



Of the many phrases Alfred Adler contributed to everyday language, none is more familiar than "inferiority complex," here delineated by cartoonist William Steig.

The Man Who Gave Us 'Inferiority Complex,' 'Compensation,' 'Overcompensation,' 'Aggressive Drive' And 'Style of Life'

By MAGGIE SCARF

"DO you think," Alfred Adler once demanded of Freud, "that it is such a great pleasure for me to stand in your shadow for the whole of my life?" If Adler were alive today, he might well reiterate the question: it is chiefly as one of the great early Freudians that he is remembered. And yet he always insisted that he was not a disciple; he had never been psychoanalyzed by Freud nor attended his lectures. Indeed, Adler became so radically opposed to the basic tenets of Freudian theory that the two men severed all connections in 1911 and remained bitter enemies for the rest of their lives.

Adler's school was the first major deviation from the psychoanalytical movement. The name he gave it—"Individual Psychology"—was meant to imply that man's mind is not, as Freud had suggested, locked in a struggle between conscious and unconscious forces, but that each individual represents a unified and self-consistent whole, striving toward a goal which floats before him. No man, Adler believed, could be understood without reference to his (usually unconscious) goal, much as a drama could be understood only in the light of its finale. The goal a person shaped for himself, and the characteristic ways he struggled to reach it were what Adler termed his "style of life."

This month marks the close of Alfred Adler's centennial year, and a flurry of articles and tributes has not only reawakened interest in him but evoked a certain astonished recognition. For Adler's fate has been paradoxical: while his personal fame has declined, his ideas are everywhere. His early book on organ inferiorities, with its insistence on the unity of body and mind, was a precursor of psychosomatic medicine; many of his concepts, such as the "inferiority complex," "compensation," "overcompensation" and the significance of the child's birth order in the family, are now crucial to the thinking of most psychotherapists. Individual Psychology, with its stress upon the creative power of the individual—who is seen as the "novelist" of his own character—anticipated today's self-realization personality theorists; the late Abraham Maslow remarked, "For me Alfred Adler becomes more correct year by year." Similarly, the movement of existential psychiatry toward viewing a person as the sum of his choices, or what Sartre calls his "projections" (projected goals), is much the same as seeing him in terms of his "style of life." And, as Freud predicted they might, Adler's ideas have had great impact upon psychoanalysis.

Adler believed that neurosis sprang

from the individual's attempts to adapt to the environment—which in human terms is always the social environment. Freud, who thought neurosis was caused by warring demands within the personality itself, denounced Adler's approach as oversimplified: "...it concerns surface phenomena, that is, ego psychology." The subsequent movement of psychoanalytic theory has, however, been toward an emphasis on the needs of the ego. Indeed, the very phrase "ego psychology," which Freud used so scathingly, has lost its unpleasant connotations and become the dominant trend in modern psychoanalysis.

Nevertheless, Adler himself has received curiously little credit. As Henri Ellenberger points out in his massive history of dynamic psychiatry, "The Discovery of the Unconscious": "It would not be easy to find another author from whom so much has been borrowed from all sides without acknowledgment as Alfred Adler. His teaching has become, to use a French idiom, an 'open quarry'... that is, a place where anyone may come and draw anything without compunction."

ADLER was born in the Viennese suburb of Penzing on Feb. 7, 1870. Like Freud, he was the son of a middle-class Jewish merchant; but, while Freud was raised in the ghetto-like section called Leopoldstadt and remained forever conscious of his membership in a minority group, Adler took his background lightly. There were few other Jewish children in the area where he grew up, and his accent and general outlook remained more Viennese than Jewish. Nowhere in his writings was he ever to refer to anti-Semitism; Freud did so frequently.

There were other differences between these two men of similar class and stock: Freud was the darling eldest son of an adoring young mother; Alfred was his mother's second son—and she was rather cold in personality, and seems to have preferred her eldest. Adler's childhood was unhappy, embittered by jealousy of his older brother, despite the fact that four younger children were born to the family. "One of my earliest recollections," he once reminisced, "is of sitting on a bench, bandaged up on account of rickets, with my healthy brother sitting opposite me. He could run, jump and move about quite effortlessly, while for me movement of any sort was a strain and an effort..."

Adler placed this early memory of disadvantage at somewhere around age 2. As he grew older, his health improved, but not his ease in the family: "I did not enjoy staying at home." Whenever at all possible, he ran to play on the large grassy lot next to his house, where the local children gathered every day. Here the young Alfred, short, stocky and not

MAGGIE SCARF often writes on psychiatric subjects for magazines. She is at work on a novel about a social scientist.

particularly good-looking, was a popular figure: lively, and always in good spirits, he gained among his companions the sense of equality and self-esteem which he had not found at home. The hours spent playing on this field were one day to flower into Adler's notions of human inter-relatedness, that vision of a shared community of feelings and values which he called *Gemeinschaftsgefühl*, social interest.

During the period of Adler's growth into manhood, Vienna was a rich, enlightened city, at the height of her Habsburg power. When, at 18, Alfred entered the University of Vienna, it was one of the great European medical centers—and around it surged the life of the theater, of music and of the yeasty Socialist opinion which earned the city her nickname, Red Vienna. During his student years, Adler took part in it all; at one of the Socialist meetings he regularly attended he met the girl he was to marry. In 1895 he graduated, and began practice as an ophthalmologist in a run-down section of the city. He then shifted to general medicine, then to neurology; and by the time he became associated with Freud, had already found his career in psychiatry.

IT was in the fall of 1902 that Freud sent Adler a postcard asking him to join a small group that was to meet Wednesdays "to discuss problems of neurosis." No one is now sure what prompted this invitation: the two men had never met. One legend has it that a nasty review of Freud's "The Interpretation of Dreams" appeared in Vienna's powerful daily *Neue Freie Presse*, and that Adler sent in a letter defending the book. But recent researches have turned up the fact that Freud's work (which sold barely 100 copies when it was published) was never even reviewed in that newspaper. Whatever event did lead him to seek out Adler remains mysterious.

At any rate, Freud's card initiated a nine-year working relationship which, though never intimate, was at first fruitful, then painful, and ultimately impossible. It was during Adler's time within the Freudian circle that his first major work appeared: a slim book about the effects of "organ inferiorities" — that is, congenitally weak or poorly functioning organs—on personality development.

There was, of course, nothing novel in the idea that the organism tries to repair its own weaknesses: clinicians had long been aware that where one kidney, for example, functioned poorly the other would become overdeveloped and attempt to do the work of two. But Adler's suggestion was that this process of compensation could also proceed in the psychological sphere; in that case

(Continued on Page 44)



ADLER ON FREUD—"Do you think it is such a great pleasure for me to stand in your shadow for the whole of my life?" he once asked the founder of psychoanalysis. After a nine-year working relationship, the two broke in 1911, the first major split in the movement.



FREUD ON ADLER—"His theory . . . pretends to explain with one stroke the behavior and character of men as well as their neurotic and psychotic maladies. As a matter of fact, Adler's theory is more adequate to any other field than to that of the neuroses."

(Continued from Page 11)

the individual experienced powerful mental urges toward repairing his weakness, and concentrated his entire attention on the weak organ. If, for instance, the person had weak eyesight, he would lavish intensive care upon the whole process of seeing. The result, claimed Adler, was that often by psychological means an overcompensation was brought about; the function of the organ became not just adequate but superior. Where the adaptive struggle was successful, it could lead to striking accomplishments: Beethoven, who suffered from congenital ear disease; numerous sculptors and painters with defective eyesight; Demosthenes, a childhood stammerer who became one of the greatest orators. On the other hand, where nature failed to produce a correction, pathological processes might be set in motion: "Inability, neurosis, psychological disease . . . may appear in this event." The discouraged individual might withdraw from the demands of life to seek the greater security of isolation.

Freud approved of the study of Organ Inferiority and its Psychological Compensation." It was a maverick work to be sure, but though independent of psychoanalytic theory in its approach, it could stand beside it quite comfortably. The following year, however, Adler advanced a theory which Freud found outrageous: he suggested that there was in man an innate instinctive aggressivity which spurred him onward. "Fighting, wrestling, beating, biting and cruelties show the aggression drive in its pure form," wrote Adler. "Its refinement and specialization lead to sports, competition, dueling, thirst for dominance, and religious, social, national and race struggles. . . . When the aggression drive turns [back] upon the subject, we find traits of humility, submission and devotion, flagellantism and masochism . . . the extreme is suicide."

Adler suggested that people with strong aggressive instincts were attracted to certain professions. These included — aside from the obvious examples of the revolutionary hero and the criminal — those of the judge, policeman, teacher, minister and physician. "Charity, sympa-

thy, altruism and sensitive interest in misery represent new satisfactions on which the drive, which originally tended toward cruelty, feeds. If this seems strange, it is nevertheless easy to recognize that a real understanding for suffering and pain can only come from an original interest in the world of torment."

Freud indignantly denied that there was such a thing as a special aggressive instinct which stood alongside "the familiar instincts of self-preservation and sex, and on an equal footing with them." Like all great innovators, he took a defiantly protective attitude toward his newborn system; the idea that behavior might be motivated by aggressive as well as libidinal forces threatened the very integrity of his model. Nevertheless some 14 years later, Freud reversed himself on this issue. He conceded that he was now "obliged to assert the existence of an aggressive instinct, but it is different from Adler's. I prefer to call it the 'destructive' or 'death instinct.'"

IN formulating the death instinct, Freud borrowed from biology the notion that there is in all living things a tendency to revert to the inorganic state — that is, to die. He suggested that there was in human nature a trend or drive toward return to the inanimate, the so-called "death wish." Thus, a person's aggressive, destructive strivings (which existed alongside his life-enhancing libidinal strivings) represented his instinctual desire to reach a state of nonfeeling, the absolute zero of death. Curiously enough, Adler, too, reversed his position: he later came to believe that man had no instinctual tendencies toward aggression at all. "I enriched psychoanalysis by the aggressive drive," he once remarked. "I gladly make them a present of it."

By 1910, Adler and Freud had been associated for some eight years. During that busy period the new discipline which Freud called "psychoanalysis," although still the joke of Vienna, began achieving some international recognition. His "small group" had grown from 5 members to 35; it was now the "Vienna Psycho-Analytical Society" and far too large to continue

meeting in the waiting room of his office. That year, Adler was president of the society, coeditor of the *Zentralblatt für Psychoanalyse* — and an increasingly noisy critic of Freudian psychoanalysis.

"I am having an atrocious time with Adler . . ." Freud complained in a letter written that fall. "I have been hoping that it would come to a clean separation, but it drags on and despite my opinion that nothing is to be done."

Adler had never subscribed to Freud's belief that it was sexual material, repressed into the unconscious during early childhood, that lay at the core of neurosis. According to Freud, sexual libido was the great dynamic force in psychic life: now Adler made the shocking move of suggesting an entirely different motive force, which he called the "masculine protest." This was — in a society which valued masculinity and devalued the feminine — the child's striving to become big, to take power, to dominate others; in short, "to be a real man." The masculine protest, which could be present in both men and women, was a strategy adopted in early childhood as a means of compensating for subjective feelings of weakness and disadvantage. The child who failed to adapt to his environment thus became the neurotic who sought to dominate it. Seen from this vantage, the neurotic symptom represented not an unresolvable sexual dilemma but a misguided attempt at compensating for feelings of inferiority.

Such views could not be tolerated within the Freudian orbit. In January of 1911, Adler was asked to present before the society a comprehensive report on his own evolving theories. A storm of protests followed. For Adler described sexuality as merely an expression of personality, not its fundamental motivator; while sexual maladjustment was often present in neurosis, he insisted that it was not its cause. The important biological fact, in Adler's terms, was not the child's instinctive sexual behavior but his smallness and helplessness in relation to the "giants" surrounding him. In his early adaptive attempts the child might settle upon faulty methods of gaining significance and self-esteem; he might see "success" in terms of wielding power over others. Adler pointed to the curious "social returns" of neurosis — the ability to screen oneself from the de-

mands of life, and to dominate others by exploiting one's own symptoms and weaknesses. The neurotic's tyranny over his close circle was a theme to which Adler returned continually: "I have taken 40 years to make my psychology simple," he often remarked later in his life. "I might have made it more simple by saying, 'All neurosis is vanity' — but this might not be understood."

ADLER'S January talks, his postulation of the masculine protest, following on the heels of the aggression drive, all led to his final explosive break with Freud early in 1911. That same year, Hans Vaihinger's celebrated book, "The Philosophy of 'As If,'" appeared; it had a profound effect upon Adler. The theme of Vaihinger's book was that man, in order to avoid drowning in a sea of facts, creates systems or ways of looking at things which he then assumes are "true." The fixing of the zero point would be an example; we determine the zero on a Fahrenheit scale and then behave "as if" it actually existed. We draw meridians and parallels on the face of the globe, and then proceed "as if" these lines had a counterpart in reality. While they do not, said Vaihinger, they are useful fictions — our lives, to say nothing of our sanity, often depend upon our behaving as if our fictions were true.

Adler found in Vaihinger's theories a conceptual framework for his own ideas. In his most important book, "The Neurotic Constitution," Adler suggested that all human behavior, thought and feeling proceeds along the lines of "as if." In other words, in earliest childhood each person — as part of his striving to adapt to the environment and overcome his weaknesses — creates for himself an idealized goal of perfect adaptation, and then struggles toward it as if this goal alone represented success, security and happiness. "The human mind," wrote Adler, "shows an urge to capture into fixed forms . . . that is, fictions, that which is chaotic, always in flux and incomprehensible. Serving this urge, the child quite generally uses a schema in order to act and find his way . . ." In developing the schema, the child projects before him his goal, his unique vision of that thing which would overcome all obstacles and bring him perfect security. With the ideal in front, a line of direction is established: from

then on, everything the individual chooses to see, and the ways he feels about those things, falls into place accordingly. Adler believed that the child's schema was fixed by the age of 4 or 5 (i.e., that his personality was more or less programmed); this was the prototype which became the individual's "style of life."

According to Adler, the key to a man's behavior is that hidden purpose toward which all his strivings are directed: "Causes, powers . . . and the like cannot serve as explanatory principles. The final goal alone can. Experiences, traumata, sexual development mechanisms cannot yield an explanation; but the perspective in which these are regarded, the individual way of seeing them . . . can do so." In explaining this, he re-

marked: "It has the same effect on me whether a poisonous snake is actually approaching my foot or whether I merely believe that it is a poisonous snake." Similarly, if a man believed that his mother had been a monster and blamed all his later failures on that fact, it mattered little whether she was objectively monstrous or not—the effect was the same, for in that individual's schema, she was.

Adler's central idea was that life is always essentially a movement toward better adaptation to the environment, and that in man—the first animal in nature with the ability to form goals and purposes—adaptation assumes a psychological aspect. That is, by struggling forward to achieve our imaginary goals,

we lift ourselves, as Adler said, "by our own bootstraps." He believed the great force motivating all human acts to be "a striving from a felt minus toward a felt plus situation, from a feeling of inferiority toward superiority, perfection, totality."

Neurosis was, in Adler's view, a species of maladaptation. The great issue in neurotic illness, he maintained, was not what had happened in the past to cause it, but where it was heading—what particular goal the patient was achieving with his symptoms. "The most important question of the healthy and diseased mental life is not 'Whence?' but 'Whither?'" he declared. "In this 'Whither?' the cause is contained."

THE Neurotic Constitution" was published in 1912. "With this book," wrote Adler to a friend, "I have founded the school of Individual Psychology." He submitted the book to the Vienna Medical School as a thesis, and applied for a position as lecturer.

He had to wait three years for a reply; and when it arrived, it came as an affront which rankled for the rest of his life. His candidature had been refused unanimously. (Recently, the report on Adler's work which was submitted to the medical faculty has come to light. Its author complains that, while Adler's ideas are often "ingenious," they are far too speculative, and are even occasionally as "grotesque as those of Freud.")

Meanwhile, World War I had broken out, and there were other worries. Adler's wife, Raissa, had gone with their four children to visit her family's home in Russia. When the assassination at Sarajevo took place, Adler telegraphed her to return immediately. "Shall wait," replied Raissa tartly—and then was caught there by the war for the better part of a year.

The Adler marriage does not seem to have been happy (the children all vastly preferred their ebullient, outgoing father to their sternly political mother). Raissa Adler was a radical and a feminist when she married, and Alfred's subsequent lack of interest in Socialist politics deeply disappointed her. Adler was, however, a sympathetic supporter of the feminist cause. Unlike Freud, who considered woman's inferior social role to stem from her innate physical and psychological inferiority, Adler felt that women were depreciated by

a male-oriented culture. He believed that only resentment and resistance could result from their being forced to subordinate themselves to their husbands — or to man in society — and predicted that women would one day rebel. Still, as one of Adler's biographers noted drily: "... fighting for the emancipation of women and living with an emancipated woman are two wholly different things."

At the close of World War I, Adler was 48 years old. He had served for several years as a physician and psychiatrist with the Austrian Army. The peace and the fragmentation of the Austro-Hungarian Empire brought a period of utmost suffering to Vienna. Food supplies were low, and there was virtually no fuel in the city. Nevertheless, in the midst of this general deprivation, the new Social Democratic Government asked Adler to organize a program of psychological counseling for problem children. It was in these unpromising circumstances that the famous Vienna child-guidance clinics were launched.

ADLER'S clinics were a pioneer effort in the direction of what is now called community psychiatry. All were attached to the public school system; any child who behaved in a disturbed way in the classroom could be brought to the nearest guidance center for help and treatment. Although they were successful from the very start and grew rapidly in number, the clinics came in for a certain amount of criticism — especially from the psychoanalysts.

The Freudians were particularly scornful of the public therapy sessions which Adler, as part of his program, held every fortnight. To these sessions he invited audiences of schoolteachers, for he wanted to "teach the teachers"—one of his favorite phrases—concepts of mental hygiene.

Each session began with the teacher of the particular "problem child" reading out his notes on the pupil. Adler then discussed these case notes with both teacher and audience, after which the child was invited to come in. This was always a moment of high drama: Adler had a way of predicting, merely from hearing the notes and without having set eyes on the child, what his physical habits and appearance would be — even down to the most startling details. Thus, the child's entrance enchanted the audience,

like the conclusion of a successful conjuring trick.

Adler warned the teachers to notice particularly the child's physical behavior as he entered: whether he went to lean against something or stood alone, if he held out his hand or shrank back, whether he met the therapist's eye or scowled and hung his head. For these were what Adler called "organ jargon," modes of communicating without the use of words.

Adler himself, a short, sturdy man with a black mustache and piercing eyes, always shook hands warmly with the patient and treated him as a contemporary and an equal. His first question usually aimed straight for the core of the problem: "Do you help your mother very much?" he might ask a child whose problems centered around his being spoiled, self-centered and anxiously demanding. The opening remark was generally followed by a long, absolutely silent pause, which Adler never interrupted; a friend once described him as a "past master in the art of the pause."

Adler's second daughter, Alexandra, now a well-known New York psychiatrist, recalls these clinic sessions well: "Children really loved my father and wanted to talk to him because he was absolutely nonaggressive. Once, when I was helping out at a demonstration, a child refused to speak or even look at him. To establish rapport, my father softly asked him, 'What do you think, how old am I?' The child turned to my father right away and answered."

Adler's method of therapy was essentially a gentle manipulation of both the patient and his environment. First, he would engage the child in a friendly, encouraging conversation. Its aim was to guide the child subtly toward understanding the real goal of his behavior and toward discovering how that goal determined his painful attitudes and thoughts. As the English novelist Phyllis Bottome, Adler's patient and biographer, has written: "... every child reacted differently to the treatment, [but] I never once saw a child either distressed or bored by it. The invariable effect . . . seemed to be relief and interest."

After his initial talk with the child, Adler generally asked the parents, and sometimes other family members, into the lecture hall to join the discussion; the patient's teacher and members of the audience would also partici-



PATERFAMILIAS — At home in a bygone Vienna, Adler dandles his daughter Alexandra, now a New York psychiatrist, under the stern overview of Frau Adler. Right, Valentina, who died in a Soviet prison camp.

pate. Together, the group consulted on ways both child and family might "try something a little different" to see what effect alternative approaches might have on everyone concerned. Adler's methods, pragmatic and eminently workable, won him the affection and respect of the city's schoolteachers; to this day, his reputation remains highest among professionals "on the firing line," such as teachers, counselors and social workers.

Viewed with hindsight, the Vienna clinics stand out as a remarkable early attempt to treat the individual within a group setting, and as a functioning part of his social milieu. The notions that not only the doctor but lay people could aid in the healing process, and that the patient must be seen in the context of his family group are, of course, both current in today's milieu therapy and in the entire therapeutic community approach.

ADLER was the only member of depth psychology's "first triumvirate" (Freud, Adler, Jung) to spend considerable time in the United States. He first visited here in 1926, and after that, sojourning for longer and longer periods of teaching, lecturing and practice; soon he was spending only his summers in Vienna. With the rise of Hit-

ler, he foresaw a coming catastrophe and believed that if his psychology were to survive anywhere it would be in America. There were now Individual Psychology groups all over the world, including Germany. (Adler, when invited to speak to the Berlin society and offered protection during his stay, asked the messenger to "tell them I laughed.") In 1934, the Fascist Government in Austria suppressed the child-guidance clinics. Shortly afterward, Adler managed to sell his family's home and left Vienna for good.

He had already accepted the chair of medical psychology at Long Island College of Medicine and was becoming a widely known popular lecturer. "Once," recalls his daughter Alexandra, "I arrived with him at a building where he was to give a talk, but the place was so crowded that they wouldn't admit us. My father tried to tell them he was the lecturer, but the ushers said others had already tried that silly trick on them. It took quite a bit of talking until we were finally allowed to go in."

Adler always spoke without written notes; he felt that in this way he reached his listeners more directly. He had a style that was at once informal, serious and personal, and he had the born lecturer's

knack for dealing easily with the unexpected. Once, at the meeting of a medical society in England, the chairman introduced him with some remarks that were so hostile that the audience sat staring in amazement. Adler, saying nothing, rose to his feet with a benevolent smile. Before starting his talk he walked over and patted the chairman gently on the shoulder. The entire group burst into applause.

Adler's teaching and thought were moving increasingly in a direction that had far-ranging appeal: they were becoming a curious blend of psychology, sociology and ethics. His ever-growing emphasis on *Gemeinschaftsgefühl*, social feeling, gave to Individual Psychology a quasi-religious air; his critics said sourly that Adler was no longer teaching but preaching. Fellow professionals looked askance at his habit of becoming friendly with his patients (something Freud carefully avoided) and then expecting them to become missionaries of his psychology. His carelessly organized writings were simply dismissed by many as mere "surface psychology"—a psychology, as one detractor remarked, for traveling salesmen.

Adler's new emphasis on social feeling was only half understood by many and often considered a mere mouth-

ing of platitudes about "adjustment." He had, in fact, become convinced that each individual must be seen as part of his larger social whole — that life is first and foremost social life. "No psychologist," he insisted, "is able to determine the meaning of any experience if he fails to consider it in its . . . relation to society."

IN Adler's view, true contact with others counteracted a person's tendency to form the kind of irrational fictitious goal which would lead to his isolation and estrangement. The neurotic, in his fruitless striving for self-esteem, mistakenly exploited those around him. The therapist's role, maintained Adler, was to perform what is rightly the function of the mother: to give the patient experience of a loving contact with another person, and then help him to transfer this awakened social feeling to others. The prime effort was to bring the patient's private goal into agreement with general human interests — for when a man operated on "private logic" he became ill and useless. "All failures in life — neurotics, psychotics, criminals, drunkards, problem children, suicides, perverts and prostitutes — are failures because they are lacking in social interest. They approach the problems of occupation, friendship and sex without the confidence that they can be solved by cooperation. The meaning they give to life is a private meaning . . . their interest stops short at their own person."

Adler's system of psychotherapy stressed — as Individual Psychological treatment continues to do — the importance of early recollections. Adler believed the memory was biased and that an individual retained only that which was central to his main problems and preoccupations. He also worked with the patient's dream material — but an Adlerian dream interpretation was far different from a Freudian one. For instance, in a dream of flying up and then suddenly falling a psychoanalyst would probably see sexual symbolism related to impotence; an Adlerian would view the same dream as related to a fear of failure in any one of a variety of daily activities, such as work, social relations or, indeed, sexuality. Adler saw no universal sexual symbolism in the dream: he thought each dream a unique creation which had to be interpreted in the light of the patient's line of

movement, and often as a signpost pointing the direction he unconsciously was preparing to take.

As Dr. Kurt Adler, Adler's son and a leader in the current Individual Psychological movement, explains: "Our methods of therapy revolve around, first, helping the patient to understand his mistaken life style and the real nature of his goal by slowly elaborating upon these topics and gently elevating them into conscious knowledge. Then, in helping him to use this insight in his everyday life; we do this by discussing with him his successes and failures. But the crucial part of the process is his learning to relate to the therapist, and subsequently becoming able to extend that feeling outwards, to increase his feeling of belonging, of his humanity . . . so that he's able to begin to cooperate."

"What I'm speaking of is essentially a process of socialization that the patient goes through during therapy. It's something he has failed to learn sufficiently during his development; he's held on so anxiously to his self-protective devices. What the patient must learn is to give, to share, and eventually — a point my father considered vital — he must come to see that his self-interest is really best served if his behavior benefits others as well as himself."

In 1937 Adler, whose per-

sonal appearances were in growing demand, embarked on a heavy speaking tour in Europe. Just as he was leaving he learned that the eldest of his four children, Valentina, who had fled the Nazis and gone to Russia with her husband, had been arrested by the Russian authorities.* He began making frantic attempts to get news of her and to send a message. In Holland, he suffered a minor heart attack. He continued on to England, and then to Scotland. On the fourth day of his tour he collapsed on a sidewalk and died on the way to the hospital.

Shortly after the funeral, which took place in Edinburgh, Freud received a letter from the German writer Arnold Zweig. Zweig mentioned how moved and saddened he had been by the news of Adler's sudden death. But the enmity of almost 30 years persisted, and Freud replied coldly: "I don't understand your sympathy for Adler. For a Jewish boy out of a Viennese suburb a death in Aberdeen is an unheard-of career in itself and a proof of how far he had got on. The world really rewarded him richly for his service in having contradicted psychoanalysis." ■

*Eventually, the family learned, through the intercession of their friend Albert Einstein, that Valentina had died in a Soviet concentration camp sometime during the war.