

Alfred Adler's Influence on the Work of C. G. Jung

By Paul Watsky

Alfred Adler's influence on the work of C. G. Jung was substantial, and of two sorts: (1) Adler provided him with a theoretical frame and treatment approach Jung employed with people whose negative self-image and deficient socialization led them to feel alienated and powerless; and (2) a cluster of Adler's most important ideas dating between 1907 and 1913 became valuable building blocks of Jung's mature formulation of psychodynamics, beginning with the publication, in 1921, of *Psychological Types*. Little need be inferred, because over the span of Jung's career from 1909 to 1955 he makes the influence apparent, by acknowledging Adler or his contributions, most often positively, almost one hundred times throughout the *Collected Works*, seminars, and *Letters* (exclusive of the Freud/Jung correspondence, where the mentions usually concern psychoanalytic business rather than theory).

Aside from Jung's own statements, hardly anything has been written about this subject, and Jung's forthrightness

makes him an anomaly among his peers and successors, since, according to Henri Ellenberger, *surreptitiously* cannibalizing Adler has been the rule:

It would not be easy to find another author from which so much has been borrowed from all sides without acknowledgment than Alfred Adler. His teaching has become, to use a French idiom, an "open quarry" (une carrière publique), that is, a place where anyone and all may come and draw anything without compunction. An author will meticulously quote the source of any sentence he takes from elsewhere, but it does not occur to him to do the same whenever the source is individual psychology; it is as if nothing original could ever come from Adler.¹

Scholars of Jung's work, with the notable exception of James Hillman, have followed suit in ignoring Adler, except to pair him with Freud as one of the great adversaries or to outline the differences between Adler's and Jung's systems of psychology. Hillman's "Poetics of Adlerian Therapy" vaults over Jung's relationship with Adler's ideas to assert that such Adlerian concepts as organ inferiority, antithetical thinking, fictional goals, and social interest can enrich Hillman's favored style of neo-Jungianism—"soul-making," "ensouling":

We must take care not to hear Adler only with Jungian ears, assuming that the "great upward drive," as Adler calls it, is the Self as a literal reality. ...The subtlety of Adler's thinking [is that]...his "striving for perfec-

Paul Watsky, Ph.D., is a Jungian analyst with a private practice in San Francisco. A member of the C.G. Jung Institute there, he is also affiliated with the Department of Psychiatry at the California Pacific Medical Center. His writing on psychology has been published in *The San Francisco Jung Institute Library Journal*, *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, and *The San Francisco Chronicle*. His poetry appears in the anthology *A New Resonance-Emerging Voices in English-Language Haiku*.

tion" is a notion of the spirit that cannot be fixed into any of its epiphanies, even as it imbues all striving with meaning. Here Adler is close to the Jung who considered the final to be a point of view toward all psychic events—to look at them as purposeful—rather than to the Jung who tended to literalize the purpose into a demonstrable individuation process of the Self.²

This essay romanticizes Adler and deromanticizes Jung, perhaps necessary correctives, but more likely to advance Hillman's revisionist agenda than to clarify Jung's.

Jung, himself, in an historical overview entitled "Depth Psychology," has described Adler's system:

For [Adler] the primary etiological factor was not sexuality but the power-drive. The neurotic individual appeared to him to be in conflict with society, with the result that his spontaneous development was blocked. On this view the individual never exists for himself alone; he maintains his psychic existence only within the community.... Neurotic symptoms and disturbances of personality were the result of a morbidly intensified valuation of the ego, which, instead of adapting to reality, develops a system of "guiding fictions." This hypothesis gives expression to a finalistic viewpoint diametrically opposed to the causal-reductive method of Freud, in that it emphasizes the direction towards a goal. Each individual chooses a guiding line as a basic pattern for the organization of all psychic contents. Among the possible guiding fictions, Adler attached special importance to the winning of superiority and power over others, the urge "to be on top." The original source of this misguided ambition lies in a deep-rooted feeling of inferiority, necessitating an over-compensation in the form of security. A primary organ-inferiority, or inferiority of the constitution as a whole, often proves to be an aetiological factor. Environmental influences in early child-

hood play their part in building up this psychic mechanism, since it is then that the foundations are laid for the development of the guiding fiction. The fiction of future superiority is maintained by tendentially distorting all valuations and giving undue importance to being "on top" as opposed to "underneath," "masculine" as opposed to "feminine," a tendency which finds its clearest expression in the so-called "masculine protest." In Adler's individual psychology, Freud's basic concepts undergo a process of recasting. The Oedipus complex, for example, loses its importance in view of the increasing drive for security; illness becomes a neurotic "arrangement" for the purpose of consolidating the life-plan. Repression loses its aetiological significance when understood as an instrument for the better realization of the guiding fiction. Even the unconscious appears as an "artifice of the psyche," so that it may very well be asked whether Adler can be included among the founders of depth psychology. Dreams, too, he regarded as distortions aiming at the fictive security of the ego and the strengthening of the power drive. Nevertheless, the services rendered by Adler and his school to the phenomenology of personality disturbances in children should not be overlooked. Above all, it must be emphasized that a whole class of neuroses can in fact be explained primarily in terms of the power drive.³

The above passage, written in 1948, eleven years past Adler's death and thirty-five after Jung broke with Freud, credits Adler with having made significant innovations, and demonstrates that Jung had a cogent grasp of Adler's psychological views—up to a point.

The point is 1913, one year after Adler published his most important work, *The Neurotic Constitution*, but well before the complete development of his system. That may be why Jung omits to mention, above or anywhere

else, various important components of Adler's fully evolved personality theory: the concepts of "activity" and "movement," social interest (*Gemeinschaftsgefühl*), the unity and sovereignty of personality, and, finally, the style of life, all formulated during Adler's middle and later career. Jung refers by name to only three works of Adler's, two books—*Study of Organ Inferiority* (1907) and *The Neurotic Constitution* (1912)—and a single previously untranslated journal article—"Trotz und Gehorsam" ("Defiant and Obedient," 1910). When Jung died his personal library contained the 1907 book and a different essay, from 1913, "Ueber männliche Einstellungen bei weiblichen Neurotikern" ("The Masculine Attitude in Female Neurotics"), in a collection of articles entitled *Traumdeutung und Andere Aufsätze* (*Dream Interpretation and Other Essays*; not, apparently, edited by Adler), whereas his extensive holdings of Freud included six works published between the 1920's and 1940's.⁴ These four publications of Adler's set forth all the Adlerian concepts upon which Jung draws.

A remark from Jung's foreword to the first edition of his lecture series "The Theory of Psychoanalysis" tells us that at least through 1912 he read Adler the way one keeps abreast of the work of an important colleague. Jung's talks were delivered at Fordham University the year following Adler's break with Freud, and a year before Jung himself followed suit. He writes:

Only after the preparation of these lectures, in the spring of 1912, did Alfred Adler's book Ueber den nervösen Charakter [The Nervous Constitution (later titled in English The Neurotic Constitution)] become known

*to me, in the summer of that year. I recognize that he and I have reached similar conclusions on various points, but here is not the place to discuss the matter more thoroughly. This should be done elsewhere.*⁵

This encounter with Adler's new work occurs at an especially noteworthy time for Jung, a period of great mental plasticity—shortly after his major contribution *The Psychology of the Unconscious* (*Wandlungen und Symbole der Libido*) appeared in 1911-12, and just before the onset, during 1913, of his isolative creative illness.⁶ As early as 1913 Jung illustrates how Adler and he have "reached similar conclusions on various points:"

*For one type of person (called the infantile-rebel) [den infantil-Unbotmässigen] a positive transference is, to begin with, an important achievement with a healing significance; for the other (the infantile-obedient) [den infantil-Gehorsamen] it is a dangerous backsliding, a convenient way of evading life's duties. For the first a negative transference denotes increased insubordination, hence a backsliding and an evasion of life's duties, for the second it is a step forward with a healing significance. (For the two types see Adler, "Trotz und Gehorsam," ...1910).*⁷

The above appears to be Jung's own improvisation on Adler, for it is unclear where he gets the terms "infantile-rebel" and "infantile-obedient." Adler's paper, originally presented to a group of teachers, sounds far less censorious: "The character of defiance and of obedience are based on unconscious and false attitudes of the child."⁸ "Trotz und Gehorsam," which addresses itself exclusively to the neurotic conduct of school children, says nothing about transference.

Between 1913 and the publication of *Psychological Types* in 1921, when Jung began giving Adler credit for substantially having influenced him, he already was building toward his mature use of Adlerian motifs.⁹ That it might take Jung upwards of a decade to assimilate Adler's ideas thoroughly was consistent with his temperament: "He carried most of his more important concepts around with him for ten years or so, constantly testing them against new facts and probing them with all possible objections, before he finally incorporated them into his writings."¹⁰ Another delaying factor may have been that such influence as Adler exerted on Jung had to overcome Jung's apparently low personal opinion of him: "Freud was the far greater mind than Adler. Freud is a real view, Adler a sidelight, though of considerable importance."¹¹

Beyond the fact that Adler generally lacked charisma with intellectuals, Jung's racial attitudes eventually led him to consign Adler, along with Freud, to an ideological doghouse especially for Jewish psychoanalysts: "A little bit of primitivity does not hurt [a Jew]; on the contrary, I can understand that Freud's and Adler's reduction of everything psychic to primitive sexual wishes and power drives has something about it that is beneficial and satisfactory to the Jew, because it is a form of simplification."¹² Jung expresses himself even more extravagantly during the 1930's:

Freud and Adler have beheld very clearly the shadow that accompanies us all. The Jews have this peculiarity in common with women; being physically weaker, they have to aim at the chinks in the armour of their adversary, and thanks to this technique which has been forced on them through the

centuries, the Jews themselves are best protected where others are most vulnerable.... The Jewish race as a whole—at least this is my experience— possesses an unconscious which can be compared with the "Aryan" only with reserve....In my opinion it has been a grave error in medical psychology up till now to apply Jewish categories—which are not even binding on all Jews—indiscriminately to Germanic and Slavic Cristendom.¹³

Most often when Jung unequivocally criticizes Adler he yokes him with Freud as exemplifying one or another bad quality from which Jung seeks to distance himself, such as "overemphasizing the pathological aspect of life and...interpreting man too exclusively in the light of his defects";¹⁴ taking insufficient account of the individual's conscious psyche;¹⁵ considering fantasy "nothing but a 'symbolic' disguise for the basic drives and interactions presupposed by these investigators";¹⁶ erroneously claiming their theories to have "universal validity";¹⁷ showing an "excessive concern with the instincts [which] fails to satisfy the deeper spiritual needs of the patient";¹⁸ neglecting to recognize that neurosis "is always an intensely individual phenomenon" and therefore that a neurosis cannot be described "as if it presented a specific and clearly defined clinical picture."¹⁹

At times Jung's zeal to associate Adler negatively with Freud leads him to ignore what he almost certainly knows, as when, utterly disregarding Adler's teleological bent, Jung writes, "Unlike Freud and Adler, whose principles of explanation are essentially reductive, and always return to the infantile conditions that limit human nature, I lay more stress on a constructive or synthetic exploration, in acknowledgment of the fact that tomor-

row is of more practical importance than yesterday, and that the Whence is less essential than the Whither."²⁰ A more roundabout path that Jung takes to devalue Adler is to compare him with Freud, judge Adler superior for having added an important dimension to psychological theory, but then to liken him to Freud in being similarly narrow-minded, and consequently of lesser worth than Jung:

It is...significant that Freud's first pupil, Alfred Adler, framed an entirely different hypothesis of equally broad applicability.... Both Freud and Adler make the mistake of assuming the continuous operation of the one and the same instinct.... Freud and Adler can easily be reconciled if only we will take the trouble to regard the psyche not as a rigid and unalterable system, but as a fluid stream of events which change kaleidoscopically under the alternating influence of different instincts. Hence we may have to explain a man on the Freudian basis before his marriage, and on the Adlerian basis afterwards.²¹

Jung, however, could include himself jokingly with the others in a shadow triumvirate, which he does during his 1938 seminar on Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*:

Voluptuousness, the lust principle, is Freud; passion for power is Adler; and selfishness—that is myself, perfectly simple. You see my idea really is the individuation process and that is just rank selfishness. And Freud is supposed to be nothing but sex, and Adler nothing but power. Those are the three aspects in the right order, mind you. First came Freud, then Adler who was about my age but an earlier pupil of Freud....And mine is the last, and peculiarly enough it includes the other two, for voluptuousness and passion for power are only two aspects of selfishness.²²

Whatever respect Jung bestows on Adler's contributions is hard-won, rather than the free gift of friendship or the result of natural affinity, but Jung bestows respect in its sincerest form, by adopting elements of Adler's theory.

A startling acknowledgment by Jung of Adler's influence on him appears in the 1929 lecture "Problems of Modern Psychotherapy," where he writes that when circumstances warrant he employs Adler's analytical method as the third of four potentially self-sufficient "stages" of analysis. A given clinical situation may require only one, or as many as all four, of these possible approaches. The first, confession, whose origin and model are in religion, can free a patient from the socially alienating burden of guilty secrets. The second, elucidation, essentially Freudian analysis, dispels transference neuroses by identifying and interpreting the incestuous infantile fantasies at their root. The third, education, pioneered by Adler, "show[s] the patient that he 'arranges' his symptoms and exploits his neurosis in order to achieve a fictitious importance...and that even his transference and his other fixations subserve the will to power and thus represent a 'masculine protest' against imaginary suppression."²³ And the fourth, transformation, eventually recognized as the hallmark of Jungian analysis, explores the symbolic products—dreams, fantasies, artwork—of individuals for whom normalcy feels stifling. It aims to clarify one's path towards fuller self-realization, the process Jung names "individuation." Jung justifies his eclecticism by asserting that the analyst has a responsibility to achieve maximum results with minimum expenditures of energy and money, and hence that the patient's

idiosyncratic needs must dictate the treatment approach. Elsewhere Jung writes in a similar vein that when he feels uncertain how to proceed with a case he may advise his patient to read several books by Freud and Adler then report back to him which method better suits the problem, after which Jung will proceed accordingly.²⁴ This pragmatism, in whose service he draws upon Adler as well as Freud, has been underemphasized by both Jung's adherents and his adversaries. Yet from the standpoint of psychological theory it is even more significant that an array of Adler's innovations can be discerned within classic Jungianism.

Jung's formulation of psychological types, which categorizes the psyche's styles of mediating between the inner and the external worlds, comprises an ego psychology, well before Freud takes that path into territory where Adler has preceded Jung as the initial explorer. Adler's first theory of organ inferiority, ca. 1907, assumes that congenital physical defects and childhood disease or trauma are the exclusive causative factors in neurosis. From 1910 to 1911 Adler progresses to the position that "organ inferiorities [become] psychologically effective not through the nervous superstructure, but through the intervention of feelings of inferiority," and in *The Neurotic Constitution* he concludes that "more important than innate disposition, objective experience, and environment is the subjective evaluation of these."²⁵ Since all children recognize their literal inferiority compared with adults and older siblings, anyone may acquire a neurotically distorted self image. Children also realize that not all their physical capacities are equally great, which gives them an additional basis

for a subjective sense of inferiority. Those children who consider themselves at a substantial physical or social disadvantage suffer proportionately. They will try to correct the assumed power imbalance either by appropriate compensatory efforts to become equal, perhaps even superior—overcompensation—or by maladaptive behavior likely to produce a settled, though perhaps unconscious, sense of inferiority and a neurotic life style. "Compensation" eventually became a concept of great importance within Jung's system, but only gradually, in a manner that exemplifies von Franz's description of his slowness thoroughly to assimilate novelties.

The psychological term "compensation" did not originate with Adler, but rather, according to Ellenberger,²⁶ with a mentor of Jung's, Theodore Flournoy, who used it to designate one of the four "functions of the unconscious," the others being creativity, protectiveness, and play.²⁷ Flournoy's well-known study of a medium, *From India to the Planet Mars*, published late in 1899, offered Jung data he employed with his medical dissertation, "On the Psychology and Pathology of So-Called Occult Phenomena" (1902). But Flournoy's long case history, his sole publication to which Jung refers in the *Collected Works*, makes little fuss about compensation and its sister functions—just two mentions of the former word, and a diffuse presentation of the latter.²⁸ Despite citing Flournoy thirteen times in his eighty-five page dissertation, Jung never mentions compensation.²⁹ Jung next uses the term in his 1907 study, "The Psychology of Dementia Praecox," but mistakenly attributes its origination to an 1893 publication of Freud's.³⁰

The very attraction to Freud's teaching brought Jung into contact with Adler, who, in 1907, published *Study of Organ Inferiority and Its Psychical Compensation*, a book which, along with *From India to the Planet Mars*, Jung still owned, as we have seen, at the time of his death. The following passage from Adler's work readily shows that Adler's discussion of compensation, besides being more elaborate and psychodynamic than Flournoy's, has a tonality Jung probably would have found appealing:

The interesting psychic phenomena of repression, substitution, conversion, which Freud demonstrated in his psychoanalysis and which I also found to be the most important constituents of the psychoneuroses develop...in the case of inferior organs.... Complete compensation such as we find in artists, geniuses, a few professional people, has a great many psychic functional characteristics in common with the psychoneuroses, and has with many, especially with hysteria, a common culmination point, the hallucinatory character of the psyche. The following quotations from "Grimm's German Mythology" bears witness how closely our conception of the compensation and over-compensation of the inferior organ corresponds to the popular feeling: "We find in the heroes as well as in the Gods want of limbs: Orin (sic) is one-eyed, Tyr one-handed, Loki lame, Hoeder blind, Vidar dumb, Hagano also one-eyed, Walkeri one-handed, Gunther and Wieland lame; and there are a goodly number of blind and dumb heroes. But it seems heroic that while a defect disfigures childhood and early youth suddenly from out such gloom appears the radiant presence as well as the power long curbed. To these belong the blind birth of the Guelph and the folk-tradition birth of the Hessian and the Suabian."³¹

Although while presenting his new theory of libido in *The Psychology of the Unconscious* (revised and reissued in English as *Symbols of Transformation*) Jung never cites Adler, he now refers to compensation seven times, in as many different contexts. The strongest indication of Adler's influence is that Jung mentions "over-compensation," a term from *Study of Organ Inferiority*: "The 'policeman'...referred to the father, whose gigantic size was over-compensated by the church steeple."³² Several other usages anticipate aspects of Jung's future work, notably: "Whoever takes... [libido] away from a real object without putting in its place a real compensation is overtaken by the inevitable results of introversion," which foreshadows Jung's hypothesis regarding the reciprocal flow of extraverted and introverted energy available to the psyche.³³

Jung's next major work, *Psychological Types* (1921), fully presents Jung's system of ego psychology, and illustrates, to such a degree as to invite our overestimation, how Adler stimulated the development of Jung's thinking. The unmistakable similarity of diction between "inferior function" (*minderwertige funktion*) and Adler's "organ inferiority" (*minderwertigkeit des Organen*) strongly suggests a derivation from Adler. Furthermore, Jung defines inferior function along lines compatible with Adler's revised theory of organ inferiority: "[The] inferior function [is]...the function that lags behind in the process of differentiation...Experience shows that it is practically impossible, owing to adverse circumstances in general, for anyone to develop all his psychological functions simultaneously."³⁴ From this it follows that we all risk suffering because of relative functional inferiority, a circumstance that inevitably impacts upon the ego.

Nonetheless, parallelism does not prove influence. Jung himself suggests another source when, in *Psychology of the Unconscious*, he footnotes his discussion of psychotic regression by remarking that Pierre Janet, who takes a biological perspective, “makes the distinction in this function of a firmly organized ‘inferior’ and ‘superior’ part, conceived of as in a state of continuous transformation....The neuroses are the disturbances or the checks in the evolution of the functions—the illnesses depending upon the morbid functioning of the organism....The old parts are...the inferior parts of the functions, and these replace, in a purposeless fashion, the abortive attempts at adaptation.”³⁵ Adler, too, in *The Neurotic Constitution*, salutes Janet, his *sentiment d’incompletude* (feeling of incompleteness), as being “so wholly in harmony with the results offered by me that I am justified in seeing in my work an extension of this most important fundamental fact.”³⁶ Maybe so, but Adler applies *sentiment d’incompletude* differently from Janet.³⁷ Janet probably should be considered the common ancestor of Adler’s and Jung’s views on inferiority.

Concerning the psychodynamics of the inferior function, however, Adler’s influence on Jung appears substantial. Jung posits that the inferior function hinders adaptation and tends to sink into unconsciousness, but consequently, as a gateway for the unconscious, it serves to offset the ego’s excessive dependence on the hypertrophic superior function. *Psychological Types* both acknowledges Adler and attempts to supersede him:

COMPENSATION[—]The concept was introduced into the psychology of the neu-

*roses by Adler...Whereas Adler restricts compensation to the balancing of inferiority feelings, I conceive of it as functional adjustment in general, an inherent self-regulation of the psychic apparatus. In this sense, I regard the activity of the unconscious (q.v.) as a balancing of the one-sidedness of the general attitude (q.v.) produced by the functioning of consciousness (q.v.).*³⁸

Jung elaborates this definition of a major concept not only by quoting Adler at length but also by clarifying how Adler’s thought has stimulated his:

*The neurotic feeling of inferiority, which according to Adler corresponds etiologically to an organ inferiority, gives rise to an “auxiliary device” [Hilfskonstruktion], that is, a compensation, which consists of the setting up of a “guiding fiction” to balance the inferiority. The guiding fiction is a psychological system that endeavors to turn an inferiority into a superiority. The significant thing about the conception is the undeniable and empirically demonstrable existence of a compensating function in the sphere of psychological processes.*³⁹

Jung takes fictionalism to be a form of psychological compensation, and sees in its manifestation a logical proof that the unconscious exists. Apparently he likes the concept of fictionalism for itself as well, since he uses it, very much according to Adler’s sense, on six occasions between 1912 and 1954.⁴⁰ There are three reasons to assume Jung acquired the concept from Adler, rather than Vaihinger, whom Adler cites as his intellectual precursor: Jung often credits the former but never once invokes Vaihinger’s name, had no books by him in his library, and uses the term the way Adler, a less-than-impeccable disciple of Vaihinger’s, usually does.⁴¹ Jung generally grants the ego considerable importance, out of

his belief that a mature, well-adapted ego is essential for dealing clear-sightedly with the world and for mediating between a person's unconscious and the environment:

The more one has lived outside of life, the more one tries to defend oneself against it and invents all sorts of security mechanisms such as Adler describes so aptly. He has... dwelt particularly upon that side, the fictions by which one makes oneself safe; and it is always safety against life, safety against the here and now, instead of submitting to things as they are. With the attitude of the here and now, you make the best of a situation, you say what you have to say, and do what you have to do. The problem in these visions [Christiana Morgan's]... consists...in a certain unreality. No matter what you experience, you can everywhere be unreal.⁴²

The tone of this 1934 excerpt suggests that beside psychological theory Jung shares with Adler an ethical affinity regarding the proper mental fortitude necessary to achieve ego adaptation. They agree that many neuroses result from a lack of courage in the patient, itself conditioned by an overindulgent childhood setting, in a word, pampering. Adler writes: "Introspection...serves especially for the reinforcement and testing of the masculine protest, of characteristics such as courage, pride, ambition," and, [the patient is] "impotent for reason, in order to be pampered like a child." Jung echoes: "Patients...[who consciously have decided to repress something] give us the impression of being mentally well-developed individuals who seem to suffer only from a peculiar cowardice in regard to their own feelings," and elsewhere refers to "the pampering sweetness of childhood."⁴³

They both assume that healing requires an individual to be honest with him- or herself and to accommodate reasonably well. Adler stresses accommodation with the social environment, while Jung emphasizes that once the ego has mastered normative tasks accommodation must occur in relation to the inner environment, the unconscious.

The psychological systems of Adler and Jung are least compatible regarding the nature of the unconscious, though they only grow most markedly so past 1913. In 1929, well after Jung has launched his theory of an archetypally structured, autonomous unconscious, Adler writes: "The unconscious is nothing other than that which we have been unable to formulate in clear concepts. It is not a matter of contents hiding away in some unconscious or subconscious recess of our minds, but of parts of our consciousness, the significance of which we have not fully understood."⁴⁴ What Adler writes in 1929 is less pertinent to the question of influence than how he sounds before 1913, when Jung read him attentively. In those days Adler could resonate, far more than one might expect, like the vatic Wise Old Man Jung declaiming of Self and individuation: "Through the great *being* which surrounds and penetrates us, there is a great *becoming* which strives toward a completed *being*."⁴⁵ The Adler of 1912 considers the unconscious an important repository, both of an individual's goal and also of compensatory tactics—devices eventually codified by Anna Freud under the rubric mechanisms of defense. He identifies four such tactics: (1) power strivings, enacted via the "masculine protest," by which means a person attempts to become like a dominant man; (2) finalism, or teleology, the ego-orienting gen-

eral direction of a person's power goal; (3) fictionalism, or guiding lines, a melange of blueprints for reaching the goal and of assumptions about the subject's existential condition; and (4) safeguarding methods, namely, defenses against the loss of self-esteem.

From among Adler's three forms of safeguarding—aggression, distance, and the "neurotic arrangement"—Jung frequently uses the latter, similarly to Adler, to describe a maladaptive ego defense that involves organizing one's behavior or manipulating the environment to achieve a psychological advantage. Compare Adler's "If the boy is to emerge out of his insecurity into which he has been plunged by his constitutional inferiority he must arrange his preparations for life in accordance with a set point of view as after a plan" with Jung's 1946 discussion of transference: "The contents which enter into the transference were as a rule originally projected onto the parents or other members of the family....Is the incest one of the 'arrangements' (Adler) of the will to power?"⁴⁶ The cognitive counterpart of behavioral arrangements is fictionalism—a way to organize one's beliefs about oneself and the world so as to generate purpose, sustain momentum, and render one's existence meaningful. Here too, Jung closely follows *The Neurotic Constitution*, where Adler writes: "The scheme of which the child avails himself in order to enable him to act and orient himself is one common to and in accordance with the tendency of the human understanding to reduce that which is chaotic, fluid, and intangible in life to measurable entities by means of the assumption of fictions."⁴⁷ Jung's "Principles of Practical Psychotherapy" (1935) applies the term similarly: "Those who want to be 'on top' are mostly people who are either the

underdogs in reality or fancy that they are not playing the role that is properly due to them. Hence they often have difficulty in adapting themselves socially and try to cover up their inferiority with power fictions."⁴⁸ Jung's adoption of "arrangements" and "fictionalism" is relatively straightforward. His way of handling the concepts "finalism" and "power strivings," because they are applicable to archetypal processes, appears more complicated and richer.

During the years around 1912, the time of greatest intellectual convergence between Adler and Jung, their still unconsolidated ideas about teleology are most similar. Subsequently, Jung posits the archetype of the Self, which acts as the intrapsychic agent of teleology by furthering an organism's inherent tendency most fully to express its unique physical and mental potential. Adler, meanwhile, moves in the opposite direction, becoming convinced that the highest expression and ultimate goal of human nature is an inborn social interest, *Gemeinschaftsgefühl*. Jung continues to find Adler's early version of teleology useful for understanding unconscious goal-directed strivings in the service of ego defense or fulfillment, and acknowledges Adler's seminal contribution: "Neurotic symptoms and complexes are also elaborate 'arrangements' which inexorably pursue their aims, with incredible obstinacy and cunning. *Neurosis is teleologically oriented*. In establishing this Adler has won himself no small credit."⁴⁹

A similar divergence occurs with the fourth of Adler's above-mentioned unconscious compensatory strategies, the power drive, and its handmaiden, the masculine protest. Adler increasingly portrays the power drive as an ego compensation, while Jung confers on "power

striving” the status of an instinctual force comparable to eros.⁵⁰ Both are alumni of the informal fraternity of late-nineteenth/early-twentieth century intellectuals who had been deeply impressed by Nietzsche's philosophy,⁵¹ and Jung credits Adler with having imported the construct of the will to power into depth psychology.⁵² He first employs Adler's Nietzschean perspective during the early 1920s, and subsequently applies it across a spectrum of modes ranging from corroborative or illustrative citation through complete annexation. The citation mode implies less involvement with the given concept:

One cannot expect a disorder that began so early on the basis of organ inferiorities to be cured at once. It will take years to reach a complete adaptation. A strong feeling of inferiority is obviously at the bottom of the neurosis. It is a clear case of Adlerian psychology, where the inferiority gives rise to a power complex. The symptomatology shows how the neurosis attempted to compensate the loss of efficiency.⁵³

Elsewhere, Jung blends Adler's contribution with his own emergent version of depth psychology: “Adler has employed the term ‘godlikeness’ to characterize certain basic features of neurotic power psychology. If I likewise borrow the same term from *Faust*, I use it here more in the sense...[of] the knowledge of good and evil,” a knowledge, Jung then underscores, which often produces inflation, either positive or negative.⁵⁴ At times Jung completely assimilates this Adlerian motif. Speculating about Nietzsche's psychopathology, Jung elaborates on the grim prognosis for unmodulated power strivings:

What did the collision with the shadow, namely the will to power, reveal to him? Is

it to be regarded as something bogus, a symptom of repression. Is the will to power genuine or merely secondary? If the conflict with the shadow had let loose a flood of sexual fantasies, the matter would be perfectly clear; but it happened otherwise. The “Kern des Pudels” was not Eros but the power of the ego. From this we would have to conclude that what was repressed was not Eros but the will to power. There is in my mind no ground for the assumption that Eros is genuine and the will to power bogus. The will to power is surely just as mighty a daemon as Eros, and just as old and original.⁵⁵

Here Jung expresses himself faithfully and with his distinctive voice, but clearly having benefited from Adler's perspective.

The gradual divergence of Adler's and Jung's ideas about teleology and the power drive is somewhat balanced out by their gradual reconciliation concerning masculine protest, which term Adler introduced in a 1910 paper “Inferiority Feeling and Masculine Protest,” and through 1912 applied to the power strivings of males and females alike. Jung, in 1914, dismissed this coinage as referring to nothing beyond infantile wish fulfillment.⁵⁶ By 1930 Adler had restricted masculine protest to designating only women's negative reactions to their second-class social status. Within a roughly similar time-frame Jung developed his theory of the animus, a complex in women which manifests itself like a stereotypic male. By 1943 Jung became amenable to Adler's locution, having worked it into a description of feminine behavior wholly compatible with the animus construct:

Her parents' unhappy marriage afforded an excellent opportunity for the childish urge for power. The power instinct wants

the ego to be “on top” under all circumstances, by fair means or foul. The “integrity of the personality” must be preserved at all costs. Every attempt, be it only the apparent attempt, of the environment to obtain the slightest ascendancy over the subject is met, to use Adler’s expression, by the “masculine protest.”⁵⁷

However positive the influence of “masculine protest” may have been for Jung’s development of the animus construct, it did not extend to Adler’s social liberalism, for Jung remained far less sensitive to women’s genuine social disadvantages than the father of *Gemeinschaftsgefühl*, who wrote:

*A girl comes into the world with a prejudice sounding in her ears which is designed only to rob her of her belief in her own value, to shatter her self-confidence and destroy her hope of ever doing anything worth while. If this prejudice is constantly being strengthened, if a girl sees again and again how women are given servile roles to play, it is not hard to understand how she loses courage, fails to face her obligations, and sinks back from the solution of her life’s problems. Then indeed she is useless and incapable!*⁵⁸

Jung utterly lacked Adler’s radicalism on the subject of women’s needs and nature. He appreciated women, and argued for the full reinstatement of the feminine in Judaeo-Christianity, but his definition of woman incorporated aspects of traditional stereotypes, and prescribed for them their long-standing tasks:

No one can get round the fact that by taking up a masculine profession, studying and working like a man, a woman is doing something not wholly in accord with, if not directly injurious to, her feminine nature.... It is a woman’s outstanding characteristic that she can do anything for the love of a man. But those women who can achieve something

*important for the sake of a thing are most exceptional, because this does not really agree with their nature. Love for a thing is a man’s prerogative.... A man should live as a man and a woman as a woman.*⁵⁹

These contrasting passages, both originally published in 1927, exemplify one of the several profound differences between these authors. Nevertheless, Jung’s encounter, fifteen years earlier, with Adler’s ideas, had lasting positive consequences.

Notes

1. Henri Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious* (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 645.
2. James Hillman, *Healing Fiction* (New York: Station Hill, 1983), p. 104.
3. C.G. Jung, “Depth Psychology,” *CW 18* (1951), pars. 1153-4.
4. C.G. Jung Bibliothek, *Katalog* (Kusnacht-Zurich: privately printed, 1967).
5. C.G. Jung, “The Theory of Psychoanalysis,” *CW 4* (1912), p. 87.
6. Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious*, p. 672.
7. Jung, “Letter to Loy,” *CW 4* (1913), par. 659.
8. Alfred Adler, “Trotz und Gehorsam,” in *Heilen und Bilden* (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt, 1914), p. 91. Unpublished translation; thanks to Mr. Chris Scrogum.
9. See Jung, “The Psychology of the Unconscious Process” (1918), in Constance E. Long, ed., *Collected Papers on Analytical Psychology*, 2d ed. (London: Bailliant, Tindall, and Cox, 1920), pp. 390-1. This piece is a prototype of Two Essays on Analytical Psychology.
10. M.-L. von Franz, “The Library of C.G. Jung,” *Spring* (1970), p. 192.
11. Jung, *Letters*, vol. 1 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973), p. 302.
12. Jung, “The Role of the Unconscious,” *CW 10* (1918), par. 19.
13. Jung, “The State of Psychotherapy Today,” *CW 10* (1934), par. 353.
14. Jung, “The Aetiology of Neurosis,” *CW 4* (1929), par. 773. See also *CW 18* (1958), par. 1259.
15. Jung, *Psychological Types*, *CW 6* (1923), par. 601.

16. Jung, "The Structure of the Unconscious," *CW 7* (1916), par. 490.
17. Jung, "A Rejoinder to Dr. Bally," *CW 10* (1933), par. 1029. See also par. 342.
18. Jung, "Psychotherapists or the Clergy," *CW 11* (1932), par. 496. See also *CW 9i*, pars. 43-4, 91.
19. Jung, "Analytical Psychology and Education," *CW 17* (1946), par. 203.
20. Jung, "Introduction to Kranefeldt's 'Secret Ways of the Mind,'" *CW 4* (1934), par. 759. See also *CW 6*, par. 788.
21. Jung, "Analytical Psychology and Education," par. 156. For thirty-nine years, Jung held to the view that Freud and Adler "are partially wrong, or rather, they are mutually complimentary....In practice one would do well to consider both points of view" (Jung, "Fundamental Questions of Psychotherapy," *CW 16* [1951], pars. 4-5). See also *CW 7* (1912), par. 256; and *CW 18* (1951), par. 1154.
22. Jung, *Nietzsche's Zarathustra, Notes on the Seminar Given in 1934-1939* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), p. 145. See also *CW 7* (1943), par. 199.
23. Jung, "Problems of Modern Psychotherapy," *CW 16* (1929), pars. 122, 151.
24. Jung, "The Tavistock Lectures," *CW 18* (1935), par. 280.
25. Heinz and Rowena Anspacher, *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler* (New York: Basic Books, 1956), pp. 44-5.
26. Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious*, p. 317.
27. Sonu Shamdasani, "Encountering Helene," in Theodore Flournoy, *From India to the Planet Mars* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. xxv. I am indebted to Mr. Shamdasani for informing me that in an earlier draft of this paper I had failed to discuss Flournoy's priority over Adler in regard to "compensation."
28. Helene Smith, Flournoy's subject, is both plagued and rewarded by her alleged supernatural gifts: "If the spontaneous automatism of Mlle. Smith are often the vexatious result of her moments of suggestibility, of the tempestuous irruption of her subliminal reveries, they also often assume the form of useful messages. Such compensation is not to be despised" (Flournoy, *From India*, p. 41). Flournoy emphasizes the material compensations Smith's mediumship yields her—especially increased efficacy and social status—not its intrapsychic advantages (see p. 34).
29. Jung, "On the Psychology and Pathology of So-called Occult Phenomena," *CW 1* (1902), pars. 96n, 98, 101-7, 115, 117, 119-20, 125n, 136.
30. Jung, *CW 3*, pars. 59n, 61; see also pars. 212, 276. Jung lists as his reference "On the Psychical Mechanisms of Hysterical Phenomena," from *Studies on Hysteria*, part I, but Freud never uses the word "compensation" in this essay. When eventually he adopts it, in *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), the mode is more informal than technical: e.g., the pleasurable dream of a five-year-old boy frustrated at not being permitted to climb a high alp "was a compensation" (Sigmund Freud, *SE 6* [1900], p. 128.) Of the eight times Freud employs the word "compensation" before 1907, only one, in *Gradiva* (1906), implies, though it does not specifically state, that "compensation" refers to a distinctive psychological process (Sigmund Freud, *SE 9* (1960), p. 80. See also *SE 6*, pp. 131, 171, 181; and *SE 8*, pp. 72, 109, 127).
31. Adler, *Study of Organ Inferiority and Its Psychological Compensation* (New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company, 1917), pp. 65-6.
32. Jung, *The Psychology of the Unconscious* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1946), p. 363.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 98, 177. See also pp. 50, 74, 176, 197, and 454. For Jung's mature formulation of libidinal dynamics see Jung, "On Psychic Energy," *CW 8*, pars. 27, 78 (e.g., "Energy is a quantitative concept....Libido moves not only forwards and backwards, but also outwards and inwards").
34. Jung, *Psychological Types*, *CW 6* (1921), par. 763.
35. Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 488.
36. Adler, *Neurotic Constitution*, p. vi.
37. Anspacher, *Individual Psychology*, pp. 114-5.
38. Jung, *Psychological Types*, pars. 693-4. See also par. 626 and *CW 7*, par. 104 n. 11.
39. *Ibid.*, par. 693.
40. Jung, *CW 4*, par. 564; *CW 6*, pars. 693, 501; *CW 7*, par. 500; *CW 14*, par. 514n; *CW 16*, par. 24.
41. Paul Stepansky, *In Freud's Shadow, Adler in Context* (New Jersey: Analytic Press, 1983), pp. 157-160.
42. Jung, *The Visions Seminars* (Zurich: Spring, 1976), p. 478. This passage is rendered more elaborately but substantially the same way in Claire Douglas's recent edition, C.G.

- Jung, *Visions. Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930-1934* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), pp. 1319-1320.
43. Adler, *Neurotic Constitution*, pp. 97, 20; see also p. 283. Jung, "Theory of Psychoanalysis," *CW 4*, pars. 212, 213; see also pars. 380-381, 390, and *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 335. For a suggestive example of what may be either affinity or influence, compare Adler's discussion of inappropriate compulsive laughter over an earthquake with Jung's account of a woman's shadow-driven mirth following her father's death (Adler, *Neurotic Constitution*, p. 326; Jung, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, *CW 7* [1943], par. 47, and *Aion*, *CW 9ii* [1959], pars. 13, 15).
 44. From "Problems of Neurosis," in Anspacher, *Individual Psychology*, p. 235.
 45. Adler, *Neurotic Constitution*, p. 445. Italics Adler's.
 46. *Ibid.*, p. 34. Jung, *Psychology of the Transference*, *CW 16* (1946), par. 368; see also *CW 6*, par. 865.
 47. Adler, *Neurotic Constitution*, p. 36.
 48. Jung, "Principles of Practical Psychotherapy," *CW 16*, (1935), par. 24.
 49. Jung, *Two Essays*, par. 54. Italics mine.
 50. Eventually Freud does so as well, when, by modifying his theory to include the principle of thanatos, he capitulates to Adler in deed, though never in word.
 51. Ellenberger, *Discovery of the Unconscious*, pp. 271-8.
 52. Jung, *Two Essays*, par. 44.
 53. Jung, "Analytical Psychology and Education," par. 215.
 54. Jung, *Two Essays*, pp. 141-142.
 55. *Ibid.*, par. 42. Faust exclaims, "*Das also war des Pudels Kern*"—*Faust*, Part I, l. 1323—upon discovering that Mephistopheles has been disguised as the black dog. Thus Jung refers to the core of the shadow archetype/complex. I am indebted to Dr. Susan Thackrey for this reference.
 56. Jung, "On Psychological Understanding," *CW 3* (1914), par. 411.
 57. Jung, *Two Essays*, par. 50. N.B. Jung does not refer to masculine protest in the 1928 Dodd, Mead edition of this piece. Compare pp. 35-38.
 58. Alfred Adler, *Understanding Human Nature* (New York:Greenberg, 1927), p. 131. For a fuller exposition see pp. 129-133.
 59. Jung, "Woman in Europe," *CW 10* (1927), par. 243.