

Fundamentals of Adlerian Psychology

A Presentation by Dr. Bernard H. Shulman
to the 17th Annual Conference
of the Japanese Society of Adlerian Psychology,
Tokyo, October 2000

Transcription by
Ichiro Kishimi, Diane Rimmer,
Tomoko Sakai, Miyoko Yamauchi

要旨

キーワード :

I think it's time for me to speak. I'm at a disadvantage because I don't know what has been said up until now. However, I want to tell you I am happy to be here, I am honored to be here, I am so pleased to be here and to see all of you here. Your country is delightful. Your city is awe-inspiring. Your city is so complicated that only the most intelligent can survive in it. All of the people are so courteous that I think that they have all studied with Dr. Noda.

Dr. Noda has asked me to talk about Individual Psychology. I asked him at what level should I talk, who will be in the audience. And he told me that you were all very sophisticated and that I should talk at a high level, leaving time for questions. I will talk to you about Individual Psychology in a general way because it is a large subject and such a large subject would take days and days to cover completely.

Individual Psychology is almost one hundred years old. Any theory that could last for one hundred years must have been something good to begin with. There have been changes in the theory, which are actually developments in the theory. For example, if we were to start developing the theory today, we would not use the same language. The name Individual Psychology is a very bad name for this psychology. This is a psychology for the human individual in human society, and this psychology says that you cannot separate the individual and the individual's behavior from its social setting. Therefore, in some sense, it is a social psychology. The individual is seen as being a member of a group.

Individual Psychology is largely a psychology of normal people. Psychopathology is seen as a mistake. Let me make it clear, I am not talking about all forms of mental illness, because some forms of mental illness are caused by disturbances within the body. I'm talking about disturbances of the "psyche." The word "psyche" in Greek originally meant soul. I do not know if there is a concept for soul in the Japanese language. In America, where religion is not what it used to be, the word soul is used mainly in a religious sense, not in a psychological sense. So that the word

"psyche" really refers to, or it means, disturbances in the mental functioning — in the functioning of the mind. When I use the term psychopathology, I mean disturbances in the functioning of the mind that are not caused by recognizable illnesses of the soma or the body.

As the theory has developed there have been arguments about what the fundamental aspects of the theory are. Adler began the theory many years ago by talking about "organ inferiority," namely, that if there was a defect in some part of the body, the whole body would try to compensate for the defect. Later, Adler expanded the idea to the concept that any feeling of inferiority would set into motion some form of compensation. If we were developing the theory today, I would not use the term "feeling of inferiority." I would use the concept of a "self." Self is actually a difficult construct to explain, although when I speak about a "self" everyone seems to know what I mean. Each person is able to experience himself or herself. In English it is very easy for us to use words like myself, yourself, himself, and what we are doing in using the word that way is speaking about an "identity." The concept of an identity is a kind of common experience, so that, nobody has really tried to identify it in a scientific way until recently when trying to study the self or do tests on the self we've had to ask ourselves — our selves: What is the self? What do we measure when we measure a self?

I would like to describe how an Adlerian thinks about the self by comparing it to the psychoanalytic point of view. In psychoanalysis, there is a concept called "primary narcissism." Primary narcissism refers to the fact that the newborn infant seeks to satisfy some of its own "needs" or "drives" — I am using the language of psychoanalysis when I speak that way. In psychoanalysis, the satisfaction of the needs of the infant is often in conflict with the demands of the social group. This led Freud to develop a theory of repression and led him to write a book called *Civilization and its Discontents*. Adlerian theory leads us to a different conclusion. Adler struggled with this because at that time there was not yet really language available to describe what he was trying to formulate. There is a very important sentence in the book *What Life Should Mean to You*. It is the first sentence in chapter six. It says: From the moment of birth the infant is trying to establish a relationship to the mother. In *Individual Psychology* there is no primary narcissism. The infant is immediately trying to form an attachment.

The human being is a social animal. Human beings live in groups. The infant is unable to care for itself and requires a long time to develop into an adult. Only insects spend more time in the larval stages than in the adult stages. In mammals, the time spent being a child is short; the adult's life is longer. A human being spends 20% to 25% of its life before it becomes an adult. Therefore, the period of rearing the young is the longest among the animals. I think only the elephant takes as long to come to sexual maturity as does the human. Since the infant needs the parent for such a long period of time, bonding is necessary for the survival of the species. It is this concept that lies at the basis of the theory of *Individual Psychology* and it is, of course, why the name *Individual Psychology* is a mistake.

The human being is basically social, fundamentally cooperative, learns to get along with the parent. The attachment is sought by the infant. Notice the important difference between this principle and Freud's "pleasure principle." The human being, of course, is able to experience pleasure and pain, has a built-in program — I find computer language sometimes useful — is hardwired, has certain instinctual programs which we can observe. The human infant will, of course, try to avoid noxious or painful situations. But the main thing that the human infant can do is to commu-

nicate by crying. There's an absolute need for the parent. If we think about the survival of the species, the human species has been successful in surviving on this planet — so far. Perhaps we will destroy ourselves, but we have not yet. From the point of view of Individual Psychology, mental health is the ability to fully participate in the human group. As the infant grows, the most important thing that the parents can do is to nurture the child and prepare the child for adult life. Because of the human brain and the length of time involved before adult life is reached, learning becomes very important. This long period of learning also gives us the opportunity to learn the wrong things. Therefore, from the viewpoint of Individual Psychology, parents and teachers have very important jobs in raising the young, in preserving the species, in preparing the next generation.

Children have the job of preparing themselves. They have to learn. Children learn the best when they are attracted to the learning. Human beings are attracted by information. The most attractive information for human beings is information about people. That is why people read gossip columns. That is why we want to know things about people and we talk to each other about people. People are the most interesting things to us.

I just want to go down a side road for a moment here to talk about motivation, again using psychoanalysis for a comparison point. Motivation in psychoanalysis comes from the energy in the drives: the libidinal drives and the aggressive drives. Motivation in Individual Psychology comes not from a push, but from a pull; it comes from "preferences." If one thinks in terms of preferences, then we can postulate what one pays the most attention to. Those of you that have studied infant behavior know that the infant will look longer at its mother's face than at anything else. Human beings are the only animals that will sit in front of a television set for hours and look at the faces of other people. Your dog will go elsewhere and your cat will go to sleep. This, I think, shows the great preference for information that human beings have. All of you sitting in this room are here because you like information. So that one of the strongest motives for behavior for Adlerians is the "information gathering" motive; we want to know. Over two thousand years ago there was a Greek philosopher named Aristotle. One of his books begins with the sentence, "All men by nature desire to know."

As the child grows, the child meets challenges. The term that Adler used at that time was "tasks." The child has tasks, jobs; the child has to learn to take care of itself. When the child is young the parents have to provide the care-taking, the nurturing, and the security, the safety for the child. But the child has to learn also to take care of itself. The next thing the child has to learn is how to do things. Infants begin experimenting at an early age. If you have a child that is a thumb-sucker, you may have noticed that at a very early age the infant struggles to put the thumb into the mouth and eventually learns to do it. If you watch the infant who begins crawling and begins walking, you can see that the infant is learning a skill. Learning a skill, learning a new skill, is something that is very satisfying to human beings.

Adler gave various names to these things. He sometimes spoke about the "striving for superiority." That was a bad word, but he had already used the word inferiority so he used the word superiority — it's in the English translation. The German uses different language. They don't use the word inferiority; they use a word which means "being of lesser value." So that not being able to do something as well as someone else does not result in an inferiority feeling. What results in an inferiority feeling is the feeling that one is not worth as much as the other person, that one is

not equal to the other person. This raises a related issue, which is the issue of — when do people feel that they are of equal worth ? — which we will come to in a minute, because this is one of the keys to mental health in Individual Psychology.

What we talked about earlier was that one of the things that the infant starts to do upon birth is to form a bond, to attach. The attachment, first to the mother, can then spread to other people in the environment as there develops a relationship between the child and other human beings. It is, for Adlerians, most important for this first bond with the mother to occur. It has to be formed early because there is a time element in development that is important; certain things must happen at the right time in development or a development does not take place right.

Those of you who are parents will recognize that there comes a time in the infant's life when it is about ten months old, when it begins to show what is called "separation anxiety." The infant not only prefers the mother's face, but vigorously resists separation from the mother. At this stage, the infant is participating more in the human community. It is now making decisions. This early ability of the human being to make decisions signals the later development of executive capacities. We want our adults to be able to make decisions; we want our children to learn to make the right decisions. We start worrying when they start to make decisions before they're really ready to make them. That's why adolescence is a more stormy period in our western society than childhood is. Because at the time of adolescence a new stage of development has been reached and the adolescent now has a new task, which is the separation from the parents and the ability to move into full adult life gradually, we hope — not too impulsively, we hope.

The task that the child is dealing with, at this particular time, has to do with the child's confidence. The child's ability to learn to walk, to learn to talk, to learn to handle its own emotional feelings, to learn how to deal with new situations, to learn how to relate to people, to learn how to recognize safe situations and unsafe situations — are all part of the preparation for adult life. This is gradual, more and more as time goes on. It becomes less the job of the parent and more of the job of the child to take over. So you can see again how information becomes important.

Information, as we usually talk about it today, is something that we get from outside sources. But the most important information that we get is the information that comes from the connection between ourselves and outside sources; our own experiences provide important information for us. Therefore it is important for the child to have a variety of experiences.

From the point of view of Individual Psychology then, the basic motives of human behavior have to do with the human's membership in the social group. What moves us most of the time are the social motives. Our behavior takes place in the social field. Now, what does all this mean? From the point of view of human psychology, in order to successfully be a mentally healthy human being, a human being must be a participant in human society; do what children do when they are children, do what adults do when they are adults. One of the ways that individual psychologists have of talking about this — and probably Rudolf Dreikurs was most important in using this concept — that what gives the human being the feeling of belonging, is the understanding that one is making a contribution. Dreikurs used to say that if you were somebody who needs to get, to win, then you must repeat it every day; if you are someone who has made a contribution, it is permanent, you don't have to do it again, you've done it. If you are making a contribution, if you feel and believe that you are making a contribution, it is very difficult to feel that you are of lesser worth. To use different language, the best compensation for a feeling of in-

feriority is to make a contribution.

This brings me to another term in Individual Psychology that is unfortunate. The term in English is "social interest." Use this as a technical term. It has nothing to do with either "social" or with "interest." The German term is *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* which, German being the kind of language it is, tends to combine several words into one big word. But what *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* means is a "sense of being a part of the group," or a better English translation would be a "sense of togetherness." To use the language of metaphors, which of course provides pictures and is usually much better than ordinary words, it is the sense that "we are all in the same boat." There must be a Japanese equivalent? The feeling of "we're all together in the same boat" is a feeling that brings people together rather than separates them. It permits us to see things through the eyes of the other. It reduces the feeling of strangeness, of alienation. Here, I am using English and I don't know what the proper words would be in Japanese. It is a feeling of understanding and of being understood. And you can see a feeling like that makes it possible for people to cooperate with each other. It makes it possible for us to think in terms of the welfare of everyone. This is what is called "social interest." The very label itself is going to be greatly misunderstood because the language is wrong.

Attempts have been made to measure social interest and there have been disagreements among the testers as to which tests are valid and which ones are not. One of the tests measured the need for approval from others. Another test measured the need to please others. Neither test measured social interest specifically, because social interest is the concern with the welfare of others, not necessarily pleasing others.

Now, as the human being develops, what one can see, examining different people at different ages, is that social interest develops later than some of the other motives. In Maslow's study on basic needs, it isn't until later on in life that the person's needs become much more toward integration and the philosophical approach to life. The same is true in Erik Erikson's discussion of the stages of development. And in the studies by Piaget on children, a sense of morality really does not begin to develop until adolescence. So that at different ages, human beings have different "preferences." I prefer the word "preferences" to the word "needs." I can measure a preference by measuring how much attention is paid to it.

What I have been doing so far is going step by step, building a theory. I've tried to explain who human beings are and where they're going. I think this would fit in with what Dr. Noda calls the non-theistic approach. This is part of the theory. We can speak about the developmental stages; we can speak about motivation itself. We can speak about specific types of behavior and how to understand them. We can speak about pathological or aberrant behaviors. We can speak about methods of intervention to health or to change behaviors. We can speak about individual issues and group issues. We can also speak about other aspects of life that we haven't covered this time. We have not talked about sleep, dreams, the emotions themselves, anxiety, or love. We have not talked about all of the different things that can happen in the relationships between people. As for Adlerian Psychology, people are people, they are not objects — — unlike object relations theory or Kohut's self-object. People are people, never objects.

Question posed to Dr. Bernard H. Shulman

—What/who are human beings, where did we come from, where are we going
— what does this have to do with social interest?

I'd like to think that human beings are a species of animal. I hope I don't offend anyone by describing human beings as a species of animal. In the past I have been criticized for comparing human beings to animals by people who told me that human beings have souls and animals don't have souls. I'm not an expert in that field. If I compare human beings to other species of mammals, I see the human species as one that is motivated as I have described before. We are as loyal to our groups as the gorillas are to their own groups, or as a wolf is to its own pack. We are omnivorous. Therefore, we have a greater range — we can live in more places in the world than most other animals. We move across the world more easily. We are the most dangerous to other species. We have the most control over the environment. We started out in small groups and we formed tribes. And in early history, the tribes fought each other. Eventually the tribes stopped fighting with each other; instead they began to trade with each other and to intermarry with each other. And eventually they began to learn from each other.

Over the centuries of our existence, we have gradually moved towards something that nowadays is called "globalization." For people who are not accustomed to this, it is difficult because it often seems like a threat to the tribe. With the increased ability to move, families have become less coherent. People do not stay together as they used to. It is possible that we, as a species, will not be able to tolerate globalization.

Tests on the cognitive ability of people show that the human brain can only deal with a certain amount of complexity. The tests however don't tell the whole story. Ordinarily, if you say to someone, "I'm going to name five objects for you and I want you to repeat them," the person will be able to repeat the five objects. One of the signs that a person is having difficulty with memory is that the person cannot repeat the five objects. The usual maximum for human beings is seven objects and yet, people can train themselves to remember fifty objects. So that, it is fairly obvious that most of the time we are not using all of the brainpower that we have, or we have not learned how to do it yet.

One statement that I made earlier was that children needed to have a variety of experiences. Children learn best when they are feeling secure and supported. If you tell a child, "Yes, you can do that," the child is more likely to be able to do that. So I suspect that it is possible for human beings to deal with globalization, and a diversity of people, customs and cultures — but it will take time and it will take training. And people who do not have the training will feel threatened by this change.

In the language of George Kelly's theory of "personal constructs," the threat will be that they will have to change the way they look at the world. If the way you look at the world now is untrue and you don't have another way of looking at the world handy to use, then all of a sudden, you don't know what's going on in the world. That's another way of saying that we are threatened when we do not have the information we need. So I believe that there will be difficulties but that we will eventually become one world. But we will still want to preserve certain smaller entities for our loyalties. The feeling of belonging and making a contribution to the whole world

— not many people can feel that. So we need always the places to which the person can feel belonging and can feel loyalty — perhaps, the college that we attended, the city in which we live, the baseball team — these are all places where we can still feel loyalty and feel belonging. To our families, to groups; human beings will always need a defined group. I can't feel belonging to the whole world because I don't know the whole world. But my experiences changed me. This is my first visit to Japan. Japan is no longer strange to me. When I spoke to people in Chicago who had been to Japan, all of the people said to me, "You will like it." They were right! I now have a different sense about Japan than I had before because I have had an experience.

So there is always the possibility for a greater and greater feeling of belonging, and we can belong to more than one group. I think that human beings will always look for small groups to belong to. I think that is good because human beings need to belong. But the ideal, the goal, where we are going, is expansive. The species is spreading over the planet. Some of us feel that the planet would be a lot better off if we left. Some people feel that there are too many human beings on the planet already. But this is where the human species seems to be going and whether we will learn to reduce the number of our species is something that I don't know — I don't think we will. At any rate, I believe that this is who we are as a species. I think that as each individual develops, grows older, the older individual can think in terms of the future of the species.

When you have children, when you have grandchildren, you can think further into the future and ask yourself what it will be like. I think that is a developmental stage in life.

The question was: What does this have to do with social interest? Social interest is considered by the Adlerians to be an inborn potential, just as speech is an inborn potential. Speech develops in the infant because the mother talks to the baby. The mother looks in the baby's face and makes "mother noises" and the baby looks back and smiles, and makes "baby noises." The two of them both enjoy it very much. The child, the infant, learns to speak; the potential is inborn. I think the potential to be interested in the welfare of the human species is inborn. I think it's hard to think about the welfare of the human species if you have to think about your own survival; if you are surrounded by enemies, especially human enemies; if you are miserable or your life is miserable. I think it is easier to speak about the welfare of the human species when you feel good about yourself and other people.

In my professional capacity in Chicago, I have had the ability to meet a large number of wealthy people. Some of them were born into wealth, others were very successful business people. I noticed a very important difference between the people who were born into wealth and the people who had made the wealth themselves. The people who were born into wealth did not give as much to charity as did the people who had made the money. The people who had been personally successful enjoyed contributing. They were much more generous than were the people that were born into wealth, they were also nicer people. They were people that had been successful. I also met people who had been financially successful, but socially not. Other people were not pleased with them. Even when they gave to charity, other people still would not accept them. And the difference seemed to be that these less-acceptable people were giving to charity in order to win acceptance, not in order to contribute. I took all this to mean that being able to make a contribution that made a difference to the lives of other people was a very satisfying thing to do. I think that the ideal future of the human species would be one in which every human being has the opportunity to make a contribution and would be recognized for the contribution that one has made. And

I know you didn't think my answer would be that long !

—Why was the German term "Gemeinschaftsgefühl" given the translation "social interest?"

I asked the same question myself. At one time, in the English language, the word "community feeling" was used. I don't know if this is true or not, but I was told that in America "community feeling" sounded too much like communist. There was a strong anti-communist sentiment in America, and most of the Individual Psychologists in the 1930s were immigrants that had come from Europe and they were afraid of being considered communists. There was a reason for this. Adler was a member of the Social Democrat Party in Vienna. Adler's wife was a communist. Adler's oldest daughter and her husband had gone to Russia. And at that time, in the United States, it was dangerous — not dangerous, but inconvenient — for anyone to have any kind of communist connection, especially if one were an immigrant and wanted to get a job. This is what I was told — maybe it's true. It's still a bad label. It doesn't tell us what Gemeinschaftsgefühl really is.

—Could you explain a little more about what you mean by "people are people, not objects."

I made the statement that "people are people, not objects." What I was referring to was the language that the object relations theory uses and that Kohut uses in talking about people. The object relations people use the word "object" to describe other people. They have certain reasons for doing that. For example, when a baby has a blanket that it loves, the blanket is spoken of as a "transitional object." It's not a parent, it's something else that is used for soothing. Adlerians don't use the term "transitional object" because they don't think that the blanket replaces the mother at all — they think that the blanket is just something that the baby likes the sensation of. I don't think the blanket has any more meaning than the way a dog likes to sleep in a certain place. I don't feel that you have to think in the terms of a "transitional object." Now, if the "transitional object" happens to be a doll, then there perhaps seems more reason for thinking of a doll or stuffed animal as something that you can imagine is a living thing and the child can talk to it. The child knows it is not a living thing. The child is playing with it. The child knows the difference between what is real and what is unreal. So again, I see no reason to talk about this in terms of object theory.

These objects, dolls and other items, can be thought of as self-soothing items. Human beings are not the only animal that has habits. They like to have things in a certain way. They like to repeat the same sort of things over and over again. Your child will like to hear the same story over and over and over again and will correct you if you tell it wrong. This creates predictability. It is a source of information for the child. So, whether the child has a stuffed animal, or whether the child is a thumb-sucker, or the child needs to have a certain type of blanket or pillow, or peels the wall paper from the wall, or pulls the threads out of the curtain of the window, or

whatever it is — this is repetitive behavior which feels good. It does not have to have any other significance. It is what animals do as well. If you ever watch an animal building its own nest, you can see it does the same thing over and over again. This is, for me, a built-in form of human behavior.

A wife who is a housekeeper, who takes care of the home, will polish the same thing over and over again even when it doesn't need polishing. A person who collects coins will count the same coins over and over again. It can become a ritual form of behavior. When carried to an extreme, we call it compulsive behavior. We call some of these things compulsions if the person becomes anxious when these cannot be done. There is a part of the brain where this type of activity is taken care of. If it becomes too disturbing, then there are medications available to calm down this part of the brain. My son, who knows more about psychopharmacology than I do, will be willing to explain that to you further.

I would like to add one thing. This type of activity, which seems to be very private and it is not something that we really talk about — children don't say to each other "I suck my thumb at night, what do you do at night?" — this type of self-soothing activity is the most enjoyable when it is done in a group. People enjoy singing in a group much more than they enjoy singing alone. People like eating in groups more than they like eating alone. All of this underlines my statement about what type of animal the human is.

One more use of the word object is found in the Kohut "self psychology," where he uses the term "self-object." A self-object seems to be another person who can be used to provide something for the self; such as someone who will admire me, someone who will serve me, someone who will nurture me. Such relationships are relationships in which the person who provides the service is a self-object rather than another person. Now, self-objects are nice to have, everybody should have a dozen or so self-objects, but then you're obliged to be a self-object yourself for other people. For example, a successful marriage is likely to be a marriage in which each person is able to do something important for the other person.

Clinical Features of Individual Psychology

I've been asked to speak on some of the clinical features of Individual Psychology. I would like to start out by talking about understanding behavior. I myself am a psychiatrist, a physician and thus, I also have to make an appropriate diagnosis. In my work, I have to know the right terms, I have to fill out the right papers, I have the usual responsibility to the patient. But, that's not quite the same thing as understanding the patient's behavior.

In psychiatry, there have almost always been two ways of looking at behavior. One way is to look at the sickness or wellness of the patient; the ability of the patient to function in everyday life, to hold a job, to live with other members of the family; what treatment to give; what complaints the patient has; — the prognosis of the patient.

The second way of looking at the patient we have called understanding the "psychodynamics." The word psyche we have already talked about today. The word "dynamic" from the Greek, means force or strength. So literally, psychodynamics means looking at the psychological forces in the individual. Being an Individual Psychologist, I don't look for drives. I look at "movement." The word movement can easily be misunderstood. In Individual Psychology, movement has to do

with where the patient is going, or what is the patient's intention, or what is the goal of the patient's behavior. The psychoanalytic reaction to this was to say that the goal of behavior is always to satisfy the instinct. Certainly it is appropriate to say that the goal of eating is not to be hungry anymore. It's also appropriate to say that the goal of eating is to enjoy food, and the goal of eating is that you're not going to have a chance to eat anything until you get home late tonight. So, thinking about goals can become unclear. In order to be more specific, I will either use the word "intention" or I will specify as to whether something is a short-range goal or a long-range goal.

A short-range goal can be seen very easily in the behavior of a child. A mother who knows her child can quickly understand what the child is trying to accomplish. Of course, sometimes the mother doesn't understand, but those mothers who have had courses in Individual Psychology have learned to recognize when the child's goal is to get attention from the mother, or when the child's goal is to win a power contest with the mother. And the mother begins to be able to see the child's intention in behaving in certain ways. As a physician, I can also see short-range goals in people. Usually when a patient comes to a physician, the short-range goal is to get help, to relieve pain, to reduce a fever; or for the psychiatrist, to reduce anxiety or relieve a depression. Those are certainly legitimate goals.

However, there are other things that the psychiatrist can understand: psychodynamics. Sometimes the patient comes to the emergency room because she needs to get away from her family. Sometimes an old woman is depressed because her son has not called her this week. Sometimes an adolescent has threatened suicide because he's angry at his father. So that the psychiatrist also wants to understand the "intention" of the patient and wants to know what kind of help really is it that the patient wants. Does the patient want me to take away the depression, or does the patient want me to be sympathetic about the depression? Does the patient want me to be an ally against the husband? Does the patient want me to write a letter so that he does not have to go to work? Understanding the intention of the behavior is one of the things that I have to do. One thing is important to remember: the patient does not always know what the intention is. Sometimes you can say to the patient, "Did you do such and such a thing because you were angry at your mother?" and the patient may say, "Yes, that is why I did it." The patient will recognize that this was the reason for doing it.

There are other behaviors which are learned behaviors and you can use the concept of learned behavior or conditioning and understanding that — — and I have to tell you that some other Adlerians were very unhappy with me when I used the concept of conditioning. But Adler himself talks about "self-training" and training is just a kind of conditioning. An easy example of conditioning to understand is the following. Imagine that you are watching television. You are not hungry and you're not thinking about food. Suddenly there is an advertisement on television which shows some food and suddenly your mouth waters. This is an example of learned behavior. Your mouth is watering when you see the food on television. There's no food there, only the image of food. If you can have an actual physiological change in your own body because of the picture you saw on television, you can imagine what other pictures may do to you.

Let us take this and apply it to a symptom such as anxiety. The person develops an anxiety disorder as follows. I will give you an actual true example. I had a patient who was a victim in a holdup, a robbery. The holdup was at a Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant. Do you have Ken-

tucky Fried Chicken in Japan? The person doing the holdup was an employee and the girl in the restaurant who worked there recognized him. So he decided that he had to kill her and he shot her in the head. However, fortunately the bullet glanced off of her skull. She had a concussion and she was unconscious. She woke up in the hospital with a terrible headache, but she remembered everything that happened. And the person who did the holdup was looked for by the police. She was actually sent to me because she had a headache and I work with headache doctors when the patients don't respond to the usual treatment. She tried to go back to work after one week. She wanted to go back to work. She went to work and felt very uncomfortable in the restaurant. Her headache became worse and she went home. She expressed the fear that she would not be able to return to work because of the headache. Then she discovered that if she drove her car by the restaurant, it made her heart beat faster. And she felt uncomfortable and her headache would get worse. So she began avoiding the street that the restaurant was on. One day, she drove past another Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant in another neighborhood and she had the same sensation. Now she was really upset because now she felt she was becoming a prisoner in her own house. It was at that point that she was sent to me.

Every student who has had a course in abnormal psychology will understand what happened. This is an example of trauma. The patient's reaction to the trauma is the experience of fear, which is probably the way she felt when the holdup occurred. That is, the stimuli of being near a Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant or going back to the restaurant, evoked the feelings that one sees in what we call a "post-traumatic stress disorder." The way the brain works is that if you have the anxiety, you look for ways to avoid the anxiety. That is, the reaction to anxiety is avoidance. Avoidance behavior leads to further anxiety. The anxiety, thus, generalizes. It spreads from the specific to the general. This is the way the brain works. Step by step, the anxiety spreads to more and more things.

The role that the mind plays in this is that the mind becomes alerted for the possibility of anxiety, and looks for more things to avoid. The mind sets up an early warning system. So that, in order to protect oneself, one has more anxiety. This of course is ineffective behavior. The avoidance is carried too far and it is a wonderful example of how a post-traumatic stress disorder works. The best time to catch it is at the beginning, before it spreads. I don't know if this saying is used in Japan, but in America the saying is that if one falls off a horse, one has to get back on the horse right away or one will become too frightened to ride a horse.

Knowing that this is the way the brain works, the Adlerian would then say: What is the goal of this symptom, of this anxiety? It is the avoidance of the fear of danger. What is the approach to it? Well, one can show that the danger is not present. Better yet, one can go with the person through all the dangers — you can take the patient to all of the Kentucky Fried Chicken stores. You can train the person to relax and have the person do breathing exercises before going into the restaurant. Or you can use cognitive therapy and have the patient keep a diary of all of the times that she has become frightened and what she did about it. All of these are different ways of interfering with learned behavior.

This is an example of where the goal of the symptom does not fit in with the long-range goal of a person — nobody wants to have anxiety going past a Kentucky Fried Chicken restaurant. But imagine to yourself that this is a person who already has a tendency to look for ways of avoiding what is difficult. Put this person in a difficult situation and the person will look for

ways to avoid. How do you avoid dangerous situations ? You stay home. But what if your conscience says, one should go to work, or go to school ? Well, you would really like to go to work, but you have developed something called "agoraphobia." The most common symptom of agoraphobia that I have seen recently in America is the woman who cannot go to the supermarket alone to shop. If someone will go with her she can go. She can order things over the telephone or over the Internet, but she cannot go out of the house alone. She has successfully turned herself into an invalid. Being an invalid is a respectable role in society. This would be considered by the Adlerian as a retreat from a life task. And the treatment would involve helping this person not only to go to the store to shop, but helping this person to feel good about herself so that she really wants to do these things; she no longer has a preference for avoidance, but has a preference for approach.

I've given some examples of short-range goals or the immediate goals of behavior both in children and their relationship to parents, and in patients — as we see them. We also see the immediate goals of behavior and we recognize it many times. We can tell when a boy is fond of a girl and is trying to impress her, or when an employee tries to make a good impression on a boss. We all recognize these social behaviors very easily. They are sometimes harder to recognize when we are less experienced or when situations are new for us. But when we go through the usual developmental stages, we learn how people at our own age, our contemporaries behave — we can tell usually when they're up to something. Generally speaking, it's our own experience that helps us to recognize when other people are being truthful and sincere. It's my opinion that a woman can recognize when another woman is lying much more quickly than a man can recognize it. And the same is true for men. Men can tell when another man is lying much more easily than women can tell and they're so surprised at what women are willing to believe. That reminds me of an old American song, which says, "How could you believe me when I told you that I loved you when you know I've been a liar all my life ?"

The people who develop the agoraphobia don't know why they are developing it, they are not aware of what they are up to. It is not because they would be ashamed if they knew. They are really, truly feeling anxious. They don't understand what's happening to them. They are not able to say, "Oh, my anxiety is generalizing, that is the cause of a post-traumatic stress disorder."

The long-range goals of behavior are the personality traits and tendencies or, for the benefit of the psychiatrists and clinical psychologists in the audience, the axis two issues. Adler talked about different types and Mosak liked to talk about different types according to differences in the "life style." Human beings are so unique, so different from each other, that although in many ways they can be alike, each person is always still a little bit different. Nevertheless, if we want to talk about tendencies and personality types, we have to talk about ways in which they seem to be similar most of the time even if it's not one hundred percent. And so we can, in general, say some people have a higher activity level than others, some people are more excitable than others, some people can't sit still, some people would rather rest all the time. In addition to these "dispositions," there are also differences in long-range goals. For example, one person is more interested in power than another, another person is more interested in popularity than another. My son and I had a patient who's admitted stated goal was to have more money than everybody else. He made a lot of money and made a lot of enemies making the money. And because he has so many enemies, he's paying off a lot of money, especially to his attorneys. One academician that I know, a professor,

wanted to be smarter than everybody else. He wanted to know more than everybody else. He picked a very small field of knowledge and became the world's expert in this field.

Most people have reasonable long-range goals. Most people want to get along with other people, be reasonably happy, to be well thought of, to be able to feel good about themselves. But people with these reasonable goals don't get into trouble anyway. So that the people that we are usually taking care of are people that have made a mistake somewhere along the way. This is a very important concept in Individual Psychology. So for the Adlerian, the concept of mistaken notions is an important concept in understanding what goes wrong. What kind of mistakes can people make?

They may be wrong about themselves. They may have a wrong idea about what other people want. They may misunderstand what is necessary in life.

Why do people make mistakes ? For the Individual Psychologists these mistakes are usually made early in life, before the child is old enough to make good judgments. It may be because the parents have failed to do something. For example, the child that feels rejected may not feel welcome in this world. The child that has been overprotected may not feel able to deal with challenges and difficulties. A child may be over-ambitious. That is, the child may want to do something that truly very few people can do; it is too hard or too impossible to do. So that the child ends up feeling it cannot deal with situations and becomes discouraged or pursues the wrong actions.

Now, what this means is that in the treatment of these people, the therapist's job is to understand what the mistake is, to help the person to understand what the mistake is. This can be very threatening because you may seem to be telling somebody, "You have been all wrong about life, all of your life you have been wrong." It is better to do this with great tact. It is even better if you don't do it openly, but speak in such a way that it becomes apparent. But then, you also have the job of re-educating the person, because you have to help the person not only see the mistake, but correct it, and to go about things in a new way.

How does one discover the mistakes ? The most common tool that I use is to look at the earliest childhood recollections. That's not the only way. Sometimes I am not clever enough to pick it out from the earliest recollections. I'm sure that if you've been studying with Dr. Noda that you all have some experience at looking at the early childhood recollections and trying to understand what they're saying about the person. The earliest childhood recollections usually give me three things that allow me to formulate something that we call the "life style."

I understand that this term caused some trouble because the use of the word "life" in this sense was confusing. The German word is "style of living." The earlier Adler used an even better word, which in German said "life plan." Because it is really the life plan that we figure out; the "style" is only something that comes out of the life plan. Do any of you remember a school called transactional analysis? Eric Berne, who wrote about transactional analysis, used the term "script." Bern lived in California where a script is the plan for a movie, a film. Bern wrote about it as if each person created his or her own script and acted it out. It is in this sense, that I think I get from the early recollections most of the time, a self-image and a picture of the world. I cannot really separate the self-image from the picture of the world because I cannot take the self-image out of the world — it's always in the world. So it is a relationship between the self and in everything else in the world. The German existentialists used the term Dasein. The being-there, the being-in-the-world, and the response to it: How am I going to be in this world? That's what I

think I can draw from the early recollections.

Developing Social Interest in Children

I've been asked to discuss: What can parents, teachers and therapists do to develop children's social interest? Karen Horney prepared a list of children's needs, which she published in about 1937. The need for warmth and affection, for support, for guidance, for safety, and what she called "healthy friendship," the need to be able to deal with conflict as well as to have everything go smoothly, the need to be able to be tough when necessary. Another important thing which has also been studied by the people who study small children, is constancy. Inconsistent behavior leads to confusion and distrust. That leads to some rules, such as: do not tell the child you will do something and then not do it; do not depreciate the child. If the child makes a mistake — well, children make mistakes. One doesn't depreciate the child for making a mistake; one says, "When you are older, you will be able to do it better." One encourages. One admires the child and cherishes the child, and yet is still able to set the rules for correct behavior. One disapproves of misbehavior, but does not disapprove of the child. This behavior is called "attribution." One attributes to the child the behavior you want. One says, "I know you can do it. When you're willing to try you will be able to do it." The child says, "I can't do it, it's too hard." One says, "I trust you. You'll figure out a way to do it." Behavior like that is encouraging to the child. "You know, my mother believes I can do it. Maybe I can. Maybe she's right." Teachers do this all the time with children. Encourage the child.

There's a story about Alfred Adler. A teacher brought the child to Adler saying that the child had terrible penmanship. This was back in the days when it was important for a child to have good penmanship, to write clearly. The teacher brought the child to Adler with an example of something the child had written, and of course the child was ashamed. Adler took the writing and looked at it and said, "Now that, that is a very good 'L' right there."

One teaches best through encouragement, not by discouragement. Children want to do the thing that pleases. Small children love to be praised by the teacher. Adolescents are different because at that stage, the adolescents have already put the teacher into a different category; the teacher's opinion no longer counts. So, you help adolescents by helping them to achieve recognition from their peers, not from the teacher. In each case, understanding what the needs of the child are and behaving in ways that take care of these needs is important. In essence, being a good friend, a loving parent, a kind authority, consistent, trustworthy, something that is solid in the world, and presenting the world in an interesting way to the child. Last, and important, is giving the child an opportunity to make a contribution and feel worthwhile through making a contribution.

Question posed to Dr. Robert B. Shulman

— Robert, would you like to tell us a little about what Dr. Shulman was like as a father?

I've been looking through a viewfinder for the last three hours. So I was not prepared for this, however I am always prepared to speak of my father. I actually feel very privileged to have had Dad for my father because I realize what a contribution he has made himself. When I was a young child, I would go to Adlerian meetings and see how he was treated. It seemed to me he was always well thought of and respected, and he seemed to have this benevolent influence on others. Now when I was a small, small child I knew that, even though Dad was not "old," that when he set policy, it was set, it was important. I never felt that he was practicing at home when he talked. It seemed natural. Mom would yell and Dad would calmly state how things were to be. And as I grew up I could always argue with Mom, but with Dad it was "discussion." And when he set policy, I had to respect it.

In my own life I actually spent some time away from home. I left for college at eighteen and lived 2000 miles away — I believe much to the regret of my parents. I sort of knocked around without purpose for a number of years and felt unfulfilled. When I realized that I needed to do something more productive in life, I was finally able to say that it was OK to go home and become a doctor. Subsequent to that decision, everything has been much easier in life for me.

It really has been a tremendous honor to be able to work with my father. In my training I had exposure to the leaders of the psychoanalytic movement, the Kohutian movement in Chicago. Their language was foreign to me of course. But after seeing the psychoanalytic masters, I believe they couldn't hold a candle to Dad. Maybe again it was a question of language, but I felt that Dad was able to understand the human condition much better than anyone else I had ever seen in action. Now when we work together — we share the patients we have in the hospital, we both take turns seeing them on different days — Dad is universally beloved by them all and I am of course scorned as the younger, immature doctor — but that's OK.

Again, being able to see the contribution that Dad has made, and I have seen it in America. In my career now I teach other doctors, I give talks on certain subjects and invariably there will be someone who had been a student of Dad's at some point. They always come up afterwards and say nice things. Now I see what a student of Dad's, Dr. Noda, has done here, and the lines of contributions become treelike. When I was small, my Dad with Dr. Dreikurs and Dr. Mosak, were building the Adler School in Chicago. They have students all over the United States. And I see Dr. Noda doing that here for Japan. I can see how the lines of descent occur. I talk of Dad as being in direct lineage to Alfred Adler and Dr. Dreikurs. I think through this lineage, through Dr. Noda, Japan has benefited from this direct lineage right back to Alfred Adler.

Growing up, the Adlerian terminology was second nature to me. I see myself as the prototypic Adlerian middle child, with a strong sense of fairness. But when I decided what I needed to do in life, it had to do with being productive and making contribution. At the time I did not identify this as an Individual Psychology precept, but clearly Dad had taken those ideas and managed to instill them into my "psyche" — if you will — as a child. Overall, I like to think he did a good job.

Comment on Robert's Response by Dr. Shulman

I want to straighten some things out. I think Robert is very modest. I think it is my privilege

to work with him. I am very flattered that he wants to work with me. He could have worked with anybody he wanted to. He is already the best young psychiatrist in our office, in our area. Everybody comes to him for advice. He is good at politics too. And I am very, very proud of him.

更新履歴

2012年12月1日 アドレリアン掲載号より転載