A few years ago, a Swiss psychologist proposed to supplement "depth" psychology by a much needed "hight" psychology. One can but smile . . .

In 1951, a London psychiatrist (2) used the term "syntho-analytic psychotherapy." It led him away from, and again far behind, the insights of Adler's Comparative Individual Psychology.

In the same, the term "teleo-psychological principles" was used by an American Adlerian in a context where it made clear that our stress was on "telos", as opposed to "causa." (4) But should we Individual Psychologists of the 1960's call ourselves "analysts"?

Accepting this label and not being chemists, we could only be considered by others as "psycho"-analysts.

To analyse an isolated being's psyche and to assume it to exist of three "systems, realms, regions, or provinces" (3) was the way of atomistic, pre-organismic, individual psychologists for whom instincts, for instance the libido, were the driving force in human behaviour. As individual Psychologists we have learned from Adler, not only to see the indivisible person's "telos," but also to trace out the guiding lines of all his overt and mental behaviour which aim at his personality (or self) ideal and form his unique style of life. Not explaining "causes," but interpreting our client's erroneous goal-striving and life style to him, we make him aware of initial errors in his self-concept which led him to become a sufferer. Unconspicuously being encouraged to adopt a more social goal which will transform his inadequate life-style, he will not only cease to suffer unnecessarily and to be unhappy and inefficient, but he will be enabled to contribute to the transformation of the present socially untenable conditions (which many well adjusted people contend themselves with interpreting more or less cleverly). In this sense the work of Dreikurs can help us all to transform the fiction of our democracy into a reality.

The application of Comparative Individual Psychology is, therefore, not merely "teleoanalysis" but "life style interpretation" with all this implies. And being thus one of the most efficient psychotherapies of our days, life style interpretation and correction has a strong appeal to serious contemporaries. (With all admiration for the work of William James I dislike the use of his expression "cash value" in a scientific context. Cash value for whom? Adler's Ideal was "usefulness for all")!
In not "analysing," in the manner of the natural sciences, the abstract "depth" of a "psyche," we do not at all remain at the "surface" as is sometimes affirmed by not properly informed people. By investigating the unique whole being in his social context and by unmasking his neurotic tricks in order to help him to change his life style we accomplish, on the contrary, the profound and radical work of reeducating an erring and wrongly trained individual, so as to make him a social contributor.

Freud's interest for the depth of the "unconscious" (or id) has soon moved towards the "ego." In 1930 Adler could write, that speaking of "the unconscious in the ego" gives the ego quite a different face--a face that Individual Psychology was the first to recognize." (1 b, p.244) Already in 1926 he had written that Individual Psychology is "in a great distance from the now declining theories of a shallow 'depth' psychology"; and it "can on no point abandon its independent position." (la, Vorrede)

Years ago, Dreikurs has pointed out in his Individual Psychology Bulletin that we improve our own conceptions, and we contribute to general advances in the science of understanding human behaviour, by conserving our identity as Individual Psychologists. It would not be appropriate to add a term which is unnecessary, inadequate and misleading. Misleading because it more blurs than points out what we are really doing as "therapists" (for which "analyst" is no synonym).

Paul Rom, London
Editor, Individual Psychology News Letter
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