during the day suggested there is no violent struggle at the root, only on the outside. Further, he never wet himself when his mother was with him or he was at school. He may have feel he was the cause of his mother's troubles. The boy lived with his grandparents, who pampered him. Before that, the child used to sleep with the parents. If he slept in his mother's bed, Adler noted, he would not wet himself.

Four years earlier the boy had come down with an osteomyelitic condition. His leg was in danger of being amputated. This was an important source for his feelings of inferiority. He stayed out of school for 3 years. He returned, only to be enrolled in special education classes. He always interrupted the other students, trying to get recognized. He had a brother 4 years older who was also his father's favorite. This made the younger boy the problem. As a result, the boy adopted this mantle and often played the role of the clown. For these things, Adler characterized him as an ambitious weakling. On the positive side, Fritz had no difficulty eating, so the parents were doing something right; similarly with washing and dressing.

Adler then made it known that both the parents and the grandparents were blood relations. This was discouraging and a source of social weakness. The possibility of organ inferiority was therefore very high. The child also had whooping cough and bladder trouble, which would promote pampering. He occasionally cried out at night. He walked at 16 months and talked at 3 years. This is late and indicates an over involvement by the mother. In features, Fritz appeared slightly mongoloid, which would exacerbate the situation because of a tendency to start out in a feeble-minded class to begin with.

Up to this point, Adler had been lecturing to the professional audience. He then asked that the mother be brought in. His intent was to win her over to a new program of re-education for her son. Adler began by praising the child, a behavior which the mother usually minimized. He asked the mother what the child would like to become. She replied, a cabinetmaker. He asked what the father did and she said he was a dental mechanic. So Adler concluded that it was a compatible wish, which the mother seemed to not see. Adler asked if the boy had any friends. Yes, but all younger ones, she replied. How was he in dealing with money? Ok, she said. Has he been to one of three clinics before? Yes, evidently, but got into a fight. Was he reliable? Yes. How was he with the older brother? She dissembled and made up how well they got along.

At that point, the child then entered the room. Adler addressed him directly. He asked him how he was getting along in school, but then stated he usually acts cowardly because he had no confidence in himself: "You are overwhelmed by arithmetic. We could help you do better if you are interested. You would then be able to go to a higher school. We should like you to come to our clinic. You will have a good time there. We shall work together and you shall improve. I was also poor in arithmetic but soon learned to excel above everyone else. What would your teacher think of that?" The boy made a positive, enthusiastic reply. Adler then told the boy to come again and in the same sentence admonished him to ignore what others say about

him. "And don't wet yourself at home when criticized. You must help me," Adler tells him. "May I rely on you?" The child then left the room.

In addition to the accounts by Adler and his colleagues in Vienna, there were other publications. There was also *The Case of Miss R.* (1929), the interpretation of a life story, which followed a patient into neurosis across the life span and proposed an innovative method for reading and creating case histories.[10] "The Pattern of Life" were lectures he gave at the New School for Social Research in 1929, in which a number of cases were presented. These endeavors abruptly ended in 1934, however, when the fascists took over the Austrian Republic. Already aware of the pending problem that the Nazis' rise to power entailed, Adler had long before been expanding his operations internationally and replanting himself elsewhere. As we said, after World War I the *Journal of Individual Psychology* resumed publication in 1923 and it added editors such as the Americans G. Stanley Hall and William Ernest Hocking when it migrated to the United States.

When the lecture invitations began to increase, Adler took it as a personal challenge to learn English in order to accept more of them. In the first half of 1927, he gave talks at the New School for Social Research, the New York Academy of Medicine, various child guidance and mental hygiene associations, local churches, and Institutes, and he held clinics at two New York Hospitals. In Boston, he was the guest of William Healy and he lectured at Harvard, introduced by Morton Prince. One of his articles also appeared in Prince's *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. In Providence he lectured at Brown, as well as local schools. In Chicago he lectured at the University of Chicago and spoke to professional meetings sponsored by the Board of Education. Two thousand five hundred were turned away trying to get tickets to his lectures for teachers. He then proceeded on to lecture in Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Wisconsin, and California to wide acclaim. He returned in 1928 to receive the LLD from Wittenberg College and he returned again 1929–1930 as lecturer at Columbia. Back home, he became medical director of a clinic for neurotics and was named Citizen of Vienna in 1930. It should have been a day of celebration, but he was publicly greeted by the mayor as a deserving pupil of Freud, which angered him.

His message, by that time in his life, which impressed so many, was that leading children in the formative years to a useful life would change both our quality of life and our history, while the children at the same time would be protected from neuroses and delinquency.

By then, there were active groups devoted to Adlerian psychology in Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, England, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United States.[11] Tirelessly traveling and lecturing, while also trying to find his daughter who was at that time lost somewhere in Russia, he died in Scotland in 1937.

Ellenberger summed Adler's teachings in a series of axioms[12]: Man was a unity, a whole, not conscious and unconscious, and not divided into id, ego, and superego. Adler's conception of personality was based on the idea of dynamism, that is, life cannot be conceived without movement. We think forward and have goals and intentionality. There is always in the life of the individual a sense of cosmic influ-

ence. We live always in a sense of community feeling and within an individual conception of the cosmos. Also, there is a spontaneous structuration of the parts in a whole. That is, all functions conspire toward the whole of individuality. There is always action and reaction between the individual and the environment; this underlay the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. There is a law of absolute truth, even if it is a fictitious norm set up for the conduct the individual and governing his or her relation to community feeling, deviation from which causes psychopathology, perversions, and criminality. These premises define the relation of humans to nature, social groups, and with each other; they form the basis for the interrelation of the individual to the community. Adler also believed that individuals are divided into visual, auditive, or motor types.[13]

Every individual also has a style of life, a phrase Adler employed instead of the construct of personality. An individual's style of life is discovered by investigation of present attitudes, earliest memories, childhood activities, adolescent wishes, and dreams. These sources reveal the individual's perception of the world and hence his or her style of living. Each person also has a secret goal they are attempting to attain. Dreams reveal this, as well as reveal a tentative solution to the dreamer's immediate problems. The key question to ask for Adler was "What is the patient's life goal?" "What is their life style?" To know these things, one had to work with children. So he worked with patients and their families and did extensive work in schools. Later he would found his own kindergarten classes for therapeutic education.[14]

Adler's Influence

Adler attracted numerous adherents during his own lifetime. Two of his children even followed in his footsteps, Kurt, his only son, and his daughter Alexandra. Contrary to his father's aversion for numbers, Kurt Adler was a numerical genius from an early age.[15] He took a PhD from the University of Vienna in physics and mathematics in 1935 and he then earned an MD in 1941 from the Long Island College of Medicine. Though an MD and a psychiatrist, he always referred to himself as a psychologist. He worked as a psychiatrist for the US Army during World War II, and afterward carried on a private practice in New York City for 45 years, until he died in 1997. He believed, as his father did, that mental health is achieved through integration into a community, when the person merges his or her own self-interest with the common interest of humanity.

Alfred Adler's daughter, Alexandra, also made a name for herself in individual psychology. Her father died in 1937 in the middle of a lecture series, which she endeavored to complete. Afterward, she helped to found The Alfred Adler Institute in New York. In 1952, Rudolph Dreikurs, MD, founded Alfred Adler Institute in Chicago, now the Adler Institute of Professional Psychology, and between the two of them Adlerian psychology flourished in Chicago and New York as separate centers of activity. Prior to that time, Alexandra Adler had undertaken a major study of

the traumatic neuroses when in 1942, among many other physicians; she examined the victims of the Cocoanut Grove fire, a devastating incident in a crowded Boston nightclub that resulted in 442 deaths and 166 injured. Her report highlighted the fact that symptoms of depression and anxiety associated with traumatic exposure may be more permanent and persistent than originally thought due to persistent emotional factors long after the physical injuries had healed.[16] She was remembered as a brilliant researcher, neurologist, and psychiatrist. She was also noted as one of the first women neurologists at Harvard Medical School. She died on January 4, 2001 at age 99.

Another ardent Adlerian, Alexander Müller, a Jewish psychiatrist, was born in Hungary in 1895 and studied medicine in Vienna. He was drafted as a soldier, however, in World War I and spent 4 years as a prisoner of war in Russia. After the war he helped Adler found numerous child guidance clinics and also was active in therapy, teaching, lecturing, and the training of therapists. When the Nazis came to power, he and his family emigrated, trying to settle in several different countries before landing in Holland. When the Nazis invaded Holland, they fled back to Hungary, where he was interred in a concentration camp. After liberation, he returned to Holland until 1952, when he was invited to become a lecturer in Zürich at the Institute for Applied Psychology. He became the director of the Swiss Society for Individual Psychology and secretary of the International Association for Individual psychology before retirement. He died in 1968.

Lydia Sicher, MD, psychiatrist and PhD, was born in Vienna in 1890 and took her MD at the University of Vienna in 1916. During World War I, she was a physician and First Lieutenant in the Austrian army. Afterward, skilled in surgery, pathological anatomy, and radiology, she worked in Vienna under Wagner-Jauregg in neurology and psychiatry for 6 years.

Sicher met Adler in 1919 and was drawn to his work over that of Freud's. She became director of Adler's clinic when he left for the United States in 1929 and she ran it until it was closed by the Nazis in 1938. By then, she and her colleagues had treated over 3,000 patients using Adler's methods. She traveled widely throughout Europe while also running the clinic, until she immigrated to the United States in 1939. She spent 2 years in Utah, lecturing and seeing patients, until 1941, when she moved to Los Angeles and founded the first Adlerian Society there. She was also president of the American Society of Adlerian Psychology and was a member of the editorial board of the *Journal of Individual Psychology*.

Sophia deVries was born in Holland in 1901, took a BA in education and earned a teaching credential by 1919. Thereafter she started working with children. Soon, she went to Italy and studied with Maria Montessori. She first heard Adler lecture in Amsterdam, but it was not until 1935 that she went to Vienna, where she took courses given by Alfred Adler, Lydia Sicher, Alexander Müller, Rudolf Dreikurs, August Eichorn, and Karl Bühler. Her "study analysis," a process of supervised analysis by a qualified Adlerian, was with Sicher, who was Adler's first assistant, and her case supervision was provided by Müller, who was a close co-worker of Adler.

During the War, the Nazis forbid the practice of Adlerian psychology, but she continued anyway, largely in isolation. After the war, in 1945, the Adlerian training group was re-established in Holland. She was chosen for the Scientific Committee on Adlerian Psychology and taught courses with Alexander Müller in Amsterdam. She immigrated to the United States in 1948, settled in Southern California, and worked closely with Lydia Sicher. She moved to Northern California in 1952, worked as a case worker for Lincoln Child Center in Oakland, and continued to teach and develop a private practice.

For nearly 20 years, deVries served as a mentor and consultant to the Alfred Adler Institute of San Francisco, offering study groups, case studies of individuals, supervision, and study-analyses to students. Toward the end of her career, she became a major figure in the Adler translation project.

Anthony Bruck was a tireless lay advocate of individual psychology. He was multilingual from an early age and earned an MBA in Vienna. He moved to the United States in 1922. He had been introduced to Adler's essays before emigrating and in 1926, when he heard Adler was coming to the United States, wrote, introduced himself, and was able to arrange lectures for Adler in New York. That began a period when he became involved in all aspects of Adlerian psychology. He was the secretary of the Adler study group that met at the New School for Social Research, he attended all of Adler's lectures and became close to Adler himself. He returned to Vienna in 1931 and visited all 32 of the Adlerian Child Guidance Clinics and joined the Adlerians at the Café Shiller for extensive discussions. Thereafter, at Adler's encouragement, he traveled and lectured widely at universities and clinics throughout Central America, parts of Europe, and also the Middle East, returning to the United States in 1947. He lectured and traveled widely there, particularly in California, before returning to New York in 1977. Having been a confidant to Adler, he was close with his immediate disciples as well, who remembered him as a significant influence on their community.

Henry Stein,[17] a PhD in psychology, first encountered Adlerian psychology in the 1970s in the Bay Area of San Francisco, California. There, he was directed to Sophia deVries, who was well connected to the other Adlerians and depth psychologists of the day and she eventually became his teacher. As we noted before, she had studied with Alfred Adler, Carl Jung, August Eichorn, Ludwig Klages, and Maria Montessori. She did her study analysis with Lydia Sicher and received her case supervision from Alexander Müller.

She first suggested a study analysis where Stein would read a series of Adler's books to study the theory, and then in a weekly meeting, discuss with her each idea and its application to his personal and professional life. Eventually, he studied with her for more than 20 years. She in turn introduced Stein to Anthony Bruck and others and to a cache of unpublished documents that constitute the Adler archives.

Under deVries's guidance, Stein read all of Adler's writings that he could find, discovering that many of them were still not translated into English. She suggested that he learn German, so that he could then read the untranslated material. The result, with a group of German-speaking Adlerian translators more skilled than he, was the recently published clinical writings of Alfred Adler in 12 volumes.[18]

The Ansbachers

We may say that Adler's influence was far reaching, but remains widely unknown, especially today. While he did study psychopathology, his real focus was on education, which was not considered a hot topic in any case, but it was the field where the person could be studied as a whole and their hopes and strivings identified so as to bring about the development of their highest potential, beginning at an early age.

Even before he had met Adler through Maslow, Heinz Ansbacher came into psychology through popular lectures Adler had delivered at Columbia University in 1930. Meanwhile, Rowena Ansbacher had studied with Adler in Vienna in 1928. Thereafter, both came to know him intimately until the time of his death in 1937. Heinz Ansbacher and his wife went on to become Adler's tireless advocates, making his writings more widely known in the English language literature.

In *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections from his Writings* (1956), the Ansbachers' thesis was that Adler was the original field theorist of a dynamic psychology as a social science.[19] In his subjectivist orientation, Adler was the complete antithesis of Freud's objectivist epistemology. The essential problem, they noted, over and over, was how few really knew Adler's work. This was exacerbated by the unsystematic nature of his writings. Their volume hoped to correct that by collecting his papers in approximate chronological order and then thematically in the middle around the exposition of his theories. They were particularly aided in this regard, they said, by encouragement from Abraham Maslow and also the guiding hand of Gordon Willard Allport, and Gardner Murphy, among others.

In the introductory chapters, the editors went to great lengths to differentiate Adler from Freud and at the same time to explain Adler's system. Individual psychology was, first of all, a subjective depth psychology. By this they meant that it goes beyond surface phenomena to take unconscious motivation into account, but it does not hypostatize or reify the unconscious as a separate theoretical construct. It was dynamic, in that it incorporated strivings held by the person that they did not themselves fully understand, but which had definite effects as goals and ideals.

They went to great lengths to review William James's differentiation of personality types as tender and tough minded, classing Adler in the tender and Freud in the tough-minded columns. Freud was a biologically oriented reductionist bent on proving psychoanalysis a science. Adler was interested in the subjective interpretation of life from the person's point of view and gave more emphasis to experiential meaning rather than an externalist description of biology in shaping character. The Ansbachers then compared Adler to other psychological systems, finding him compatible with the personalistic psychology of William Stern, whose psychology represented a science of immediate experience which was experienced by the goal-directed person. The individual was a self-consistent unity always striving toward an ideal. Adler himself even remarked on their similarities.

Adler's was an idiographic science, the Ansbachers also pointed out. It was made up of laws that pertain to the individual case only, at the same time it was nomothetic, governed by general laws such as compensation for inferiority, but the focus

was always on the individual, one's style of life, and opinion of the self, geared toward specific individual goals. The next step, the Ansbachers maintained, was to compare Adler to Allport and also to the psychology of Gardner Murphy.

They cited Adler's holism as a link to gestalt psychology. Solomon Asch, they pointed out, employed the same term as Adler—social interest—in differentiating himself from the socialization advocated by Freud. They reserved a special section comparing Adler to Kurt Lewin. Indeed, Lewin himself believed that the gestaltists had provided experimental evidence for the correctness of Adler's views.[20] First, they were similar in that they both rejected classification systems. Second, for both, dynamic forces were not fixed quantities of energy, but relational and changing. Adler's concept of movement was Lewin's concept of vector—the expression of a force directed from one point to another. For these reasons the Ansbachers classed Adler as the original field theorist in psychology.

His psychology, the Ansbachers continued, was also descriptive and not explanatory. This linked him to Dilthey, Spranger, and Jaspers. Even the early psychoanalysts commented on this similarity between Adler and Jaspers regarding the neuroses. The Ansbachers compared Adler favorably to the phenomenological psychology of Donald Snygg and Arthur Combs, and the existentialists, and finally to the client-centered theory of personality put forth by Carl Rogers.[21] Indeed, many of the later variations of Freud's theories among the neo-Freudians, they further pointed out, could be called instead, neo-Adlerian.

For his part, Adler came to depth psychology as a physician in general medicine and true to his training stayed there by emphasizing biology and physiology over unconscious mental mechanisms. He strove instead for a psychology that would lead to a more holistic biology.

In this regard, the true meaning of holism, according to Jan Smuts, makes room for a new science of personality, which "as the synthetic science of human nature, will form the crown of all the sciences, and, in turn, become the basis of a new Ethic, a new Metaphysic." As a method of approach to this new science Smuts proposed a comparative study of carefully documented biographies that will enable man to formulate the laws of personal evolution. It should come as no surprise that Smuts and Adler corresponded.[22]

Adler always maintained the originality of his own work. Nevertheless, he felt he had advocated for psychoanalysis in the Viennese medical community for many years and played some role in its acceptance as a science. But he also did not understand why he had to do his own work under Freud's shadow. One interpretation, of course, was that he could not see the bubble he was working in, in which, one could say, he was unconsciously dreaming, not his own dream, but Freud's dream, which centered in Freud's mind always around Freud and no one else.

May and Adler

Meanwhile, in 1932, Rollo May, a 20-year-old graduate from Oberlin College, had just arrived for a 3-year stint teaching English at Anatolia College in Saloniki,

Greece. Idealistic and starry-eyed, all he knew about Greece he had learned in *Bulfinch's Mythology*. He was in love with the place, in love with his students, in love with learning, and decidedly stuck in the classical Greek mindset. He was on a search, he later wrote, for beauty.[23]

But after 2 years the blush had worn off and May found himself in a lonely depression. Athens and Delphi no longer amazed him. He became neurasthenic; he lost energy, and took to his bed. He understood that he had to change, to adopt new values, and a new way of seeing, if he was to pull out of this slump. That summer, he took off for the mountains. He walked through a cold and snowy night beyond the inhabitants on the slopes and by morning had reached one of the remote villages high up beyond modern civilization, where no one spoke any English. He arranged a room and spent a number of days by the fire at an inn; writing on odd slips of paper all the thoughts that were streaming into his mind. He was engaging in a primitive form of self-analysis. Both a budding poet and an amateur artist, he had brought the tools of those trades, so began chronicling both the inward and the outward journey he was taking in pencil and in paint.

Eight weeks later, in May of 1932, May found himself enrolled in Alfred Adler's seminar at Semerling, a resort in the mountains above Vienna. We have little data on the content of these seminars, but May later proclaimed them seminal in the development of his thought about human nature. This was also as close to psychoanalysis as he would come, until later when he developed friendships with various American analysts and became a pupil of Paul Tillich, who had his own interpretations of Freud. The point was, it was this early direct contact with Adler, not Freud, that most influenced May with regard to dynamic theories of personality.

There was a strong personal reward that came out of the seminars as well. While there, he met an older American woman who had been watching him draw and she invited him to join a group of 18 students traveling through central Europe that summer visiting the peasant villages, and he accepted. They began in Vienna, proceeded to Hungary, then to Czechoslovakia, where May was exposed to art, music, dancing, and beauty. He returned to his teaching in the fall, a new man.

Adler and Maslow

From 1932 on, Adler himself became a visiting professor at Long Island College of Medicine. Finally, in 1934, he immigrated to the United States with his wife and lived at the Gramercy Hotel. There, he met Abraham Maslow. Maslow had been first introduced to the writings of Freud and Adler in 1932 and was fascinated by their differences, but also their relevance to his own work on dominance, power, and sexual hierarchies in primates. He came to believe at that time that Adler's work seemed more realistic—that hierarchy determined sexual behavior, not the other way around.

Maslow had graduated from the University of Wisconsin under Harry Harlow with a PhD in comparative animal psychology, and at that time he was a

committed experimentalist. By 1935 he had a secure postdoctoral fellowship under E. L. Thorndike at Columbia, was married, and comfortably settled in New York. New York at the time was a hot bed of displaced émigré social thinkers and Adler was one of them. Maslow immediately sought out his company. Adler used to run Friday evening seminars in his hotel suite, where Maslow soon became a frequent guest. According to Maslow's biographer, 40 years his senior, Adler soon became Maslow's mentor.[24] To Maslow's complete surprise, the Friday groups were quite small, which gave him more time for intensive interaction. He brought numerous friends and colleagues to hear Adler lecture and to meet with him personally. One of them, he said, was Heinze Ansbacher.

Adler's influence on Maslow was allegedly enormous. He had convinced Maslow of the importance of social interest and reinforced the biological bases of the neuroses. But more importantly, Maslow got the meaning of *Menschenkenntnis*—it was an intuitive picture of the total person in the context of his or her environment. They saw each other intensively for an 18-month period and then had a falling out, after which Maslow ceased coming around. Adler died a short time later.

Adler's Influence on Victor Frankl

Possibly one of Adler's most significant admirers was Victor Frankl, founder of Logotherapy and a major pioneer in the development of existential psychiatry. Frankl had been particularly attracted to Adler's conception of cosmic feeling in the individual.

Of Jewish ancestry, Frankl was born March 26, 1905, son of Gabriel and Elsa Frankl.[25] His father was a government employee and his mother a housewife. Already drawn toward psychology, in his last years in high school he wrote a psychoanalytic study of Schopenhauer, published in the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, and opened a correspondence with Sigmund Freud. A medical student at age 20, he finally met Freud in 1925. By then, however, he had fallen under the influence of Alfred Adler's theories, soon publishing "Psychotherapy and Weltanschauung" in Adler's *International Journal of Individual Psychology*.[26] He was graduated from the University of Vienna with the MD in 1930. By 1940 he had become director of neurology at the Rothschild Hospital in Vienna and a year later married Mathilde Grosser. In 1942, however, they were both arrested by the Nazis and sent to the concentration camps. His father, mother, and brother died there, along with Mathilde, who managed to stay alive until 1945.

Frankl, himself, survived both Auschwitz and Dachau. Despite 3 years of the most abject horror, under constant threat of death, he lived to write about his experiences. There were, he came to believe, dimensions of consciousness so much deeper and more profound than that addressed by psychoanalysis that some completely new and revolutionary theory was in order. Out of this realization he evolved a new kind of therapy addressing the existential dimension of human experience, which he came to call Logotherapy, the discovery of meaning as a way to reach the deepest aspects of the soul.

While he eventually wrote some 20 volumes in German on the technical aspects of Logotherapy, American audiences heard of it for the first time through the English translation of *The Doctor and the Soul* (1955), renamed *From Death Camp to Existentialism* (1959), and later renamed again *Man's Search for Meaning* (1963).[27] The book appeared with a preface by the distinguished personality-social psychologist at Harvard, Gordon Willard Allport, the man who was primarily responsible for seeing its publication through the Beacon Press edition and who sponsored Frankl's introduction to the American psychological community. As a result, Frankl came to the United States as a visiting professor at Harvard in 1961, before he went on to Southern Methodist University in 1966, Stanford in 1971, and Duquesne in 1972. As a lecturer he was in international demand. His books have been translated into 14 languages and the US edition of *Man's Search for Meaning* by itself sold more than 4 million copies.

In this work, Frankl gave an account of his own experiences in the camps, followed by an essay on the basic principles of Logotherapy.[28] His intention, however, was not to write a systematic autobiography, but to sketch firsthand the psychology of the concentration camp prisoner in order for the reader to understand the genesis of Logotherapy. He was quite clear that it was impossible for us who were never there to ever understand what happened to those interned. We who had never gone through it could never really know the true extent of the suffering, crucifixion, and death of so many. He did not wish to tell about the worst kind of person that emerged under these extraordinary circumstances; he wished only to show that something really hopeful and important came to him about the human condition. He discovered heroic people who found a way to live, even if only briefly, by actualizing their highest values in the midst constant torture and death. He was self-consciously aware at the outset, he said, that those who were not there could never know, and of those who were, "the best of us did not come back."

The experiences in the camps, he said, proceeded through three distinct phases: the shock upon being arrested, the abject apathy that emerged in the face of the constant terrors, and the anesthesia that followed liberation.

In the first phase, shock set in somewhere between the time of arrest and the first hours after arrival in the camps. Thousands were rounded up and herded onto cattle cars, then compressed so tightly that few could even crouch down. With no food, ventilation, or sanitary facilities, the trains carried them for days, finally disgorging them at their destination. During this time, most maintained an attitude of utter disbelief that all this could be happening. Bewildered, cold, and hungry, they arrived only to stand a long time for inspection as an officer beckoned them to the right or the left. They did not yet know that one way meant immediate death in the gas chambers, the other way meant assignment to a work detail. Ninety percent of the 2,500 who arrived with him, Frankl said, were sent to death at the first selection.

Those who were left were then herded into buildings where their bags and parcels were taken from them. At first, unwilling to give up everything they had brought, many clung to the past, to a piece of jewelry, a wedding ring, a watch. Frankl kept a manuscript hidden under his coat until at one point they all realized, one by one,

that everything would be taken away. They were stripped naked and every single hair was shaved off their bodies. Then they were given old clothes that had belonged to dead prisoners. Kickings, beatings, and brutal killings occurred all around them, carried out by the most sadistic and horrible means. Finally, by being successively subjected to the lowest of degradations, with the punishment of death hanging over them for showing even the slightest disgust, all delusion of reprieve finally vanished.

Then the second stage began, that of apathy. This was emotional death, a necessary survival mechanism. Nothing became too terrible to witness. One did not avert one's eyes any more, whatever the episode. While a reaction could mean one's own death, because of attracting the guards' attention, the real effect was nothing so rationally mediated. Rather, each one in turn experienced a complete numbing of all emotional sensibilities. Soon, it became impossible to react; but this, too, had survival value, because it helped each prisoner become insensitive to the daily and hourly beatings. Prevailing on such a large scale, apathy made a prisoner frightened to take any initiative whatsoever. Fate became one's master and was not to be tempted.

The prisoners were forced by these outward circumstances to turn within. But when they did so, they opened themselves up, one degree or another to the reality of interior vision. Sleep and, hence, dreaming became a kind of drug, a temporary respite. The most ghastly moment of each day, Frankl said, was awakening, because it brought one back to face the horror. Sleep, when it could be had, took place eventually under the most extraordinary of conditions. As for dreaming, once Frankl thought to wake up his neighbor from a terrible nightmare, but he suddenly left off, realizing that nothing could be worse then to subject the man once again to their present waking reality.

He reported that under these outward circumstances there was an extreme intensification of inner life. There were numerous instances of time distortion, for instance. Each hour would pass by with excruciating slowness. A minute might seem like an eternity. A day seemed longer than a week. Also, an inward curiosity about one's personal circumstances would develop. With each new insult more horrible than the one before, living on the edge, not knowing if that was to be the final moment on earth, each situation brought a curious detachment, a removed pondering as to which way the outcome might go. A certain dark humor also became another of the soul's weapons in the fight for self-preservation. A certain mass forgetfulness of norms and values might occur, as in one reported instance of cannibalism. Anything that led to survival was the key. All else was forgotten.

He also gave many instances of dissociated states of consciousness. In tears from pain, walking many miles to a distant work site in cold bitter winds, wearing only rags and torn shoes, Frankl had been thinking of endless little problems—Would he get enough food that day? Could he fix his broken shoelace? Could he trade a cigarette he had for extra bread? Suddenly, he became disgusted with these trivial thoughts and, desiring to turn away from them, he saw himself standing on a platform in a well-lit and warm lecture hall, lecturing to an interested audience on the psychology of the concentration camp! Everything pressing on him, all the little problems he thought about while he marched through the cold and the wind, he then

saw remotely, from an objective viewpoint. In this way he was able to rise above his emotional suffering at that moment.

He also noted the psychic influence of the mind on health and disease. On the one hand, the will to live produced remarkable instances of self-healing. Despite severe vitamin deficiency and inability to brush their teeth, everyone's gums remained generally healthy. Sores and abrasions did not suppurate, despite the constant infestation of lice and the dirt and grime from wearing the same clothes for 6 months at a time without washing. Many common minor physical and mental complaints simply disappeared in the face of the larger daily task of survival at all costs.

On the other hand, the mind could play a role for ill. One patient, for instance, had a dream in which he was granted the opportunity to ask one question. He asked when the war would be over for him and the dream gave a precise date. Accordingly, he announced to his friends that the Armistice would come and the war would be ending on that specific date. But as the months past and the date neared it appeared that the fighting would continue. Suddenly, he came down with a mysterious fever and died. It was, of course, the exact date foretold to him in his dream.

As well, thoughts of suicide were common. While generally each man clung to life, the real danger to everyone was the prisoner who lost faith in the future. It usually started when the person refused to get up. He would not get dressed and wash or go out onto the parade ground. Under other circumstances, a prisoner might refuse to go to sick bay when mortally ill. Such a person would just lay there in his own excrement, just waiting for the end.

The highest achievement of all, however, was the rising of a spiritual consciousness. "We who lived in the concentration camps can remember the men who walked through the huts comforting others, giving away their last piece of bread."[29] Most importantly, Frankl noted that how a person reacted was an inward decision, not mediated by any outward circumstances. Each person chose the stance they would take toward what happened to them. In this inward attitude they were completely free. For some, each situation brought out their worst or appealed to their weakest aspect, and this aspect they became. For others, each situation was a test of inward spiritual strength. They would ask of themselves, not "Why is this happening to me?" but "Am I worthy of my sufferings?"

Some of these people who knew they were about to die and who had made peace within themselves appeared angelic and could commune with the simplest levels of living nature—a twig, a blade of grass, as if all was one. For them, self-realization for just one moment became a reality.

At one point, Frankl recounted marching to a work detail amidst fierce kicks and the crushing blows of gun butts. Stumbling on for miles, through ice and wind, the prisoners supported each other. The man next to him furtively wondered what their wives would think if they could see what pitiful condition their men were in. After this, as they continued along, they both knew they were thinking of their wives. Frankl wrote:

> Occasionally I looked at the sky, where the stars were fading and the pink light of the morning was beginning to spread behind a dark bank of clouds. But my mind clung to my wife's image, imagining it with an uncanny acuteness. I heard her answering me, saw her

> smile, her frank and encouraging look. Real or not, her look was then more luminous than the sun which was beginning to rise. A thought transfixed me: for the first time in my life I saw the truth as it is set into song by so many poets, proclaimed as the final wisdom by so many thinkers. The truth–that love is the ultimate and highest goal to which man can aspire. Then I grasped the meaning of the greatest secret that human poetry and human thought and belief have to impart: *The salvation of man is through love and in love*. I understood how a man who has nothing left in this world still may know bliss, be it only for a brief moment, in the contemplation of his beloved. In a position of utter desolation, when man cannot express himself in positive action, when his only achievement may consist in enduring his sufferings in the right way–an honorable way–in such a position man can, through loving contemplation of the image he carries of his beloved, achieve fulfillment.[30]

Meaning could emerge in the midst of suffering. To illustrate this Frankl recounted the episode of a prisoner who stole some potatoes from the storehouse. When he was discovered the camp commandant threatened to deprive everyone of food until the culprit was given up. Instead of betraying him, all 2,500 inmates chose to fast. That night in Frankl's hut the men were depressed. As tempers flared up, the lights went out, making things even worse. The hut leader got up to quiet their fears and once he had their attention, he asked a surprised Frankl to address them on ways to prevent despair and suicide. Extemporizing, Frankl rose from his own cold, exhausted, and hungry state to speak to the collective group in such great despair about hope and meaning. He appealed to their dreams and their memories, to people whom they had lost, or to those who might still be alive whom they had loved. Live for them, he said.

In order not to sound biblical, he quoted from poets and essayists, "What does not kill me makes me stronger." They all had small things to be glad for, an extra bowl of soup, the hope of a light work detail, escaping once again the daily dreaded selection. Meaning could be found even in the most profound suffering, because we always have the choice of what attitude we will take toward what happens to us. Suffering gives us hidden opportunities for new achievement. Because everyone in the room was still alive, life still expected something from them. Life questions us and it is upon us to take responsibility to find the right answers to fulfill the tasks it sets for each individual. Once we have discovered for ourselves a reason to live, we can endure anything. "He who has a why can bear with almost any how." When the lights came on again and he stopped talking, many came before him thankful and weeping.

Then there was the final phase, the psychology of the prisoner after liberation. Frankl recounts that after so many years, after so many false hopes, the human soul had been torn open, its depths had become overexposed. Consequently, when liberation came, its reality could not be immediately grasped.

In many instances, Frankl noted that the pressure bearing down on people for years to be silent suddenly was released and made them talk, irresistibly. Sometimes, after many days or months of this kind of chatter, the first glimmer of feeling might emerge, although this was not universally the case. After what they had seen and experienced, others never opened again.

Frankl recounted the story of one of his first walks outside the camps with a compatriot, who in his glee on being released insisted on trampling down a field of

young crops. Frankl objected, but the man replied angrily that he had lost his wife and children in the gas chambers; hadn't he a right to trample down a few stalks of oats? For many like him, Frankl noted, there was only the moral deformity, the bitterness, and the disillusionment that followed. Former prisoners would return to their home towns only to find everyone in their family gone. Strangers lived in their houses. Those who had not been through the camps merely shrugged their shoulders. They did not know what had gone on. And if they did, what could they have done about it? The former prisoners soon came to realize that no earthly happiness could compensate them for all they had suffered. After so many years of withstanding the absolute limit of suffering, they were introduced to a new kind of suffering that had no limits. In the end, liberation, the day, which for so long had been a dream, was followed by an eerie transition, after which, the horrors of the camps were remembered as if a nightmare.

Logotherapy

Even before the war Frankl had been working on the problems of existential anxiety in psychotherapy. But afterward this kind of anxiety evolved into the central focus of his worldview. Logotherapy, a therapy of the soul in the search for meaning, became the third school of Viennese psychiatry, after Freudian and Adlerian psychology. Frankl's position was that the basis of all human striving was not to overcome the conflicts between biological urges and the extent of their fulfillment, but to discover reasons to live. We are impelled not by our repressions but by our values and ideals. Neurosis, he came to believe, was the necessary result of putting sense gratification before meaning.

Frankl made many comparisons between his approach and that of Freud. Freud stayed focused on the psychological expression of biological needs, while Logotherapy "dared to enter the human dimension." Its focus on meaning went beyond mere adjustment to the norms of a society and entered into the existential nature of personal experience. Frankl saw in this that the therapist's job was to pilot patients through the existential crisis until they discovered where they were heading in their life. For some, this was not the real issue; in these cases, he practiced classical psychoanalysis. For others, this was the central problem, and so logotherapeutic interventions were necessary, which carried the patient and the therapist beyond the more limited frame of reference conceived by Freud. Adler had first showed him the way.

Frankl tried to get the patient to ask the deeper questions about personal existence, to see that even the simplest of daily tasks carried large spiritual consequences, in that all things are transitory, that life is finite, and that the end is final. He said, "The logotherapist's role consists of widening and broadening the visual field of the patient so that the whole spectrum of potential meaning becomes conscious and visible to him."[31] This widening to a world beyond the self he further called "the self-transcendence of human existence."

He encouraged his patients to take up a cause, to love something or someone, and to stand for some principle. Only in this way is character refined and perfected. Meaning should be the goal, not happiness or self-actualization, as these are mere side effects of transcendence; they are byproducts, not the goals, of a well-lived life.

Meaning, in this regard, can be created in several ways. The most difficult is through the actualization of values. Normally, we wait until the last minute and then make do with each situation we are presented with in life. Sometimes, however, we are able to see that by starting with the small things and putting them in order, by slowing accruing the success that comes from mastery of events over which we do have control, that the highest of what we cherish can come into being.

The other way, which is the path most readily open to most of us, is to find meaning in the attitude we take toward our suffering. No person is free from this dimension of human experience. Yet, as Frankl found in the concentration camps, we are likewise free to determine the attitude we will take toward what happens to us. Each struggle presents us with a new opportunity for transcendence and inward growth. In this his theories sound much like Buddhist thought, which, like Logotherapy, emphasizes the transitoriness of all existence, existential emptiness, and the transcendence of suffering. Yet his occasional references to belief in God, his emphasis on depth psychology as a secularized religious language, and his references to transcendent consciousness made Frankl's work tremendously popular with English-speaking audiences, especially in the field of pastoral theology. This may explain why his work has been closely embraced by the popular Christian world. Meanwhile, it has been rejected by the orthodox psychoanalysts, received somewhat coolly within Orthodox Judaism, and hardly mentioned by technical scholars of the Holocaust. Despite the fact that Frankl spent most of his life in Vienna and had always been an Austrian citizen, he remained, after all, for the very reasons he is considered suspect by these other sources, a folk hero, particularly among the existential-humanistic psychologists.

Finally, there are numerous ways in which we can see Adler in Frankl's work. The intuitive nature of Adler's vision of the person leads to a deepening of the existential point of view with regard to human experience. It is not the happiness psychology of Prof. Seligman, or a denial of the dark side of human nature, but a full bodied and direct encounter with pain, conflict, suffering, and death as a means toward self-transcendence. Frankl's was a case study of Adler's theories, particularly the need for social feeling (*gemeinschaftsgefeuhl*) to understand the existential context of personal autonomy (*Menschenkenntnis*). The biological roots of one's psychological sense of inferiority lead to compensation and the striving for superiority in the context of social feeling. Whatever we are in the secular domain, within the inner life of the person, there is the capacity to experience cosmic feeling, to live "as if" there will be a better day, and to understand love as the ultimate experience of self-transcendence. Freud did not take up these topics. Instead, the way for Frankl was through Adler.

These influences cause us to look a little more deeply into Adler's life and work. One always presumes that when we talk about depth psychology we must be talking

about the lineage from Freud. We have shown thus far, however, that there was a flourishing dynamic psychology of the subconscious many years before Freud that had emerged upon the international scene. Adler's work, moreover, came out of his interest in psychology, but within the context of Adler's own medical background. Adler's ideas, such as the inferiority complex, were taken over by the psychoanalysts and wrongly since then attributed to Freud, and while Adler's theories were clearly psychodynamic, they rejected most of the major presuppositions Freud had put forth about the unconscious and the nature of psychic energy. Adler championed psychoanalysis without being Freud's disciple.

This can be seen in the many ways in which Adler's individual psychology is totally unlike psychoanalysis. In fact, a further elaboration of Adler's thinking shows him to have had a greater impact on a normative psychology of the individual, which Freud did not write much about, and, further, it was direct contact with the Adlerian, not the Freudian system, that so inspired later pioneers such as Maslow, May, and Frankl in the rise of existential-humanistic and transpersonal psychology.[32]

Notes

1. I have relied heavily on Ellenberger, 1970, pp. 571–656; and Ansbacher, H. L., & Ansbacher, R. R. (Eds.). (1964). *Alfred Adler*: *Superiority and social interest*: *A collection of later writings*, with a biographical essay by Carl Fürtmuller. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
2. Adler, A. (2002a). Health manual for the tailoring trade. In H. T. Stein (Ed). (G. L. Liebenau, Trans), *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler (1898–1909)* (Vol. 2.1, pp. 1–14). Bellingham, WA: Classical Adlerian Translation Project. (Original work published 1898); Adler, A. (1898). *Gesundheitsbuch für das Schneidergewerbe*, No. 5 of the series: *Weigweiser der Gewerbehygiene*, G. Golebiewski (Ed.). Berlin: Carl Heymanns.
3. Adler, A. (1917). Study of organ inferiority and its psychical compensation: A contribution to clinical medicine. *Nervous and Mental Disease Monograph Series, 24*. (S. E. Jelliffe, Trans.). New York: The Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company; Adler, A. (2002b). A study of organ inferiority and its philosophical and psychological meaning. H. T. Stein (Ed.) (G. L. Liebenau, Trans.), *The Collected clinical works of Alfred Alder (1898–1909)* (Vol. 2.2, pp. 78–85). Bellingham, WA: Classical Adlerian Translation Project. (Original work published 1907); Adler, A. (1907). *Studie über Minderwertigkeit von Organen* [Study of organ inferiority].Vienna: Urban und Schwartenberg.
4. Adler, A. (1916). *The neurotic constitution*: *Outlines of a comparative individualistic psychology and psychotherapy* (B. Glueck & J. E. Lind, Trans.). New York: Moffat, Yard.
5. Adler, A. (1935). Introduction. *International Journal of Individual Psychology, 1*(1), p. 5; Adler, A. (1924). *The practice and theory of individual psychology*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Company, Ltd; New York, Harcourt, Brace & company.
6. Adler, 1935, p. 6.
7. Adler, A. (1927). *Understanding human nature*. New York: Greenberg; Adler, A. (1927). *Menschenkenntnis*. [Understanding human nature]. Leipzig: Hirzel.
8. Adler, A. (1930a). *Guiding the child on the principles of individual psychology* (B. Ginzburg, Trans.). London: George Allen and Unwin; New York: Greenberg.
9. Adler, 1930a, pp. 127–147.
10. Adler, A. (1929). *The case of Miss R.*: *The interpretation of a life story* (E & F. Jensen, Trans.). New York: Greenberg.

11. Fürtmuller, C., & Adler, A. (1964). A bibliographical essay. In H. L. Ansbacher, & R. R. Ansbacher (Eds.). *Alfred Adler: Superiority and social interest*: *A collection of later writings*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, p. 383.
12. Ellenberger, 1970, pp. 609–613.
13. Adler, 1930a, p. 62.
14. See, Adler (1930a); Adler, A. (1930b). *The pattern of life* (B. Wolfe, Ed.). New York: Cosmopolitan Book Corporation; Murchison, C. (Ed.). (1930). *Psychologies of 1930*, by Alfred Adler, Madison Bentley, Edwin G. Boring [and others]. Worcester, MA: Clark University Press; London, H. Milford, Oxford University Press.
15. Kaiser, C. (1995). An interview with Kurt Adler (1905–1997) on his 90th birthday. Adler Institute of Zurich, Adler Institute Homepage. http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/hstein/kurt-90.htm
16. Adler, A. (1945). Two different types of post-traumatic neuroses. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 102*, 237–240.
17. Stein, H. T. (2002–2006). *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler* (Vols.1–12). Bellingham, WA: Classical Adlerian Translation Project.
18. Stein, H. T. (2007). Adler's legacy: Past, present, and future. Ansbacher Lecture. Annual Conference, North American Society for Adlerian Psychology, May 24, 2007. Vancouver, BC. Adler Home Page. http://ourworld.compuserve.com/homepages/hstein/adlers-legacy.htm
19. Ansbacher, H., & Ansbacher, R. (Eds.). (1956). *The individual psychology of Alfred Adler*: *A systematic presentation in selections from his writings.* New York: Harper & Row.
20. Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p. 12.
21. Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p. 15. These are clearly the Ansbachers' interpretations as a form of comparison, not the articulation of a lineage.
22. Smuts, J. C. (1926). *Holism and evolution*. New York, London: Macmillan. See also, Ellenberger, 1970, p. 631.
23. May, R. (1985). *My quest for beauty*. San Francisco: Saybrook.
24. Hoffman E. (1988). *The right to be human*: *A biography of Abraham Maslow*. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, pp. 102–106.
25. Biographical material in this section comes from *Contemporary Authors*. http://gale.cengage.com/pdf/facts/ca.pdf
26. Frankl, V. (1925). Psychotherapie und Weltanshauung [Psychotherapy and weltanschauung]. *International Zeitschrift fur Individualpsychologie*, *3*, 250–252.
27. Frankl, V. E. (1955). *The doctor and the soul*: *An introduction to logotherapy*. New York: Knopf; Frankl, V. E. (1959). *From death-camp to existentialism*: *A psychiatrist's path to a new therapy*. Boston: Beacon Press; Frankl, V. E. (1963). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy* (I. Lasch, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
28. I have used Frankl, V. E. (1992). *Man's search for meaning*: *An introduction to logotherapy* (4th ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
29. Frankl, 1992, p. 75.
30. Frankl, 1992, p. 49.
31. Frankl, 1992, p. 115.
32. Ansbacher, H. L. (1990, Fall). Alfred Adler's influence on the three leading cofounders of humanistic psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, *30*(4), 45–53.