Editorial

With this issue we conclude the publication of the papers which were presented at the International Congress for Individual Psychology in Zurich in July 1954. But we also bring to an end an important phase in the development of Adlerian Psychology and of this Journal in particular. The history of the Journal reflects the development of Individual Psychology, not only in this country but in the world.

When the Individual Psychology News first appeared in October, 1940, as a small, mimeographed pamphlet of eight pages, Adlerian Psychology had been at its lowest period, in the United States as well as elsewhere. Many believed at that time—and for many years afterwards—that it was dead, just an historical phase in the development of psychology. Few small circles of Adlerians led a vegetative existence, mostly unknown, and—if known—regarded with little esteem in professional circles. Some feel justified even today to continue this low esteem, characteristic for that period, unaware of or unwilling to recognize the change which occurred in the meantime.

The Individual Psychology News had one main purpose: To re-establish the contact between the various Adlerians who were dispersed all over the world. Many of them came from Vienna and had to flee for political or religious reasons. For one year the News carried on its work, gradually including a few original papers with its news items.

The second year the News became the Individual Psychology Bulletin. It still was mimeographed; but each issue had twenty pages of papers, reports and news, and a printed and more presentable cover. With the third volume the Bulletin changed its format into that of a journal, first planographed and then, with Volume IV, printed. By that time it was a regular psychological journal in which the news “From Our Friends” occupied only the last two pages.

This change indicated the establishment of Adlerian Psychology as a school of thought, commanding acceptance and respect. The
groups in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles had become consolidated, with regular scientific meetings and planned programs. The increase in the content of the Bulletin, the significance of its papers and contributors, went parallel with the status which the local groups achieved. Training Institutes were conducted in the three cities. Besides, the Los Angeles group developed the Child House, the New York group established its Alfred Adler Consultation Center and the Chicago group, the Community Child Guidance Centers. Thus, all three groups provided community services for counseling and treatment.

In 1952 the Inaugural Meeting of the American Society of Adlerian Psychology took place in New York. The newly formed society took over the publication of the Journal, which heretofore had been published by the Chicago group. The Individual Psychology Bulletin changed its name to the American Journal of Individual Psychology and took on its present form.

Adlerian Psychology came of age again, we may say. It is now obvious—at least to those who are willing to see—that Adler was fifty years ahead of his time. This would not have been necessary, had the psychiatric world not been led to a detour through the widespread acceptance of Freud’s theories. Adler’s significance could only be recognized to the same degree to which Freud’s influence waned. His own disciples, discarding one after the other of his scientific principles, moved toward Adler and his social orientation. It is against this background of a general reorientation amongst the Neo-Freudians that the resurgence of Adlerian concepts can be understood.

But there are two other reasons why Adler could not gain his well-deserved place before, why his insights into human motivation were passed by for a time. Freud expressed the rebellion of a liberal era against restrictions and deprivations. He declared man’s rights for satisfaction of his desires against the demands of society. Those who cherished rugged individualism worshipped Freud. Adler recognized man’s self-determination. He saw man as a free agent, but at the same time charged him with the full responsibility of his actions, a burden which Freud had greatly alleviated by blaming uncontrollable unconscious forces for men’s misdeeds. The time was not yet ripe for Adler. Nor was the scientific orientation of that time. It was strictly mechanistic and causalistic; Freud was the last great exponent of such 17th Century scientific orientation. Adler’s emphasis of the teleological principles, of the limitation of determining forces within and around the individual, was hardly acceptable to scientists in any field. Recent devel-
opments in physics and natural sciences paved the way for a recognition of the teleological principle in psychology, since it has been discovered as a universal principle. Similarly, the concept of the totality of the individual, so fundamental in Adlerian Psychology that it provided it with a name “Individual Psychology,” has been supported by the later contribution of Smuts who created the term “Holism.” Both teleological and holistic considerations present the advanced position in modern science. Adler suddenly emerged as a pioneer, after having been considered for many years as belonging to a historical and not very important phase of modern psychology.

The textbooks on psychology and psychiatry clearly show the change in the general acceptance and prestige of Adler’s psychology. In former years they made almost no reference to him, and if there was one, it was superficial, very limited and often incorrect. Today, no reputable textbook neglects to give a full and accurate account of Adler’s theories and methods. Adlerian Psychologists, individually and collectively, gain a place in the discussion and proceedings of scientific societies.

In 1954, at the International Congress for Individual Psychology in Zurich, the International Society of Individual Psychology was formed. It not only reflects the increasing strength of Adlerian groups everywhere, but also stimulates their development and expansion. The Journal was happy to publish the scientific papers presented there.

And now a new phase begins. We may say that Adlerian Psychology has established itself so far; from now on it should integrate itself better in the current stream of psychology, psychiatry and education. The Journal will again reflect this new phase. Dr. Hans Ansbacher, the President of the American Society of Adlerian Psychology, will take over the editorship of the Journal; he plans to use it for greater integration of Adlerian Psychology into the field of applied psychology. The influence of our concepts on the thinking of our contemporaries has only begun; Adlerian psychology has much more to offer to the professional workers in all fields. This puts a great responsibility upon our societies and the Journal; we can hope and expect that they will fulfill it.
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