

Running Head: GIVING CREDIT WHERE IT'S DUE

Respecting Differences: Adler and Dreikurs

Erik Mansager, PhD

Training Analyst

Alfred Adler Institute of Northwestern Washington

Jane Griffith, MA, MAT

Professor Emerita

Adler University

Respecting Differences: Adler and Dreikurs

Prelude

Before opening I'd like to acknowledge my co-author, colleague and friend, Jane Griffith, who inspired today's discussion. Her work individually and with her late, beloved spouse, Robert L. (Bob) Powers has motivated many with its creativity and eloquence. Jane and I have been discussing the current topic for most of the year. This has been a heart-felt collaboration, and I would like to acknowledge that – even though the portion of that discussion I share with you today is spoken in the first-person singular.

Introduction

I have wondered just how many Adlerian colleagues might be aware of the 30-year old dispute about Adler's position on the primary motivation of human being. He held that it was "a striving from felt minus position towards a plus situation" (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p.1) while Dreikurs held it to be "a striving to belong." But, when I offered several alternatives for this presentation (focused on clinical conceptualization) I was surprised that the still-simmering Adler-Dreikurs debate was requested. That meant that at least a few of you are aware and also interested. Not a bad start.

My interest in suggesting this topic revolved around several puzzling circumstances. It seemed puzzling to me to find three published accounts, one interview, and at least one international presentation *all* by the same author, *all* coming after the original debate on differences, *none* of which mention this original debate or acknowledge the outcome of it. Instead, Eva Dreikurs Ferguson's accounts state that Dreikurs's position on motivation was perfectly in line with Adler's position. That is, she says that Adler **changed** his understanding of the primal motivation from "striving from minus to plus" to that of "belonging." She maintains this by creating references to "three-stages" of Adler's motivation theory development. Also puzzling is that none of her published accounts show where Adler actually said this or unambiguously intended a shift away from "striving" in favour of "belonging." Instead, she offers partial quotes selected from Adler's

writings on *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* which she uses to transform one basic human need (belonging) into the primary motivating force of **every** individual **and** the species.

I intend to re-visit the discussion in **as clear** a manner as I can by raising interlocking questions across three main topics (the alleged difference between Adler and Dreikurs; the denial of these differences; and their impact on the future of Adlerian psychotherapy).

The alleged difference: Can the claim that there are real, demonstrable and legitimate differences between Adler and Dreikurs be supported? Is it somehow wrong to show that the men differed, sometimes fundamentally? Have efforts been made to grasp what these differences mean in the practice of Individual Psychology? Who benefits when legitimate differences are detected and discussed?

The denial of fundamental differences: What can we know about the denial that there are any differences between Adler and Dreikurs? Are there any drawbacks to denying obvious differences? Is it ever appropriate to cover-up differences or declare that they do not exist or do not matter? Who benefits when they are denied?

The impact of the difference on therapy: Can the congruence of Adler's theory and style of therapy be maintained in the face of theoretical differences? What happens to a theory's congruence when differences become "additions;" or when the differences are portrayed as "advances"? Does it matter if Dreikurs's differences impact the congruence of Adler's theory?

In raising awareness about the original finding that Adler and Dreikurs fundamentally disagreed on the primary motivation of the human person – and the subsequent denial of their differences – I mean to initiate a study of the far-reaching impact of Dreikurs's modifications of Individual Psychology.

The alleged difference

For now, let me reacquaint you with the original discussion that brought the differences between Adler and Dreikurs to initial prominence.

Setting

Over a nine-year period, Jane Griffith and Bob Powers, via their newsletter, *Individual Psychology Reporter (IPR)* offered informative news articles, current and classic ones, along with commentary and discussions on them all. *IPR* was their brainchild and labour-of-love. I found them stimulating as a forum-in-print of the American Adlerian therapeutic community. Already in the late 1970s, as a young Dreikursian, I relished hearing Oscar Christensen regale students with stories of Dreikurs and how he and his Chicago school regularly upset the established order of the New York school.

As I remember Chris telling it, Dreikurs wanted to keep Adlerian thought alive and vibrant and felt the New York group was too tied to tradition and altogether too cautious among their psychoanalytic counterparts. Dreikurs, it was said, liked to shake things up. So, ten years later in the late 1980s, I was impressed to see Dreikurs' ghost still able to pull-off a shake-up. But this time, rather than savory gossip about professional in-fighting, their *IPR* offered an air of propriety and authentic inquiry about the workings of Adler's theory.

It was the fall of 1987 when *IPR (Vol. 4/4)* came out with the hint that something was brewing: Griffith reported that in her recent seminar, participants found themselves with widely different understandings of how Adler expressed the character of human striving. That set the stage for a debate that filled three more volumes of the 1988 *IPR (5/2, 5/3 and 5/4)*.

Writings

The discussion was first proposed in this way. The following year, in 1988, *IPR (5/2)* the editor of a NASAP interest-section newsletter reprinted Griffith's original observation and followed it with this comment:

Adlerians appear divided on the question as to whether 'belonging' or 'superiority striving' is the basic motivator according to Individual Psychology's understanding of human being....

[M]any of those who were trained by Rudolf Dreikurs follow him in support of belonging as the primary goal, while others advocate the striving for superiority (or as variously stated by

Adler, the striving for perfection, totality, completion, or success as any of these is privately envisioned by the individual) There is a vast difference between these two [interpretations]. We do a disservice to those to whom we try to communicate the tenets of [individual] P[ychology] when we unthinkingly interchange the two or, worse yet, don't even [refer to] the striving for superiority. (S. T. Dubelle, *IPR* 5/2, p. 1)

That was the **gauntlet!**

Next, the Griffith-Powers team took it upon themselves to review the most available and popular books of Adler (7 of them) and Dreikurs (6 of them) to see what they could find out about the two men's positions. Their findings: (1) while "**belongingness**" was referenced in Adler's discussion about *Gemeinschaftsgefühl*, there are no references to "**belonging**" as the primary motivator in any of the Adler books; (2) similarly, there were surprisingly few references to "belonging" in the Dreikurs books, and (3) both Adler and Dreikurs seemed aligned in affirming "Adler's striving for superiority (or significance) as the basic motivator and goal" (*IPR*, 5/2 p. 3).

This was puzzling, since it did not show clearly Dreikurs's well-known position on "belonging." So, Griffith and Powers took a closer look at Dreikurs' publication dates and to track revisions to subsequent editions of Dreikurs' earlier texts. As a result, they suspected it was **Dreikurs's** position on "belonging as prime motivator" that was actually under development in the course of the Dreikursian books that Griffith and Powers reviewed. Quite a puzzle!

Conclusion drawn

What they uncovered by their closer reading of Dreikurs's books – comparing his earlier and later texts – seemed to confirm the notion of **Dreikurs's** developing his position on "belonging." To me, it is still striking to read:

A genuine difference in Dreikurs's understanding of human striving separated him from Adler as early as ... 1933 [i.e., in Dreikurs's *Fundamentals of Adlerian Psychology*]. It was a difference perhaps too unclearly stated for either Dreikurs or Adler to have remarked upon at the time, since Dreikurs used many of the same terms that Adler had used, but in a

different context of assumption and emphasis. ... [I]n the late 1940s ... Dreikurs made his difference with Adler increasingly clear.... What he did not do was acknowledge this difference, for reasons that we are not able to find, and about which one can only speculate.

(*IPR*, 5/3 p. 3)

The gloves came off at that point and the next issue of *IPR* (5/4) featured seven in-depth commentaries about the previous issue, along with the Griffith and Powers responses. The other contributions – including Heinz Ansbacher, Ray Corsini, Guy Manaster, and other heavy hitters – offered stimulating insights into the discussion. Only Eva Dreikurs Ferguson’s comments outrightly disagreed with the Griffith-Powers conclusion. She asserted that there was **no difference** between Dreikurs and Adler. “Dreikurs confirmed, and did not differ from, Adler’s thinking when he wrote *Fundamentals of Adlerian Psychology...*” she insisted (*IPR* 5/4, pp. 3). Nonetheless, Griffith and Powers responded to each commentary, and did not think that the input altered their already stated conclusion in *IPR* (5/3):

According to Dreikurs, ... “[each] individual tries to get himself accepted by the community” In cases where children are subjected to faulty parenting, this effort is not experienced as successful, and an erroneous self-assessment ensues in the form of an inferiority feeling, which “impels [the child] to strive for significance” as a compensatory effort “to obtain power of some kind in order to cancel the supposed superiority of other people” In other words, the inferiority feeling is not an ever-present spur (as Adler construed it); rather, for Dreikurs it emerges as a consequence of disappointment, defeat, failure, and frustration; and, as such, it is always neurotic. (pp. 3 & 6)

Aftermath

But why, after 30 years, does the matter *still* have legs?! Perhaps the life-breath of the ongoing discussion becomes clear in the initial response of Ferguson to the Griffith and Powers conclusions (*IPR* 5/4, pp. 3-4). According to Ferguson:

What Dreikurs wrote about ... was fully congruent with Adler's thinking and writing in the 1930s.... [B]y the early 1930s, Adler clearly identified from an *evolutionary* perspective that the fundamental motivation was "belonging." That is, as a species, the human in evolution moved from minus to plus; at the individual level, belonging was foremost. When the individual mastered a task, then striving was from minus to plus, but within the broader striving for belonging. (p. 3)

Ferguson pointed the interested reader to her 1984 work, *Adlerian Theory: An Introduction*, to better understand "the stages of growth in theory in Adler's own thinking and writing" (ibid.). And the following year, in the first post-*IPR* publication, Ferguson (e.g., 1989) expanded her response saying, Dreikurs discerned over the course of Adler's career that Adler's theory about motivation supposedly went through three stages which she delineates these as follows:

The first stage was less sharply crystallized as a motivation theory and emphasized organ inferiority, while the second (middle) stage emphasized striving for power and superiority as the fundamental human motivation. In the third stage, Adler made it explicit that humans as a species strive to belong and that the goal, dictated by evolution, is to contribute to human welfare. (p. 354)

Ferguson assumed that the final result of Adler's motivation theory was that "feeling inferior" was **not** a universal motivator. As she was to say in 2016: to believe that the inferiority feeling was a motivator for everyone was an error made and propagated by Heinz Ansbacher, whom she, puzzlingly characterizes as "a stockbroker who got therapy from Adler" (2016, p. 19). "Ansbacher got stuck in the 2nd stage" she insisted; "He got stuck in believing that inferiority feelings were inevitable and part of psychic life" (p. 20). Opposing this view, Ferguson insisted, was Dreikurs, who in regard to Adler's theory: "got it" (ibid.): It was by means of her own rigorous experimental psychological training that she has been more capable of explaining Adler's third-stage thinking: While people of all ages can feel inferior about their level of task completion, any actual suffering from "inferiority

feelings about one's self identity" only inflicts people who have not been raised by democratic means (ibid.).

This argument is made in all four post-*IPR* publications (Ferguson 1989, 2000, 2010, 2016) as if it were an established fact. No attempt is made toward developing a scholarly consensus. No commentary or rebuttal is invited. Ferguson implies that every Adler expositor other than Dreikurs had actually overlooked the evolution of Adler's motivational theory. Another puzzling characteristic of her argumentation is that she does not quote Adler directly on the matter – nor do any of the authors of publications that agree with her (e.g., Marková & Čechová, 2016; Nelson, 2006; Oberst & Stewart, 2003; Shifron, 2018). None offer a statement from Adler himself on belonging as the fundamental motivator of humanity. When Ferguson *does* quote Adler, it is when he acknowledges that belonging is a basic human need (e.g., 2010, p. 1), not that Adler believed belonging was a prime motivator. When Ferguson raises the "belonging" matter – which is at the core of her own explanation of Adler's theory – she tends to cite *herself* rather than Adler (e.g., Ferguson, 2000, pp. 98, 200).

Griffith and Powers had already encountered and addressed this type of misattribution and citation-omission in their *IPR* discussion. Heinz Ansbacher brought it to their attention in 1985 (*IPR* 3/3). They reprinted his comments for the 1988 discussion (*IPR* 5/2).

I would like to take exception to the second paragraph of Rosemary M. Marquette's article.... She asserts that for Adler "the strongest motivating force for the human being is the desire to belong to the social world." If she has a reference to Adler for this statement, I would like to know it. Rudolf Dreikurs often wrote of "the need to belong" as the strongest motivating force and should be recognized as the author. (p. 3)

Ferguson's formulation of Adler's supposed shift from "striving for superiority" to "striving for belonging" is intriguing and perhaps useful in a certain conceptualization of the human person; but "intriguing" and "perhaps useful" are characteristics that also apply to the formulation of other "neo-Adlerian" ideas (Ansbacher & Ansbacher, 1956, p. 16): the works of Franz Alexander, Erich

Fromm, Karen Horney, Harry Stack Sullivan; but these don't substitute for the historical data related to Adler himself. Information around these data is presented in the next section to highlight the costs of neglecting the differences.

So there you have the context of the difference between Adler and Dreikurs. I trust I've represented Ferguson accurately. That is certainly my intention. My interest is not to illustrate right or wrong, but to accurately portray the initial discussion of the difference. Next I'll address in closer detail, the denial of this difference.

The denial of difference

It is possible that we find ourselves in a quagmire in the effort to offer proofs that verify Adler's consistent motivational position on striving from minus to plus. It will take a longer presentation than this to understand the motivation for Ferguson's partial quotes and strained connections of Adler's writings in the 1930s – which she uses to retroactively bolster Dreikurs's contention of "belonging as the prime motivator." If one were to be satisfied by the published historical record alone, Griffith's and Powers's original effort would have settled the matter in 1988.

Instead of proof-texts, I take a course that is similar to Adler's stochastic guessing scheme, by which he conceptualized his clients' movement (Adler, 1929/2005). We take guesses about the direction of a person's movement, but we surrender that guess if the future evidence refutes, and does not support the guess. The initial guess is then abandoned or corrected in order to advance to a more plausible understanding.

In this case, Dreikurs's propositions (or guesses) about a change in Adler's theory are taken from Ferguson's writing, evidence is suggested that will support the conjecture and if this is not found, if support cannot be documented, the guess is non-supported, refuted. By Adler's standard, such guesses should be corrected or abandoned.

Dreikursian Proposition #1: For instance, Ferguson proposed that "Adler developed his motivational theory through three identifiable phases" (Ferguson, 1989, p. 354). This statement could be *supported* if Adler's biographers also noted that his motivational theory developed through

such stages. On the other hand, if there is no corroboration provided by Adler's biographers the position is considerably weakened, if not *refuted*.

Dreikursian Proposition #2: Ferguson believes, at any rate, the supposed three stages were overlooked by the others. Her implication is that the Ansbachers certainly missed the point and Dreikurs got it right. She explained her understanding of this: "Ansbacher never had, never shared the clinical experiences that my dad did, so he misunderstood much of Adler's emphasis" (Ferguson, 2016, p. 19). She seemed to believe that the Ansbachers were not clinically-minded enough, and that clinicians closer to Adler would be better able to discern Adler's stages and the supposed shift from "striving" to "belonging."

Never mind the non-clinical biographers, this proposition could be sustained, *verified*, if a preponderance of clinicians that worked with Adler agreed overtly or tacitly with Dreikurs's three-phases proposition. If, however, a preponderance of clinicians that worked with Adler *disagreed* overtly or tacitly with Dreikurs on this point, this second proposition would be non-supported, *refuted*; and would be in need of modification or abandonment.

Dreikursian Proposition #3: But even setting aside the whole question of three-phases, one can still ask about the presumed "emergence of belonging as the fundamental motivator" – the crux of the difference between Adler and Dreikurs. Thus, Ferguson conjectures that "According to Adler, the fundamental motivation of humans is to belong and to contribute to the community (Ferguson, 1995)" (Ferguson, 2000, p. 200).

Ferguson goes to great lengths to use Adler's growing understanding of *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* to make it sound as if he eventually saw *this* as a motivator. A particular challenge to support or refute this contention arises here: there are no published statements by Adler to support her position. So, to sustain or verify a position that has *no* publication record, then no published *counter-evidence* can exist. If published statements contrary to Ferguson's position **can be found**, the contention that Adler changed his mind would be refuted. That is, published statements by Adler which indicate he maintained superiority striving as the primary human motivator – especially during

the years conjectured as a “third phase” – would be the refutation and should lead to an abandonment or modification of Dreikurs’s proposition.

As history would have it, the data that supports refuting the propositions above is long and verifiable.

Regarding Proposition 1 – or – Adler’s motivation theory in three stages

None of Adler’s biographers – academic, clinical or otherwise (cf., Bottome, 1957; Eife, 2018; Furtmüller, 1964; Hoffman, 1996; Orgler, 1963; Rattner, 1983; Sperber, 1974) – identify phases of his motivation theory development.

Regarding Proposition 2 – or – Ansbacher misunderstood because he was not a clinician

The sequence of Adler’s theory development which is presented by the Ansbachers (1956) has been corroborated by a number of clinicians past and present. For example, Gisela Eife, a contemporary Adlerian clinician and expositor, when asked about the development of Adler’s motivation theory, responded this way:

As Adler wrote in 1926 and 1931, being human means to have inferiority feelings. That means Adler did not abandon his early understanding of inferiority feeling. In my understanding there are no stages. Adler expanded his organising principle, which he found in the neurotic, to the human being in general. (Personal communication 18 September 2016)

And with the expansion of the Classical Adlerian Translation Project we have access to the writings and professional opinions of several clinicians who worked intimately with Adler. The writings of Anthony Bruck, Alexander Müller, and Sophia deVries now join those of Kurt Adler, Sophie Lazarsfeld, Lydia Sicher, Erwin Wexberg and Beran Wolfe, among others, who corroborate the Ansbachers’ account of Adler’s theory. Their writings *and* clinical presentations – which utilize Adler’s understanding of motivation as “striving from minus to plus” – amount to endorsements of the Ansbachers’ intellectual integrity; something which was impugned by Ferguson (2016).

Regarding Proposition 3 – or – Adler believed ‘belonging’ was the primary motivator

The books by Adler that Griffith and Powers had examined were “laced with discussions of the striving for superiority, the striving from a minus to a plus, the striving to overcome feelings of inferiority, and similar phrases” (*IPR* 5/2, 1988p. 3). That was accurate then and remains so today. Now, we also have corroboration from the 12 volumes that make up *The Collected Clinical Works of Alfred Adler* (CCWAA).

Already in the first three volumes, two books (*A Study of Organ Inferiority* and *The Neurotic Character*) and more than 40 published articles lay the structure for Adler’s theory of compensation, from which developed his formulation of striving. This is expressed in terms that are biological (i.e., organ inferiority) and gendered (i. e., masculine protest) but are *not* different theories; *nor* are they changed conceptualisations of what motivates people (as suggested by Oberst & Stewart, 2003, p. 21). They are clearer and clearer iterations of Adler’s appreciation that psychological movement goes from felt minus (-) to fictional plus (+).

Volumes 4-11 are also laced with statements, articles, and full sections which illustrate the consistency of his position on striving – and how he put it to use. Volume 4 contains Adler’s 1918 article on Dostoyevsky which signals the beginning of Adler’s incorporation of *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* as the **direction-giving** aspect of the striving movement. This formulation which pays respect to the **biological striving** and to the influence of **social embeddedness** – what Adler once called “a dual dynamic” (cf., Eife, 2018) – was part of Adler’s theory from this point onward, right through to his last works – published and unpublished.

The last issue in the CCWAA, Volume 12, is a formerly unpublished series of lectures entitled, *The General System of Individual Psychology*. The editor comments that in this undated material:

Adler’s terminology and style suggest that the lectures were given later in his career, and represent a summary of his mature theory of the personality, as well as principles of prevention and treatment.” (Stein, 2006, p. v)

This volume is especially pertinent to the current topic since it was written within the years that Ferguson considers the “third phase” of Adler’s developing motivation theory. It is replete with references to evolution (which Ferguson emphasizes in her rationale) and from its opening chapter (“Unique Goal of Overcoming”) through to its last, only two references are made to “belonging” as a human need or characteristic.

The first mention is in a context where Adler references “movement” of the child and the importance of developing in the child an interest in contribution. His point is *not* that this is a natural phenomenon, let alone a motivator for all humans; but quite the opposite. It is the caregiver’s responsibility to develop the child’s natural striving in a useful, contributing direction (pp. 85-86 §1567). Adler mentions belonging a second time in reference to a pampered child he worked with saying the child “belongs only to ... mother or perhaps to similar pampering people” (p. 109, §1969).

Consider this in the face of the ten dozen references made to “striving” (e.g., “this striving power,” “this striving force,” “striving toward ideal form,” “striving from minus to plus,” “striving to overcome difficulties,” “striving from below to above,” “striving for equilibrium,” and “striving for an ideal completion”): with no mention of “striving to belong”. Rather, Adler insists again and again “Life is based on this striving, this urge to move forward” (§393). And contrary to Ferguson’s distinction between evolutionary thinking of species and individual, Adler maintained that the fictional final goal, seen from an evolutionary perspective, guarantees the survival benefit of a focused, efficient, unified striving:

This striving force, coming from the creative power of the personality ... is expressed as movement. If this movement is put in the stream of evolution, striving toward a goal of completion, then I can understand why all the details in the mind or body of an individual connect to form a unit. (§373)

Adler gaining conceptual clarity about the striving process in humans is a legitimate finding – one can understand the individual’s end goal in different ways, as Adler did. Even *if* one were to think in terms of “striving to belong,” which Adler evidently did not, the emphasis would remain on

“striving” not on “belonging.” Why? Because “striving” is the neutral designation of movement while “belonging” can be done positively or negatively – as can “overcoming.”

As to “belonging,” It was Adler’s genius to grasp that the modicum of *Gemeinschaftsgefühl* inherent in any movement was the determiner of the *direction* – which governs whether any movement is useful to the human community or not. He formulated this first in 1918 and maintained it through his last writings.

In a sentence: Outside of Dreikurs and his own students, **no** major expositor of Adler, **none** of his biographers, **no** other clinicians who worked with him, and **none** of Adler’s own writings agree with the Dreikurs-Ferguson proposal of Adler’s motivational theory.

The Impact on Therapy

Now in many ways that would be the end of the current presentation – in that it would point to the need for a course correction for a means of developing a scholarly consensus of Adlerian motivation. But the matter does **not** stop there. In fact, a discussion of theoretical differences would be misunderstood if it were not tied to other important matters – such as the two men’s therapeutic **applications**, the manner in which they trained their clinical students to do therapy, and even their individual personalities.

These matters are being undertaken in other writings and by other students of Adler’s depth psychotherapy, but can’t be fully developed here. In the brief time left it seems important to note two issues related to the theoretical differences addressed here as they impact Adlerian therapy and therapists. The first is what seems to be Ferguson’s diminishment of Adler’s theory in favour of Dreikurs’s “advances” and the second is what might be a means of addressing the identity issues that such differences could raise.

Diminishing Adler

Back in 1988, and many times subsequently, Ferguson has insisted that “Adler was not always clear in his own writings” (*IPR 5/4*, p. 3, 1988) and again in 2000 she asserted that Dreikurs’s work was the “advancing of Adlerian theory” (Ferguson, 2000, p. 201).

Opinions, if well-informed, are to be respected. Critique that is supported and well-founded is necessary. And still, we do well to be aware of the impact of critical opinion – especially when it is not well-informed or well-founded. It seems to me that such statements as hers leave the unfortunate impression that those inquiring about Individual Psychology will find his original writings either *arcane*, which requires someone to explain what Adler meant, or *archaic*, which requires someone to constantly update or advance the theory. I reject both implications.

With the completion of the CCWAA, much of which involves fresh and readable translations, we can promote direct access to Adler's works for the professionally interested. Nothing can substitute for a deep-reading of Adler's original thoughts. Deep-reading exempts neither the new comer nor the seasoned Adlerian from putting the effort into understanding his consistent and thoroughgoing system of psychotherapy. Let's not rob any inquirer from experiencing that "the personality of Adler comes to life again ... behind the letters and the pages" of his original works (Furtmüller, 1964, p. 362).

As for "advancing Adler's theory": It is not unkind, unprofessional or disrespectful to question whether Dreikurs's formulas were "advances" of any sort. When psychology students and psychologists are interested in learning about Adler, they ought to be able to access information that is accurate clinically and historically; information that explains what Adler said and did. If they are *also* interested in those who apply Adler's theory and clinical method, then the inquirer should also be able to access material that is forthright in sharing what is not Adler, but that of his students. As we have seen in the main portion of this talk, they are not the same.

Identity Issues

Isn't it a reasonable solution to suggest that Adler's words and formulation be called Adlerian and Dreikurs's be called Dreikursian? I believe it would be very helpful if the *material* itself, our publications, were more judiciously designated in this fashion. Within the context of this paper, history indicates Dreikurs himself would have supported such a distinction. Two anecdotes about

how Dreikurs identified *himself* are worth sharing; both personal communications are offered by Jane Griffith:

I attended a program at the old Alfred Adler Institute with Bob, so this was in the early 1980s. I don't remember the overall topic or everyone who was presenting, but I remember clearly *Bernie Shulman standing and reporting* on an occasion when Dr. Dreikurs was on stage delivering a talk standing in front of a big blackboard. Shulman said Dr. D. was standing on the left of the blackboard as he faced the audience, that he then turned, wrote the name "ADLER" on the left-hand side of the blackboard, strode across the stage to the right-hand side of the blackboard and wrote the name "HORNEY," that he then walked to the center of the blackboard and placed a strong mark right down the middle, turned and said, "Here's my position!", or some such declaration, perhaps "Here's where I stand!" (Personal communication 2 April 2018; cf., Terner & Pew, 1978, p. 191)

Along with this story, Jane shared a more personal anecdote:

Bob Powers once spoke to Dreikurs about using the term "Dreikursian" in reference to Dreikurs's numerous contributions to psychology. Bob told to me that Dreikurs was very pleased with the idea. (Personal communication 5 November 2018)

It seems quite legitimate that we do as Ansbacher suggested in 1985: credit Dreikurs for his formulations – including the "belonging" position addressed here, along with Ferguson's theorizing and justifying that goes with it. The formulation that the "fundamental motivation of human beings is the need to belong (Ferguson, 1989)" (Ferguson, 2010, p. 1), is a Dreikursian formula, plain and simple. These are two men, in important ways theorizing differently. (Who is to prevent it?) If only they are accurately identified! Such accuracy would be historically accurate and professionally helpful to those who prefer to explain Adlerian theory without "Dreikursian advances." After all, it is what brought the scrutiny on this Adler-Dreikurs difference in the first place:

We do a disservice to those to whom we try to communicate the tenets of IP when we unthinkingly interchange the two or, worse yet, don't even [refer to] the striving for superiority." (ibid.)

References

- Adler, A. (2002). *The neurotic character. Fundamentals of Individual Psychology and Psychotherapy* (C. Koen, Trans.). In H. T. Stein (Ed.), *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-315). Bellingham, WA: The Classical Adlerian Translation Project.
- Adler, A. (2002). *Journal articles: 1898-1909. A study of organ inferiority: 1907. The mind-body connection, social activism, and sexuality* (G. L. Liebenau, Trans.). In H. T. Stein (Ed.), *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-229). Bellingham, WA: The Classical Adlerian Translation Project.
- Adler, A. (2003). *Journal articles: 1910-1913. Elaborating on the basic principles of Individual Psychology* (G. L. Liebenau, Trans.). In H. T. Stein (Ed.), *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-217). Bellingham, WA: The Classical Adlerian Translation Project.
- Adler, A. (2003). *Journal articles: 1914-1920. Expanding the horizons of child guidance; neurosis & psychosis* (G. L. Liebenau, Trans.). In H. T. Stein (Ed.), *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-224). Bellingham, WA: The Classical Adlerian Translation Project.
- Adler, A. (2005). *The case of Miss R.* In H. T. Stein (Ed.), *The collected clinical works of Alfred Adler* (Vol. 9, pp. 141-320). Bellingham, WA: The Classical Adlerian Translation Project. (Original work published 1929)
- Ansbacher, H. L. & Ansbacher, R. R. (1956). *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bottome, P. (1957). *Alfred Adler*. New York, NY: Vanguard Press.
- Distinguished Contributors, Inc. (1969). *Rudolf Dreikurs. Individual Psychology: A Demonstration. Part One.* In *Distinguished Contributors in Counseling* from The American Personnel & Guidance Association. St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University
- Eife, G. (2018). Inferiority feeling and community feeling in Adler's concept of the dual dynamic. In *Adlerian Year Book, 2018*. P. Prina, C. Shelley, K. John & A. Millar (Eds.), pp. 89-102. London: UK Adlerian Society and Institute for Individual Psychology.

- Ferguson, E. D. (2017, June). *Inferiority feeling and social interest*. Paper presented at the 27th Congress of the International Association of Individual Psychology, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Ferguson, E. D. (1989). Adler's motivational theory: An historical perspective on belonging and the fundamental human striving. *Individual Psychology*, 45/3, 354-361.
- Ferguson, E. D. (2000). *Motivation. A biosocial and cognitive integration of motivation and emotion*, pp. 98, 104, 200. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, E. D. (2010). Adler's innovative contributions regarding the need to belong. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 66/1, 1—7.
- Ferguson, E. D. (2016). An interview with Eva Dreikurs Ferguson: Reflections on a lifetime of Individual Psychology by R. M. Kern & W. L. Curlette. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 72/1, 12-28.
- Marková, D. & Čechová, D. (2016). *Adlerian Ethics - Applications in Counselling and Psychotherapy* (A. Shearman & D. Shearman, Trans.). London: Adlerian Society, UK & Institute for Individual Psychology.
- Nelson, J. (1995). *Positive Discipline*. New York, NY : Ballantine Books. (Original work published 1981)
- Oberst, U. E. & Stewart, A. E. (2003). *Adlerian Psychotherapy. An advanced approach to Individual Psychology*. New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Orgler, H. (1963). *Alfred Adler. The man and his work*. New York, NY: Mentor.
- Rattner, J. (1983). *Alfred Adler* (H. Zohn, Trans.). New York, NY: Frederick Ungar Publishing.
- Shifron, R., Abramson, Z., Joosten, T., Bettner, T. L., & Ferguson, E. D. (2018). Adler and Dreikurs in a changing world: Refugees in 2017. In *Adlerian Year Book, 2018*. P. Prina, C. Shelley, K. John & A. Millar (Eds.), pp. 165-183. London: UK Adlerian Society and Institute for Individual Psychology.

Sperber, M. (1974). *Masks of loneliness. Alfred Adler in perspective* (K. Wilson, Trans.). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Stein, H. T. (2001). Editor's Preface. In: A. Adler (H. T. Stein, Ed.). *The General System of Individual Psychology. Fundamentals of Individual Psychology and Psychotherapy*, pp. v-vi.